

ABORTION'S CHILDREN

HON. JIM TALENT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1998

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I request the following eloquent article be inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 22, 1998]

(By Peggy Noonan)

On the 25th anniversary of *Roe v. Wade*, we know certain facts. We know that at this point about 1.5 million abortions are performed each year in the United States. And we know that the fight over whether legalized abortion should continue has not waned with time, as many thought it would, but grown.

The debate has always been by adults about adults. What are the effects on women when they terminate a pregnancy? Do they suffer unusual depression a year or two after the procedure?

Opponents of abortion also talk about the effects of abortion on the fetus being aborted. Does it feel pain?

But there is another group of children who have been overlooked in the debate—the children who have grown up in the abortion culture, the children now 10 or 15 or even 20 years old who have had it drummed into them by television and radio and in magazines, what abortion is and why and how it became legal. It is part of the aural wallpaper of their lives. They have grown up knowing phrases like “abortion on demand” and “the right to abortion” and hearing nice adults, the people next door, talk about supporting politicians who will “protect” these “rights.”

I wonder if such talk has not left many of these children confused, so deeply that they do not even know they are confused, and morally dulled.

We all know the recent horror stories. According to prosecutors and news accounts, a girl at a prom delivers a baby in the bathroom and lets it die, then rearranges herself, washes up and goes back to the dance. A pair of college-aged lovers from “good families” in “pricy suburbs,” as news accounts put it, rent a motel room, where he delivers their child, which they throw into a Dumpster.

Is it too much to see a connection between the abortion culture in which these young people came of age and the moral dullness they are accused of displaying? Of course, such crimes have occurred throughout time; history and literature are full of them. But what is new, I think, is the apparent surprise of the young girl at the prom, and of the young couple at the motel, at the disapproval society has shown toward them.

And why should society disapprove? What, after all, is the difference between what the girl at the prom is accused of doing and a late-term abortion, something she would have heard discussed, explained and defended on television and in the newspaper?

A late-term abortion means pulling a fully formed but not yet born baby out of the womb, piercing its brain with scissors, sucking out the brain, collapsing the skull and then removing the dead baby. In the girl's home state, New Jersey, this was legal. Why wouldn't she think there is no difference, really, between that and choking a baby to death in a bathroom stall and then dropping it in a trash bin? And what, in fact, is the difference? Only that one death occurred in a bathroom stall, and the other happened in a hospital with clean white sheets and a doctor.

Consider, too, the young couple in the motel and the reasoning that may have left them free of any sense of sin or crime. If the accusations are true, what did they do that was wrong besides refuse to suck into life an inconvenient baby? Isn't that what the culture they were born into, and grew to young adulthood in, does?

I think that's the great ignored story—what we have done to our children by legalizing abortion and championing it. The daily abortion stories and abortion polls and abortion editorials and abortion pictures and stories showing how the movement to “protect these rights” is faring—all this has drummed into their heads the idea that human life is not special, is not sanctified, is not a life formed by God but a fertilized ovum that makes demands and can be removed.

What we teach the young every day is moral confusion about the worth of an ordinary human life. This has wounded, in a very real and personal way, big pieces of an entire generation. And I suspect it has left them frightened, too.

IN MEMORY OF DAVID E. PHILIPS

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1998

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to pay tribute to David E. Philips, a man who will be long remembered as a unique person who enjoyed sharing his many talents, not only with those close to him, but with his entire community.

Mr. Philips was a dedicated professor of English at Eastern Connecticut State University from 1962 until his retirement in 1991. Beloved by faculty and students alike, he brought more to his university than just a specialized knowledge of Connecticut folklore. An academic and an historian, Mr. Philips also devoted himself to the personal betterment of his students in the name of true higher education. His legacy, not only as an inspirational professor, but as an inspirational man, will long be remembered throughout his community.

After serving in the United States Navy during World War II, Mr. Philips returned home and became active in civic affairs. His hard work was pivotal for the planning and development of the new “Frog” bridge in Willimantic. Serving as a member of the Windham Board of Education from 1971 to 1979, Mr. Philips expounded an exceptional amount of effort to ensure the best possible future for the children of eastern Connecticut.

Not limiting himself to educational issues, Mr. Philips also donated further time and energy to the Democratic Town Committee and was chairman of the town planning commission. Spending his summers in Trenton, ME, he was contributing editor of *Down East Magazine* for 25 years.

An extraordinary individual, Mr. Philips was a powerful storyteller who brought joy to audiences of all ages with his remarkable ability. Author of the book, *Legendary Connecticut*, Mr. Philips joyfully shared his passion for folklore with the entire community.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare man that can devote his life to things he loves while contributing so much to the community at the same time. David E. Philips will be missed by everyone he touched, but most of all by his two sons Evan and Donald and the rest of the Philips family.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RHINOCEROS AND TIGER CONSERVATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1998

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1998

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce legislation to reauthorize a landmark conservation law known as the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act.

