

MORE ON THE MOTION TO
INSTRUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I just wanted to take this opportunity to talk a little bit more about the motion to instruct the conferees on the budget reconciliation bill which we voted on just a few moments ago, actually.

I felt very strongly, I had a chance to talk a little bit about it, but I just wanted to elaborate a little more. I felt very strongly during the debate today on this motion that the motion really got to the heart of the issue on Medicare, the cuts in Medicare, the cuts in Medicaid, and the cuts essentially to our health care system in general and how this Republican budget has essentially targeted, if you will, Medicare and Medicaid in order to primarily pay for tax cuts for wealthy Americans.

The motion to instruct the conferees pays attention to that and essentially says that the conferees should try to do whatever they can to minimize both tax cuts for the wealthy and tax increases on low- and middle-income working families in order to preserve and protect the health and income security of senior citizens and to avoid increasing the number of Americans lacking access to health care.

From the very beginning of this debate on the budget, on the one side concern about Medicare and Medicaid, on the other side the issue of where tax cuts are going to go and how those two are going to interplay, from the very beginning I thought it was possible and the point needed to be made that there was a relationship, a direct relationship between the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid and the tax cuts that were going to be implemented for wealthy Americans. In fact, if you eliminate a lot of the tax cuts for the wealthy Americans or for those of us who happen to have higher incomes, if you eliminate those tax cuts or you cut back on those tax cuts, you could add more money into Medicare and Medicaid and not have the situation where both of those health care programs for seniors as well as for low-income people are seriously threatened by this Congress and by this budget bill.

The other thing that is in this motion to instruct that I thought was so important is that it pointed out that there are a lot of people who simply will not have any health care coverage if these cuts in Medicare and Medicaid go through. Let me explain why I feel very strongly about that.

First of all, right now Medicaid, which is the health care program for low-income people in this country, is basically an entitlement. In other words, if your income falls below a certain amount, you are entitled to Medicaid, to health care coverage. Well, no longer under this Republican budget bill is Medicaid an entitlement. In fact, it is left up to the States with money

that they get in a block grant from the Federal Government to decide who they are going to cover in various categories for low-income people. So it is very possible that a lot of low-income people, seniors, children, disabled people, will simply not have health care coverage at all if the States decide not to provide it.

Now, on the Senate side, on the Senate side they decided to continue the entitlement for pregnant women, children, and for disabled persons. So one of the points that the motion to instruct makes is that we should agree with the Senate version to at least guarantee health care coverage for low-income people who fall into those three categories.

There are also a lot of people on Medicare. There are also a lot of senior citizens on Medicare who may not get health care coverage under this bill because you have to remember that part B of Medicare, which pays for your doctor bills, is not a guarantee. Right now if you are a low-income senior, part B of your Medicare is paid for by the Federal Government. But this bill has eliminated that guarantee. So if you are a low-income senior who is eligible for Medicaid, you no longer have the guarantee of part B, and you have to pay for it out of your pocket possibly unless the States decide to pay it for you.

Again, a large group, in this case low-income seniors, may not have health care in terms of having physician care.

These are the problems that we face unless in this conference an effort is made to try to cut back on this tax cut for wealthy Americans and put more money back into the Medicare Program and back into the Medicaid Program.

The other issue that came up, and I think it is a very important issue again, is on the pensions. In the Senate bill there is no change with regard to pension funds. But in the House-passed bill we have this provision that basically allows corporations to raid pension funds of their employees and use it for almost any purpose that they want, perhaps for a hostile takeover. Again, the Senate has seen that that language is not the way to go. Our motion to instruct, which did not pass today, urges that the conferees go along with the Senate bill to guarantee some protection for workers and for their pensions.

I think that is safe to say that some of these provisions where there has been disagreement between the House and the Senate, particularly when it comes to providing Medicaid-guaranteed coverage for a lot of low-income people, providing the protection for workers and their pensions and also with regard to nursing homes, right now the House-passed bill does not provide any guarantees that nursing homes are going to be up to standard, because the standards are essentially eliminated.

We hope that we will see the conferees adopt the better Senate language.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. ROSLEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROSLEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. MCKINNEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. KIM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

POSSIBLE VIOLATION OF HOUSE
RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS. Madam Speaker, I actually rise to inform my colleagues that lost in all the discussion in recent weeks back here in Washington over some very important and pressing issues has been the revelation that the House Inspector General, Mr. John Lainhart, who was appointed as House Inspector General by the former Democratic majority, in fact by the former Speaker of the House, Tom Foley, has indicated that he will soon be reporting to the House Committee on Oversight and the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct the names of those Members of Congress past and present as well as House officers who may have violated either House rules or the laws of the United States of America in conjunction with the ongoing audit into congressional finances.

I just want to refresh the memory of my colleagues that back on January 4, the opening day of this session, in one of our first acts as the new majority party in the House of Representatives, we Republicans, joined by almost all of our colleagues on the minority side of the aisle, commissioned an independent audit of House finances. The international accounting firm Price

Waterhouse, one of the Big Six accounting firms, was ultimately selected to conduct this audit. What they found, to put it simply, was a complete and total mess.

House congressional finances in fact were in such disarray that the Price Waterhouse accounting firm was unable to render an opinion on the financial condition of the House of Representatives. In fact, reading between their lines, I think one can conclude that, if any American business kept its records and managed its money the way the House of Representatives has for many, many years, under the previous leadership, that business would have been bankrupt and its owners would have been in jail.

