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. CANADY 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.''