This historic legislation, which was enacted into law four years ago, was modeled after the highly successful African Elephant Conservation Act of 1988. The fundamental purpose of this law was to establish a Conservation Fund to finance worthwhile projects to assist highly imperiled species of rhinos and tigers. Sadly, the populations of these two flagship species continue to decline and, unless additional assistance is provided, they will continue to slide toward extinction.

In the case of the rhinoceros, it has been estimated that their population has been decimated from 65,000 animals in 1970 to less than 11,000 today. In fact, in the case of two of the five species of rhinoceros, the Javan and Sumatran, there are less than 600 left in the world. While all five species of rhinoceros were listed on Appendix I of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) in 1977 and a worldwide trade ban has been imposed, poachers continue to slaughter rhinos for their horns. These horns have been used for generations in Asian medicine to treat fever in children and as decorative handles for ceremonial daggers.

Despite plummeting populations of rhinoceros, there is still an insatiable demand for rhino horn, which has made this commodity extremely valuable. In fact, African rhino horn can be worth as much as \$10,000 per kilogram and rare Asian rhino horn is worth up to \$60,000 per kilogram. The largest consumers of rhino horn live in China, Taiwan, and South Korea.

Regrettably the situation facing tigers is even worse. Of the eight subspecies of tigers once found in the world, three have become extinct and the remaining five populations have been reduced from 100,000 tigers in 1990 to less than 5,000 animals today. Furthermore, the three subspecies of South China, Siberian and Sumatran all have populations that are estimated at less than 500 animals.

Although commercial activities and human population growth have transformed large amounts of the tiger's habitat, illegal hunting has had the most dramatic impact. Despite the fact that all tigers are protected under CITES, tigers are killed for their fur and most of their body parts. Tiger bone is used in many forms of traditional Oriental medicines including powders, tablets, and wines that are consumed to fight pain, kidney and liver problems, convulsions, and heart conditions. Like rhino horn, the major consumers of these products live in China, Taiwan, and South Korea. According to CITES, during the past six years, South Korea imported about 10,500 pounds and China 78 tons of tiger bone.

Sadly, the financial rewards of illegally killing a tiger are substantial. According to the World Wildlife Fund, a pound of tiger bone sells for

over \$1,400 and a tiger pelt may be worth up to \$15,000. It is essential this market be destroyed and that people who live in the tigers' habitat begin to understand the consequences of exterminating an animal that has such a dramatic impact on so many other species.

These were fundamental goals of the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994. While it is still too early to tell whether this law will stop the population decline, it is clear that unless the United States takes a proactive leadership role in saving these species, they will soon only exist in remote wild locations or in zoos.

Since its enactment, the Congress has appropriated \$1 million over the last three fiscal years. While this is considerably less than the \$30 million that was authorized, this money has funded 24 conservation projects to assist rhinos and tigers at a Federal cost of about \$530,000. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is now evaluating an additional 70 proposals from organizations that are interested in helping to conserve these irreplaceable species.

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, it has funded 12 rhino projects, 6 tiger projects, and 6 projects that will benefit both species. These projects have included: an adopt-a-warden program in Indonesia; aerial monitoring of the Northern white rhinoceros in Zaire; establishment of a community rhino scout program for the survival of the black rhino populations in Kenya; investigation of poaching and illegal trade in wild tigers in India; a tiger community education program in Indonesia; and training of staff and surveys of four black rhino populations in the Selous Game Reserve in Tanzania. The sponsors of these projects, who are likely to match the grants with private funds, include the International Rhino Foundation, the Minnesota Zoo Foundation, and the World Wildlife Fund.

Based on the success of the African Elephant Conservation Fund, I am hopeful that these grants will make a positive difference in the fight to conserve rhinos and tigers.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Reauthorization Act, a bill to extend this landmark law for four years in the hope that it will help ensure that these vital species do not disappear from this planet.

“THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE IMF IN THE ASIAN FINANCIAL CRISIS”

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 27, 1998

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in the coming weeks, the U.S. Congress will be debating the role and policies of the International Monetary Fund and how or whether the United States should support this international institution. The context will be the Administration's request for \$3.5 billion for the New Arrangements to Borrow and \$14.5 billion for an IMF quota increase, or capital replenishment.***HD***Background

Before turning to the heart of this debate, a brief background is in order. First, the New Arrangements to Borrow, or NAB, came about subsequent to the Mexican peso crisis of 1994–95. The United States led that rescue

effort, with the assistance of the international institutions and other concerned nations. At U.S. urging, the G–7 Heads of State at the Halifax Summit in June 1995 called on the G–10 and other countries with financial capacity to develop a financial program that would have the capacity to handle future crises in the international financial system. Exactly one year ago today, the IMF Executive Directors approved the proposal for the NAB with 25 initial country participants. These countries potentially committed about \$49 billion in lines of credit to be made available on an emergency basis if IMF ordinary funds need to be supplemented in a crisis. The U.S. contribution of \$3.5 billion is equivalent to 19.74 percent share of the NAB.

