



THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

April 9, 1996

NOTE TO MELANNE VERVEER

BETSY MYERS
ELENA KAGAN
JENNIFER KLEIN
DEBBIE FINE
JUDY GOLD

From: Jeremy Ben-Ami 
Subject: HR1833 Floor debate

FYI, attached are Rep. Johnson's floor remarks. They are not especially helpful. However, also note on the second page Rep. Becerra's remarks. His wife is apparently a high-risk ob-gyn, and he quotes ACOG's position for the record.

I don't think this is too useful to include for the President's briefing. Let me know if you disagree.

March 27, 1996

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H2911

whether it be chemical poisoning or suction, dismemberment of a baby, in this case a partially delivered baby killed with brain suction, this must be brought to the forefront so the people know exactly what is going on.

I hope the President says to the bill that he will sign it. I hope he signs it. It is not likely. He will have earned the legacy of being the abortion President. What a tragic, what a pathetic legacy to be the abortion President, especially a man who once in his past used to be pro-life.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman would not yield. I wanted to point out it does say it was the Conference of Catholic Bishops that created that poster.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK]. (Mrs. MINK of Hawaii asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, it is really tragic, tragic that the personal problems and the anxieties of women who face these very, very difficult decisions that must be made with respect to their health and their safety and the integrity of their family and to have those tragic circumstances of a person's life be used under these circumstances to advance this political goal of trying to do away with abortion.

But I think that the debate clearly points out that what is being attempted here is a denunciation of the rights of women that have been created by the U.S. Supreme Court. That is what is at stake here.

It is not this procedure that is used so few times out of necessity, but it is the principle of interfering with the doctor and the women that require this procedure, taking away that right of a woman to make this difficult decision, taking away the right of a woman to consult with her physician about what needs to be done, allowing the Congress of the United States to make these decisions. I think that is the most reprehensible thing we could even think of.

We talk about getting big government off of the backs of people. Well, let us concentrate about what we are trying to do today. We are trying to take away the rights of reproductive freedom that the Supreme Court has established, which the courts have said we must not interfere, and this is what is before us today, and that is why this Congress must oppose it. That is why this bill must never become law. It is trying to dictate to the doctors how to practice and criminalize their profession. I think it is outrageous.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE], a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me.

I am not a criminal, Mr. Speaker. And I am ashamed that what we are doing today may, in fact, makes innocent women, women who love children, criminals. Coreen Costello, Mary-Dorothy Lines, Claudia Ades, Vikki Wilson, Tammy Watts, and Vikki Stella, all women who offered their most personal stories about wanting to conceive and to have a loving child and yet coming upon a physical and debilitating need to have a medical procedure.

Today we have legislation that will not cover all cases where a woman's life is in danger. The bill will not provide a health exception. H.R. 1833 creates obstacles to medical research, and tragically the life exception will not protect women. Criminals, we are making. Women, their families, their physicians. This is not the way to go.

In order to suggest that those of us who rise to support the rights of women do not have a love of a higher authority, how shameful. This is a bad bill. It does not help this country. It does not help women, and it certainly does not help the love we have for our children.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to a point that was made a few moments ago about this bill criminalizing the activities of women and making criminals of women. That is simply not true.

I would suggest that before Members come to the floor to speak about the bill, they might want to read the bill. The bill says clearly a woman upon whom a partial-birth abortion is performed may not be prosecuted under this section.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1830

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1833. In yet another attempt to roll back a woman's right to choose, to roll back Roe versus Wade, and make all abortions illegal, choice opponents are putting forward legislation which could endanger a woman's life and her ability to have children in the future.

How odd that the majority party would describe itself as family friendly. Plain and simple, the supporters of this bill feel it is more important to save a doomed fetus than the life of a mother and her ability to have children in the future.

Coreen Costello is the mother of two. The Dole amendment would not have allowed her to use this procedure. Coreen Costello said in front of the Senate in her testimony that she would have taken any child that God gave her, regardless of any handicap. But her child was a child that could not live. Fortunately for Coreen and her family, her doctor was able to save her

life and her fertility. She is now expecting her next child.

But what about the women who come after Coreen? What will happen to them, their health, their lives, their families, if this life-saving procedure is outlawed? Congress has no place in their decisions and no place in their tragedies.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Mrs. JOHNSON].

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for yielding me time.

If your daughter and son-in-law were faced with the extraordinary tragedy of discovering extreme fetal deformity late in pregnancy or a life threatening development with abortion being the only alternative, would you, would you, each individual Member of this body, want her to have available to her the procedure that was the least threatening to her life and the most protective of her future reproductive capability and the most respectful of the need for the parents to be and their living children to mourn their tragic loss?

Consider the experience of Coreen Costello. Mrs. Costello and her husband hold strong pro-life views, but were suddenly faced with the terrible and painful truth of the problems with her pregnancy. Specialists had determined that the baby had a lethal neurological disorder. Doctors at Cedars-Sinai told the Costellos that their daughter would not live, and due to the amniotic fluid pooling in Mrs. Costello's uterus, as well as the baby's position, there was a serious risk of a ruptured uterus. Natural birth or an induced labor were impossible. Coreen Costello then considered a caesarean section, but the doctors at her hospital were adamant that the risk to her health and life were simply too great.

She and her husband chose not to risk leaving their other children motherless by opting for a D&E procedure. Because of the safety of the procedure, Coreen is now pregnant again.

What right have we here in Congress on this floor to say to this family that you should have risked mom's life and ignored your doctor's advice? By what authority do we tell these women that we know more in each of their cases than their own physicians?

