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 ''pricey 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