

usual by inserting instruments known as laminaria into the woman and by applying seaweed. This process is supposed to slowly dilate the cervix so the child eventually can be removed and killed. That is the procedure. That is what they do.

After this initial step, in this particular instance, Dr. Haskell sent the woman home because it usually takes 2 or 3 days before the baby can be removed from the womb and the abortion completed. Expecting to return in 2 or 3 days, this woman followed the doctor's orders and went home to Cincinnati.

Soon after she left the abortion clinic, her cervix started dilating too quickly, causing her to go into labor. Shortly after midnight, on the first day of the procedure, she entered the hospital and gave birth to a very much alive but very tiny baby. The neonatologist determined that Baby Hope's lungs were too underdeveloped to sustain life without the help of a respirator. Baby Hope, however, was not placed on a respirator. Instead, the poor, defenseless creature was left to die only a little more than 3 hours after birth.

I am back on the floor again today because we now, tragically, have another example of a partial-birth abortion in Ohio that did not go according to the abortionist's plan, this one occurring on August 19, a couple of weeks ago.

The Dayton Daily News reported this incident. The procedure was again at the hands of Dr. Haskell. Here, too, he started the barbaric procedure by dilating the mother's cervix. Similarly, this woman went into labor only 1 hour later, was admitted to Good Samaritan Hospital, and gave birth to a baby girl a short time later. This time, however, a miracle occurred. This little baby lived.

A medical technician appropriately named this precious little "Baby Grace." After her birth, she was transferred to a neonatal intensive care unit at Children's Hospital in Dayton. The Montgomery County Children's Services Board has temporary, interim custody of little Baby Grace. She likely will face months of hospitalization and possible lifelong complications, we don't know, all resulting from being premature and the induced abortion.

I am appalled and sickened by the fact that both of these partial-birth abortions occurred anywhere. I am particularly offended by the fact they occurred in my home State of Ohio. But wherever they occur, it is a human tragedy.

I have said this before and I will say it again; the partial-birth abortion should be outlawed. Partial-birth abortion should be outlawed in our civilized society.

When we hear about the brutal death of Baby Hope and we think about the miracle of Baby Grace, we have to stop and ask, to what depths have we sunk in this country? Partial-birth abortion

is a very clear matter of right and wrong, good versus evil. It is my wish there will come a day, I hope and pray, when I no longer have to come to this Senate floor and talk about partial-birth abortions. Until that day arrives, the day when the procedure has been outlawed in our country, I must continue to plead for the protection of unborn fetuses threatened by partial-birth abortions.

In the name of Baby Hope, let's stop the killing. In the name of Baby Grace, let's protect the living.

I yield the floor.

#### PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, first, I compliment my friend and colleague from Ohio for the statement he made. Frankly, the announcement he made that this tragedy called partial-birth abortion is happening today and it is happening very frequently—I appreciate him calling attention to it. I hope our colleagues listened and I hope our colleagues this year will pass a ban on that very gruesome procedure which is the murder of a child as it is being born.

I thank my friend and colleague. I hope and expect Congress will pass it this year. Maybe with the votes necessary to overturn the President's veto.

I thank him for his statement.

#### CORRECTING THE RECORD ON THE REPUBLICAN EDUCATION BUDGET

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I would like to correct the record, because I know I heard a number of my colleagues say the Republican budget is slashing education, it's at the lowest end, it's the last appropriation bill we are taking up. Let me correct the record. Let me give you some facts.

One, the budget the Republicans passed earlier this year had an increase for education, not a decrease. The Appropriations Committee has yet to mark up the Labor-HHS bill. They are going to mark it up next week. I understand from Senator SPECTER and others they plan on appropriating \$90 billion. The amount of money we have in the current fiscal year is \$83.8 billion. So that is an increase of about \$6.2 billion for FY2000. That is an increase of about 9 percent. That is well over inflation. I think it is too much. I think we should be freezing spending. We should not be increasing spending. But I just want to correct the record. It bothers me to think some people are trying to manipulate the facts, to build up their case.

The Democrats are well aware that the Appropriations Committee is going to be marking up a bill that is going to have at least as much money this year as we spent last year in education. I hope we change the priorities. I hope we follow the guidance of my colleague from Washington, the Presiding Officer, and give the States some flexibility. I haven't heard anybody say

"Let's cut the total amount of funds going to education," but I have heard, "Let's give the States, Governors and school boards more flexibility so they can do what they need to do in improving quality education. Let's hold them accountable to improve the quality of education. Let's not just come up with more Federal programs."

I heard both of my colleagues say, "Boy, we need more Federal teachers or more school buildings." Is that really the business of the Federal Government? Are we supposed to make that decision that this school district or this school needs more teachers, or this school should be repaired, or this school should be replaced? Is that a Federal decision? I don't think so. It just so happens that within the last hour I met with the Governor of Oklahoma, the Governor of Nevada and the Governor of Utah. They say they have already reduced class size and some of them have already made significant investments in schools. But, they need more help. They want flexibility. They want to be able to use the money for individual students with disabilities. We should give them that flexibility. But our colleagues seem to think, "Oh, no, we have to have 100,000 Federal teachers. The Governor of Nevada said that in the city of Las Vegas alone they hire 18,000 new teachers every year. Why in the world should we be dictating? In last year's budget agreement we needed 30,000 teachers. Now we need to go to 100,000 teachers? Is that the Federal governments responsibility? I don't think so.

I don't think the Federal Government should be dictating that this State or this school district needs to hire more teachers or build more buildings or put in more computers. Let's give them the money we spend—and altogether the Federal Government spends over \$100 billion on education—let's give the States the flexibility to spend that money in ways that will really improve the quality of education. Maybe that will go to increasing the number of teachers or to buildings and construction. Maybe it will be in computers and in training. Maybe it will be in retention or it will be in bonuses for the best teachers. Why should we be making that decision? We don't know those schools. We don't know those districts. We don't know those superintendents. We are not serving on those PTAs. This really should not be a Federal responsibility. Let's give that responsibility to the local school boards and to the States and not have more dictates and more Federal programs.

There are already over 760 Federal education programs to date. Our colleagues on the Democrat side would like to add even more programs, as if that is going to improve the quality of education. I don't think so.

Just a couple more facts: Labor-HHS funding, which is the appropriations bill we are talking about, has been rising and growing dramatically. Yet I