got to the floor here, the gentleman's colleague, the distinguished ranking member of this subcommittee, spoke eloquently about the project, and I concur.

This is a project that we have looked at very closely. There is no question that the consolidation of the Food and Drug Administration is badly needed, and we have actually started that process. To me, it is a great disappointment that our bill requires the interruption of that process of consolidation. This is a very long-term process.

We do hope that in conference, if funds are made available, that we would be able to move this project forward into the second phase, and certainly we do understand the importance of this consolidation. So I appreciate the gentleman's rising and making us very aware of this and bringing this again to our attention.

Mr. WYNN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his thoughts.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WYNN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding. My colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), has worked tirelessly on this project and very effectively on this project. As the chairman of the subcommittee has indicated, there is no controversy with respect to doing this project, we just have to find the money to do it.

I appreciate the gentleman's raising this issue, and I assure him that I will be working closely with the chairman to see that before this process is over that, hopefully, we get the requisite funds so that this project can be fully funded.

Mr. WYNN. Reclaiming my time once again, Mr. Chairman, I certainly understand the considerations, and I thank the chairman and my colleague for their cooperation.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is considered withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HERGER) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4871) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4871, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4871 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 560, that no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except:

(1) Pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate.

(2) The following additional amendment, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes:

Ms. DELAURO, regarding health services.

(3) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes each:

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, regarding sales to any foreign country;

Mr. RANGEL, regarding Cuba;

Mr. COBURN, regarding section 640;

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, regarding Federal election contracts; and

The amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 14.

(4) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes:

Mr. TRAFICANT, regarding Buy America Act;

Mr. INSLEE, regarding Inspector General reports;

Mr. GILMAN, regarding day care centers; and

The amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 15.

Each additional amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee, and shall be considered as read. Each additional amendment shall be debatable for the time specified equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to simply say that we have tried to check with everybody on our side to make sure that those who had amendments were agreeable to this. We think that that is the case and, as a result, we will not object and hope this facilitates the handling of this bill tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

## TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HERGER). Pursuant to House Resolution 560 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4871.

□ 1657

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4871) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier today, the amendment by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) had been withdrawn and title IV was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except pro forma amendments offered by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate, and the following additional amendments, which may be offered only by the Member designated in the order of the House or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question:

The following additional amendment, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes:

(1) Ms. DELAURO, regarding health services.

(2) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes:

Mr. MORAN of Kansas, regarding sales to any foreign country;

Mr. RANGEL, regarding Cuba;

Mr. COBURN, regarding section 640;

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, regarding Federal election contracts; and

The amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 14.

□ 1700

(3) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes:

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), regarding Buy America Act; the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), regarding Inspector General reports; the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) regarding day-care centers; and the amendments printed in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13, and 15.

Are there further amendments to title IV?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

THIS ACT

SEC. 501. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 502. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available for any activity or for paying the salary of any Government employee where funding an activity or paying a salary to a Government employee would result in a decision, determination, rule, regulation, or policy that would prohibit the enforcement of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930.

SEC. 504. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be available in fiscal year 2001 for the purpose of transferring control over the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center located at Glynco, Georgia, and Artesia, New Mexico, out of the Department of the Treasury.

SEC. 505. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available to pay the salary for any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service, and has within 90 days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than 1 year, made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Office of Personnel Management as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

SEC. 506. No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).

SEC. 507. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. 508. If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds provided pursuant to this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 509. No funds appropriated by this Act shall be available to pay for an abortion, or the administrative expenses in connection with any health plan under the Federal employees health benefit program which provides any benefits or coverage for abortions.

SEC. 510. The provision of section 509 shall not apply where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest.

SEC. 511. Except as otherwise specifically provided by law, not to exceed 50 percent of unobligated balances remaining available at the end of fiscal year 2001 from appropriations made available for salaries and expenses for fiscal year 2001 in this Act, shall remain available through September 30, 2002, for each such account for the purposes authorized: *Provided*, That a request shall be submitted to the Committees on Appropriations for approval prior to the expenditure of such funds: *Provided further*, That these requests shall be made in compliance with reprogramming guidelines.

SEC. 512. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Executive Office of the President to request from the Federal Bureau of Investigation any official background investigation report on any individual, except when—

(1) such individual has given his or her express written consent for such request not more than 6 months prior to the date of such request and during the same presidential administration; or

(2) such request is required due to extraordinary circumstances involving national security.