In fact the audit, which again we promised to the American people and American taxpayers as part of the Contract with America, found 14 significant control weaknesses. These are internal management controls and financial records that were in such disarray that the auditors would not even issue an opinion on the management of House finances because of the gross lack of information.

This is the worst conclusion that an auditor can reach. In one example the poor financial management by the House under the previous Democratic control, Price Waterhouse found that handwritten ledgers were used in the House finance office which process \$700 million in taxpayer funds for salaries and expenses.

So, as I mentioned in recent days, the Inspector General has informed the House, and this was reported in the Washington Times last week, the House Inspector General has informed the House that he is preparing to present findings that will identify Members and House officers who have abused travel and salary accounts.

I want to let my colleagues know that, at the appropriate time, I will press for full disclosure of all abusers. I am sure my colleagues here tonight agree with me that we have a duty and an obligation to the American people to identify those who have abused the public trust. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

Again, I just want to point out that I will press for full disclosure of the names. The public has a right to know and a right to demand accountability. I do not want this to get lost in our efforts at other reforms and in our efforts to get a balanced budget plan enacted into law. But again, I think we have an absolute duty and responsibility to pursue this matter, again, given the report that has been presented to the House in phase 1 of the audit by Price Waterhouse.

I will just remind my colleagues that those auditors were professional auditors who conduct large-scale accounting or auditing efforts in the private sector. Those auditors would not even issue an opinion on the soundness of the House's finances or the reliability of financial statements filed by House

Democrat leaders who managed the Congress' budget during the period of the audit, which was the last Congress.

□ 2100

So, I ask my colleagues to join me in demanding full disclosure of abuses of House finances. These are the taxpayers' dollars, and the American people have a right to know who is responsible for mismanaging their money and abusing the public trust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. SEASTRAND). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

H.R. 1833, THE PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADAY] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CANADAY of Florida. Madam Speaker, while every abortion sadly takes a human life, the partial-birth abortion method takes that life as the baby emerges from the mother's womb—while the baby is only partially in the birth canal. The difference between the partial-birth abortion procedure and homicide is a mere three inches.

Partial-birth abortion goes a step beyond abortion on demand. The baby involved is not "unborn." His or her life is taken during a breach delivery. A procedure which obstetricians use in some circumstances to bring a healthy child into the world is perverted to result in a dead child. The physician, traditionally trained to do everything in his power to assist and protect both mother and child during the birth process, deliberately kills the child in the birth canal.

This is partial-birth abortion: (1) Guided by ultrasound, the abortionist grabs the live baby's legs with forceps. (2) The baby's legs are pulled out into the birth canal. (3) The abortionist delivers the baby's entire body, except for the head. (4) Then, the abortionist jams scissors into the baby's skull. The scissors are then opened to enlarge the hole. (5) The scissors are then removed and a suction catheter is inserted. The child's brains are sucked out causing the skull to collapse so the delivery of the child can be completed.

Because we believe that this procedure is an inhuman act, the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], and I introduced a bipartisan bill to ban the performance of partial-birth abortion. We now have 162 Members from both sides of the aisle

who have requested to cosponsor H.R. 1833.

Opponents of H.R. 1833 now claim that the babies who are the victims of partial-birth abortion die, either before the procedure begins or shortly thereafter. But the "Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act" does not cover a procedure in which the baby is delivered after he or she is dead. The definition of partial-birth abortion requires that the baby be partially delivered alive, then killed.

Our opponents' argument that the baby is already dead when these abortions are performed betrays their desperation. They support abortion at any time, in any manner, for any reason. But they know the American people do not support this extreme position. They realize that this inhuman procedure which we have seen depicted here and the results of which we see in this chart, this inhuman procedure in which a body is partially delivered alive, then stabbed in the back of the head, cannot be justified. So, instead of defending the procedure as the practitioners have described it, they change their story and attempt to conceal the reality of this terrible procedure.

However, the new claims of those who defend partial-birth abortion are directly contradicted by past statements of abortionists and by those who have witnessed the procedure. Brenda Shafer, a registered nurse who witnessed the procedure while working with Dr. Martin Haskell, an Ohio abortionist, wrote a letter to Congressman TONY HALL dated July 9, 1995 in which she described the procedure. Nurse Shafer wrote that witnessing the procedure was "the most horrible experience of my life." She described watching one baby and again I quote nurse Shafer:

The baby's body was moving. His little fingers were clasping together. He was kicking his feet. All the while his little head was still stuck inside. Dr. Haskell took a pair of scissors and inserted them into the back of the baby's head. Then he opened the scissors up. Then he stuck the high-powered suction tube into the hole and sucked the baby's brains out. * * *

Next, Dr. Haskell delivered the baby's head, cut the umbilical cord and delivered the placenta.

Dr. Haskell and Dr. McMahon, two abortionists who prefer the partial-birth abortion method, were interviewed by the American Medical News in 1993. These doctors "told the AM News that the majority of fetuses aborted this way are alive until the end of the procedure."

Dr. Dru Carlson—of Cedar-Sinai Medical Center in Los Angeles—wrote to Chairman HYDE in support of Dr. McMahon's use of partial-birth abortions. In the letter to Chairman HYDE she states that she has personally observed Dr. McMahon performing this procedure. She writes that after Dr. McMahon delivers the fetus up to the shoulders, he removes "cerebrospinal fluid from the brain causing instant brain herniation and death."