It is ironic that some of you here are advocating legislation that would assure that managed care plans guaranteed physicians the right to tell women all the medical possibilities for treatment, and yet you will legislate here tonight the denial to women of America who face terribly tragic, painful, personal circumstances of the right to have the medical procedure that in truth is safest for them and most protective of their reproductive capability, assures them to the maximum extent possible that they will have more children in their future.

Men of the House of Representatives, women who are Members of Congress,

H2912

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

March 27, 1996

if it were your daughter, would you not want her life and reproductive hopes and dreams protected? Of course you would. Do not do this shortsighted, mean-spirited, terrible thing to women in our Nation.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK].

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I honestly believe that a lot of the problems we have today in society stem from the fact that we have no regard for human life. You can call me old-fashioned, but I believe every individual born into this world is special, needed and important.

You know, our forefathers shared this philosophy when they wrote in our Declaration of Independence that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I ask that we consider the difference. A doctor performs a painful, cruel, partial abortion one day, and it is accepted. And then the next day, if that same mother gave birth to the same age child and then she killed her child, she would be charged with murder. Only a few hours separates these two acts, but one is considered justified and accepted, even promoted, and the other is considered unjust. There is something wrong with our society today if we continue to justify such an unjust procedure.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I know that there are some Members of Congress who believe they know everything about everything, but maybe once in awhile Members of this body might want to show a little humility. We are discussing a procedure which, as I understand it, is used in .01 of 1 percent of abortions, a situation which occurs only under the most tragic circumstances.

Day after day we hear from our conservative friends about how the big, bad Government should leave people alone and get off of the backs of people. I would urge our conservative friends to heed that advice on this occasion.

This is a tragic circumstance. Let the woman, let her family, let the physician make that decision, not the politicians in Congress.

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1833, the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act. Today's battle for the rights of the unborn differ from previous prolife and proabortion debates. Yes, this debate today will not stop all abortions. It will only stop one procedure, the partial birth abortion. It brings to light

the fact that when a woman and her unborn child have this type of procedure, that only the woman leaves the operating room.

Mr. Speaker, I think we are all forgetting one thing: A third trimester baby has a very good chance of living. If it was allowed to be born without interference, I urge my colleagues who might otherwise not support a prolife piece of legislation to support this legislation, which simply and narrowly protects against partial birth abortions.

This debate is not about a woman's right to choose, because there are other options. This debate today is about putting an end to a procedure that kills a child just a few inches from full birth.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary and also the spouse of a distinguished physician.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I am confused. The debate I am hearing from that side has nothing to do with the medical procedure that it seems we are trying to ban. I continue to hear people talk about how we are conducting abortions on babies that otherwise would be able to survive; if the pregnancy were to go to term, we would have a living baby. When in fact, as my wife who happens to be a high-risk obstetrician-gynecologist who deals specifically with women who have difficult pregnancies, has said, this is not a procedure where you are talking about a fetus that will go to term and where you will have a healthy baby born. This is a procedure that is used when it is fairly clear that the baby has no chance to live, and to allow the pregnancy to go to term would jeopardize the health and perhaps the life of the woman. So it seems like the debate is not really on point.

Now, let me read something that came from the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, those doctors that are asked to perform these types of procedures and to protect the women involved.

They state:

The college finds very disturbing any action by Congress that would supersede the medical judgment of trained physicians and that would criminalize medical procedures that may be necessary to save the life of a woman. Moreover, in defining what medical procedures doctors may or may not perform, the bill employs terminology that is not even recognized in the medical community, demonstrating why congressional opinion should never be substituted for professional medical judgment.

Mr. Speaker, I think that states it best. We have people here who are trying to impose their opinion on a medical profession where technical, highly sophisticated, highly trained individuals are being asked to perform lifesaving procedures.

It does not make sense. We should stay out of this. We should let a woman

make that very difficult choice of what type of procedure she would need to preserve her health and her life, and perhaps have a chance to have a pregnancy that will be able to go to term.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge Members to seriously consider voting strongly against this particular bill, because it does not do what the proponents say.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). The gentlewoman from Colorado is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as a woman, when I am with my doctor, I want that doctor focused on my health, and not on their criminal liability. What this bill does is it will focus any doctor on steering away from what they think might be best for the patient, because they could serve 2 years in prison or they could have a criminal record, or on and on and on.

Mr. Speaker, I think every citizen thinks that that is a zone of privacy. This Congress has never interfered in that zone of privacy between a family and their physician. Today, for the first time, if this bill becomes law, we will be moving to make an act criminal by a doctor. I much more trust my doctor than I do Members of this body. I am sorry to say, so I get very angry when I hear some of the things that have been said here.

I have heard people talk about "inhuman, brutal, gruesome, terrible." We have seen the drawings. The drawings were not done by the American College of Gynecologists and Obstetricians. They do not support this bill. They were done, as they say rightfully, by the Catholic Conference of Bishops. Now, they have the right to make their case here, but, please, again, I think most Americans trust their doctors to make those difficult decisions.

We have heard about pain, we have heard about everything. I sat through those hearings. The anesthesiologists who testified said that there is pain in everything. There is pain in birth. So if we are just going to outlaw anything that is painful, we are going to be a very busy Congress. What they were saying is what happened, some of the advocates were misstating anesthesiology procedures. That is possible, because people here are not doctors.

□ 1945

But they were not supporting the bill. They were just trying to set the record straight. Bottom line, as the gentlewoman from Kansas said, these are in very tragic circumstances. Only .01 percent of all abortions would be affected by this. These are basically a handful of doctors, and thank goodness a handful of families. But I must say as one who has been there, one who almost lost her life, I would be terribly resentful of this happening, and I never thought it could happen to me, so I say to people, please, please, I know this is a difficult issue.

Anything you cannot explain, anything that is difficult to explain, people hesitate to vote against. But please