taxes except for the Social Security tax. That was a tax cut, a tax credit for families. Not wealthy people, for families.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. And it was based on the basic notion that families can spend this money far more efficiently than the Federal bureaucracy. And I doubt if there is anybody in this room or anybody in Congress or anybody who is watching this at home who doubts the basic wisdom of that. Families are very responsible for the resources that they have.

Let me tell a quick personal story. We have just a couple of minutes and I will close with this. I was raised in a family with three boys. My dad was a life-long member of the AFL–CIO. He worked in a factory. The largest single payment that my family made when I was growing up was their house payment. But for the average family today, the largest payment they make is to the government. The average family trying to raise three kids today spends more for taxes than for food, clothing, and shelter combined, and we believe that they ought to have some tax relief.

Mr. SHAYS. Thirty-eight percent of their income is paid in taxes, where when my parents were raising me it was about 15 percent. And my parents were allowed a much larger deduction per child than families are today.

Let me close and thank my colleagues for joining me by saying that this new Republican majority has three basic objectives: to get our financial house in order and balance the budget; and the second, to save our trust funds particularly Medicare from bankruptcy; and our third effort is to transform our caretaking society into a caring society, to transform our caretaking social and corporate and agricultural welfare state into a caring opportunity society.

We are looking to bring money, power, and influence out of Washington back to people in local communities. And we are going to do this for the good of the children because, as Mr. Rabin said, the former Prime Minister of Israel, politicians are elected by adults to represent the children. And this Republican Congress is looking to represent the children so that they have a brighter future than we had.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I truly thank you for giving us this opportunity, and I am going to yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2000

TEAMWORK FOR EMPLOYEES AND MANAGERS ACT OF 1995—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–251)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS) laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval, H.R. 743, the ''Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995.'' This act would undermine crucial employee protections.

I strongly support workplace practices that promote cooperative labor-management relations. In order for the United States to remain globally competitive into the next century, employees must recognize their stake in their employer's business, employers must value their employees' labor, and each must work in partnership with the other. Cooperative efforts, by promoting mutual trust and respect, can encourage innovation, improve productivity, and enhance the efficiency and performance of American workplaces.

Current law provides for a wide variety of cooperative workplace efforts. It permits employers to work with employees in quality circles to improve quality, efficiency, and productivity. Current law also allows employers to delegate significant managerial responsibilities to employee work teams, sponsor brainstorming sessions, and solicit employee suggestions and criticisms. Today, 30,000 workplaces across the country has employee involvement plans. According to one recent survey, 96 percent of large employers already have established such programs.

I strongly support further labor-management cooperation within the broad parameters allowed under current law. To the extent that recent National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) decisions have created uncertinty as to the scope of permissible cooperation, the NLRB, in the exercise of its independent authority, should provide guidance to clarify the broad legal boundaries of the labor-management teamwork. The Congress rejected a more narrowly defined proposal designed to accomplish that objective.

Instead, this legislation, rather than promoting gueuine teamwork, would undermine the system of collective bargaining that has served this country so well for many decades. It would do this by allowing employers to establish company unions where no union currently exists and permitting company dominated unions where employees are in the process of determining whether to be represented by a union. Rather than encouraging true workplace cooperation, this bill would abolish protections that ensure independent and democratic representation in the workplace.

True cooperative efforts must be based on must partnerships. A context of mutual trust and respect encourages the prospect or achieving workplace innovation, improved productivity, and enhanced efficiency and workplace performance. Any ambiguities in he situation should be resolved, but without weakening or eliminating the fundamental right of employees to collective bargaining.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 30, 1996.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the veto message on the bill, H.R. 743, be postponed until Wednesday, July 31, 1996.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the opportunity to spend some time tonight to talk about an issue that has probably generated more mail and more phone calls and more responses from our constituents than virtually any issue since I joined the Congress just 18 months ago. I speak tonight about the issue of partial birth abortions.

I think we need to first of all talk a little bit about what in fact a partial birth abortion is. I had hoped to have some charts to show to my colleagues and those who may be watching on cable TV tonight what exactly a partial birth abortion is. But let me just say that in many respects it is a late term abortion in which the baby is virtually completely delivered and only the head of the baby is allowed to remain inside the womb, and then the doctor, the abortionist I think is a more accurate term, the abortionist takes a scissors and inserts that scissors into the back of the baby's brain, then using a very powerful suction device actually sucks out the brains of the baby. Then the baby is delivered. Of course, the baby is delivered dead.

It is true that in many respects in some of the abortions that are performed using this procedure, the babies are badly deformed and they have very little chance of surviving. I think we have to be honest and say that in some respects that is true. But in many respects, that is not true. Many times this is used just as a simple late term, what I would describe as a late term version of protracted birth control, where the baby is actually being destroyed simply because the baby is inconvenient to the mother at that particular point in her life.

On April 10, 1996, President Bill Clinton used his veto pen to perpetuate a tragedy that results in the destruction of innocent babies. It was on that date that the President vetoed H.R. 1833, the Partial Birth Abortion Ban Act.

I believe that every abortion actually involves two victims, both the baby and the mother, and I believe that every abortion sadly takes the life of an innocent child. I do understand politically that the American people and