

BORN-ALIVE INFANTS
PROTECTION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 26, 2000

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, under current law, infants who have been born, and are alive, are indeed persons. Therefore, these infants have the same rights as all humans, including receiving the best of care, comfort, food, and shelter. No one on either side of the aisle would dispute this fact. This is why I find it odd that Representatives HYDE and CANADY feel it is necessary to introduce a bill which appears only to restate the current law.

I question the motives behind the introduction of this bill. Of course I will vote for any legislation that I believe will help our children, but I am afraid that the motives for introducing this bill are based more on politics than on how to best serve our children. I think it is an underhanded attempt to trick pro-choice Members. This bill was brought before the Judiciary Committee as one that would serve to protect infants and ensure that they receive the best care possible. Based on this, all but one Member of the Committee voted in favor of the bill. The fact that pro-choice Members supported this bill, forced the bill sponsors to declare their intention to offer a Manager's Amendment. This amendment would have attacked the Supreme Court's rulings on abortion and mischaracterized the current state of abortion rights law. The inclusion of this amendment would have forced pro-choice Members to vote against the bill. In turn, this would have given our colleagues on the other side of this issue the opportunity to say that the pro-choice Members did not support a bill that protects infants, when in reality we would have been forced to vote against such a bill due to its attack on the reproductive rights of women.

I must give credit to my colleague from North Carolina, Representative WATT, for raising the issue of how fast this bill was rushed through the Judiciary Committee. This bill will amend the U.S. Code by defining the terms "person," "human being," "child," and "individual" to include "every infant member of the species homo sapiens who is born alive at any stage of development." According to the Congressional Research Service, these terms appear in more than 72,000 sections of the U.S. Code and the Code of Federal Regulations alone. While I would hope that the sponsors of this bill would not have included this change in the language if it would cause a change in the law or in the way the law would be interpreted by the Supreme Court, since the bill was presented as one that did not change current law, I am not totally convinced. As Representative WATT said in the Committee Report on H.R. 4292, this change in language opens the door for many unintended interpretations of the law.

I know that there are many neonatologists who fear that this bill would affect the decisions made by doctors and parents when treating newborns. They are confused, as am I, as to whether this bill would mandate that doctors provide care beyond what they would normally deem to be appropriate for newborns who have no possibility of survival. Doctors are currently obligated to perform procedures

that will help a baby to live if there is any chance for survival. Sadly, there are babies who are born with no hope of surviving past the first few moments of live. Doctors should not be forced to perform procedures that will only prove to be futile in prolonging the life of a child. Rather, the rights of the infant should be protected by allowing the infant to spend his few precious moments of life in the arms of his parents.

The Committee Report states that "H.R. 4292 would not mandate medical treatment where none is currently indicated" and "would not affect the applicable standard of care." Once again, I am concerned that this bill will open up current law to be interpreted in an unintended manner. Therefore, I think we should spend more time addressing how this bill will affect the current law with respect to doctors, women, and children.

There is already a common law "born alive" rule that mandates the prosecution of anyone who harms a person who has been "born" and was "alive" at the time of the harmful act. In addition, thirty-seven states have already passed explicit statutory laws relating to the treatment of infants who are "born alive," and perhaps most relevant, there is a federal statute known as the "Baby Doe Law" that requires appropriate care be provided to a newborn. Therefore, why is this bill necessary? What is the true intent of this proposed legislation? If in fact the true intent is to restate the law which protects our infants, then I will support it. However, if it is being used as a vehicle to attack the Supreme Court's rulings on the reproductive rights of women, I will have to oppose it.

PEACE BY PEACE

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2000

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and recognize several local organizations for their involvement in the fight against domestic violence. In recognition of Domestic Violence Awareness Month, a coalition of local service agencies has launched Peace by Peace, a campaign to increase awareness of this terrible crime.

Peace by Peace is a cooperative project of: Beach Cities Health District, 1736 Family Crisis Center, Little Company of Mary Health Services, Redondo Beach Police Department's Domestic Violence Advocacy Program, National Network to End Domestic Violence, JoAnn etc., and the NCADD/South Bay Men's Domestic Violence Treatment Program.

Domestic violence can no longer be ignored. Programs like Peace by Peace bring this issue to the forefront. Through the various workshops that will be held this month, South Bay residents will be able to learn more about domestic violence. It is because of organizations like the Beach Cities Health District and the Little Company of Mary Health Services that the women of the South Bay have access to quality health services in time of need.

I commend these agencies in their fight against domestic violence. The support that they provide is unparalleled. I appreciate their work and the services they provide. They have touched the lives of many throughout the South Bay.

A TRIBUTE TO CHARLES R.
TRIMBLE**HON. ZOE LOFGREN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2000

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the achievements of Charles R. Trimble, the founder of Trimble Navigation Limited and Chairman of the United States Global Positioning System Industry Council. Mr. Trimble is this year's recipient of the American Electronics Association's Medal of Achievement. Recipients of this award are recognized for their significant contributions to the high-tech industry and for distinguished service to the community, the industry and humankind.

Charles Trimble has shown vision and dedication in managing one of America's premier technology companies; his leadership by example has helped mold the success of the U.S. technology industry. Under Mr. Trimble's careful direction, Trimble Navigation Limited grew from a startup housed in a reconstructed theater to the first publicly held company engaged solely in providing GPS solutions. Trimble now has 23 offices in 15 countries; its products are distributed in 150 countries worldwide.

Charles Trimble holds four patents in signal processing and several in GPS. He was a member of the Vice President's Space Policy Advisory Board's task group on the future of U.S. Space Industrial Base for the National Space Council. In 1991, he received INC Magazine's "Entrepreneur of the Year" award. Throughout his career, he has published articles in the field of signal processing, electronics, and GPS; he has contributed to a number of technology initiatives in the San Francisco Bay Area, the Silicon Valley, and Washington, D.C.

His interests and influence reach far beyond the scope of the high-tech industry. Charles Trimble was a Member of the Board of Governors for the National Center for Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) and a Member of the Council on Foreign Relations. In 1999 he was elected to the National Academy of Engineering.

I wish to thank Charles Trimble for his dedicated leadership in the high-tech industry and commend him on his admirable accomplishments. I offer my warmest congratulations on being awarded the American Electronics Association's 2000 Medal of Achievement. Furthermore, he has my personal thanks for his many courtesies to me—from sharing his in-depth knowledge of science and technology to stepping forward to advocate intelligent science and technology policies. Charles Trimble is not only a great scientist and industrialist; he is a great human being. My life is richer for having had the chance to know him.

THOUGHTS ON THE
APPROPRIATIONS**HON. MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD**

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 2, 2000

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the thoughts of Mr. Roy Parker of

Goose Creek, South Carolina. He sent me a letter to the editor he wrote for The Post & Courier in my hometown in Charleston. Mr. Parker raises a good point that we should think about as we consider the appropriations bills in this election year.

I submit the following article for the RECORD:

HOGS AND ROOTERS

“Root hog or die” was a frequently used expression during the Great Depression. These words had a very literal meaning, which was that you had to do more than be present to survive.

Now, when you think of hogs and rooters you instinctively think of members of Congress. They pride themselves on rooting out pork and giving it where they think it will do the most good.

This practice has become so commonplace that even some of our respected politicians still defend this practice. In fact, some are so addicted to pork that they are willing to cross party lines to satisfy their addiction.

Beware of politicians bearing gifts—our hard-earned tax money. Beware of politicians who become super conservative prior to election and, if elected, will go to Congress and raise your taxes and vote with the liberals.