Second, the proposed \$14.5 billion U.S. contribution to the IMF's capital base (about \$200 billion)—composed of member-countries subscriptions or quotas—is necessary for two reasons. First, IMF usable quota resources available to member countries has dwindled to about \$43 billion. With the current IMF Stand-By programs committed to Asia—Korea, \$21 billion (total package \$57 billion); Indonesia; \$10 billion (total package \$43 billion); Thailand, \$4 billion (total \$17 billion); Philippines, \$1 billion—IMF resources will be nearly depleted.

These Asia commitments underscore the second reason for the quota increase. When the IMF was established in 1944, its quotas and capital base were much larger relative to the size of the global economy. As the global economy has expanded, the IMF's resources have not kept pace, thus eroding its financial effectiveness. If we want the IMF to continue its role as the world's principal monetary authority with the responsibility of stabilizing the international financial system, it must have sufficient resources to credibly do so.***HD***The Risks of U.S. Inaction Far Transcend The Risks of Action

In determining how it will respond to the Asia crisis, the U.S. faces a pivotal choice. We can either use our central role in the international economic community to restore economic stability in Asia and safeguard the potential for economic growth there and at home. Or we can stand by as regional financial crisis blights the economic prospects of affected countries and their people, and simply hope it will not spread.

There are risks both in interceding, or in doing nothing, and letting the market dictate the consequences. I believe the risks of inaction are far greater.

Inaction would be contrary to what should be a central tenet of U.S. and IMF policies—halting the precipitous decline of Asian, and other regions', currencies. Continued currency depreciation will only exacerbate the deteriorating Asian domestic economies. Inevitably, that pain will spread to our own economy, in the form of lost export sales and investments, market turmoil, and increased unemployment. Absent intervention, competitive devaluations are much more likely to occur, doing further damage to the global trading system. If we are to protect that system, currency stabilization—and even appreciation of some of these currencies, which have plunged to all time lows against the dollar—is an imperative.

Inaction also carries the risk of spreading economic upheaval to other regions, including Latin America, Russia, and Eastern Europe. Many of these countries are already struggling

to maintain economic growth and stability. In many cases, they have initiated reforms with IMF assistance, and are making serious progress. The spread of the Asian financial turmoil could prove enormously costly to them as well.

Inaction carries the risk not only of economic turmoil, but of significant social and political disruption. To a limited extent, this has already begun. A further economic free-fall could precipitate political and social chaos.

The social impact of declining economies is most severe, not on the affluent or well-connected, but on the middle-class and poor. To be sure, inappropriately austere economic stabilization programs—whether IMF-sponsored or not—can also hurt a broad spectrum of society, bringing lost jobs, closed businesses, higher interest rates, and lost purchasing power. But allowing an economy spiraling downward to take its natural course without remedial action could cause far, far greater hardship.

The final risk of inaction is the unacceptable abrogation of U.S. influence and leadership in Asia. The United States has argued that its geo-political and economic interests lie in considerable part in Asia. It has repeatedly sought to demonstrate its commitment in a variety of fora—such as the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation platform—despite Asia's perception of a U.S. preoccupation with Latin America and Europe. We can now either affirm our commitment to Asia, or give the lie to these previous efforts.

With U.S. leadership, international institutions have been established to respond to global military crises, such as the United Nations role in Iraq, Bosnia, etc. When global economic crises arise, the International Monetary Fund is the institution empowered by the international community to take action. Just as the United States expects the United Nations to take action when military threats to world peace emerge, we must do our part to support the International Monetary Fund—the only available institution that can act when the threats to global stability are economic. In a time of world economic crisis, the United States cannot default on its economic leadership.***HD***The Political Challenge

Convincing the Congress and the American people that continued support for the International Monetary Fund is essential will be a difficult political challenge.

Our challenge is to make clear to U.S. taxpayers and public officials the economic consequences of not supporting the IMF. If the IMF does not intervene, U.S. taxpayers, business and labor will face serious consequences: further falling Asian currencies and a further rising U.S. dollar; a still greater tide of imports and larger trade deficits; and further falling stock-market prices, affecting pensions, savings, consumer behavior, etc.

Critics of the IMF—including both Democrats and Republicans in Congress—also contend that IMF programs are “excessively austere,” with harsh impacts on citizens; that IMF program results are questionable, since countries return to the IMF for repeated reform efforts; and that IMF programs lack discernible development progress. Some of these criticisms are warranted. But legitimate complaints can be lodged against almost any institution. A narrow focus on these problems ignores the stark reality that we need some international