SEC. 513. The cost accounting standards promulgated under section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (Public Law 93–400; 41 U.S.C. 422) shall not apply with respect to a contract under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program established under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 514. (a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Archivist of the United States shall transfer to the Gerald R. Ford Foundation, as trustee, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 2.3 acres of land located within Grand Rapids, Michigan, and further described in subsection (b), such grant to be in trust, with the beneficiary being the National Archives and Records Administration, for the purpose of supporting the facilities and programs of the Gerald R. Ford Museum in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and the Gerald R. Ford Library in Ann Arbor, Michigan, in accordance with a trust agreement to be agreed upon by the Archivist and the Gerald R. Ford Foundation.

(b) LAND DESCRIPTION.—The land to be transferred pursuant to subsection (a) is described as follows:

The following premises in the City of Grand Rapids, County of Kent, State of Michigan, described as:

That part of Block 2, Converse Plat, and that part of Block 2 of J.W. Converse Replatted Addition, and that part of Government Lot 1 of Section 25, T7N, R12W, City of Grand Rapids, Kent County, Michigan, described as: BEGINNING at the NE corner of Lot 1 of Block 2 of Converse Plat; thence East 245.0 feet along the South line of Bridge Street; thence South 230.0 feet along a line which is parallel with and 170 feet East from the East line of Front Avenue as originally platted; thence West 207.5 feet parallel with the South line of Bridge Street; thence South along the centerline of vacated Front Avenue 109 feet more or less to the extended centerline of vacated Douglas Street; thence West along the centerline of vacated Douglas Street 237.5 feet more or less to the East line of Scribner Avenue; thence North along the East line of Scribner Avenue 327 feet more or less to a point which is 7.0 feet South from the NW corner of Lot 8 of Block 2 of Converse Plat; thence Easterly 200 feet more or less to the place of beginning, also described as:

Parcel A—Lots 9 & 10, Block 2 of Converse Plat, being the subdivision of Government Lots 1 & 2, Section 25, T7N, R12W; also Lots 11–24, Block 2 of J.W. Converse Replatted Addition; also part of N ½ of Section 25, T7N, R12W commencing at SE corner Lot 24, Block 2 of J.W. Converse Replatted Addition, thence N to NE corner of Lot 9 of Converse Plat, thence E 16 feet, thence S to SW corner of Lot 23 of J.W. Converse Replatted Addition, thence W 16 feet to beginning.

Parcel B—Part of Section 25, T7N, R12W, commencing on S line of Bridge Street 50 feet E of E line of Front Avenue, thence S 107.85 feet, thence 77 feet, thence N to a point on S line of said street which is 80 feet E of beginning, thence W to beginning.

Parcel C—Part of Section 25, T7N, R12W, commencing at SE corner Bridge Street & Front Avenue, thence E 50 feet, thence S 107.85 feet to alley, thence W 50 feet to E line Front Avenue, thence N 106.81 feet to beginning.

Parcel D—Part of Government Lot 1, Section 25, T7N, R12W, commencing at a point on S line of Bridge Street (66′ wide) 170 feet E of E line of Front Avenue (75′ wide), thence S 230 feet parallel with Front Avenue, thence W 170 feet parallel with Bridge Street to E line of Front Avenue, thence N along said line to a point 106.81 feet S of intersection of said line with extension of N & S line of Bridge Street, thence E 127 feet, thence northerly to a point on S line of Bridge Street 130 feet E of E line of Front Avenue, thence E along S line of Bridge Street to beginning.

Parcel E—Lots 1 through 8 of Block 2 of Converse Plat, being the subdivision of Government Lots 1 and 2, Section 25, T7N, R12W.

Also part of N ½ of Section 25, T7N, R12W, commencing at NW corner of Lot 9, Block 2 of J.W. Converse Replatted Addition; thence N 15 feet to SW corner of Lot 8; thence E 200 feet to SE corner Lot 1; thence S 15 feet to NE corner of Lot 10; thence W 200 feet to beginning.

Together with any portion of vacated streets and alleys that have become part of the above property.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

(1) COMPENSATION.—The land transferred pursuant to subsection (a) shall be transferred without compensation to the United States.

(2) APPOINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE.—In the event that the Gerald R. Ford Foundation for any reason is unable or unwilling to continue to serve as trustee, the Archivist of the United States is authorized to appoint a successor trustee.

(3) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—If the Archivist of the United States determines that the Gerald R. Ford Foundation (or a successor trustee appointed under paragraph (2)) has breached its fiduciary duty under the trust agreement entered into pursuant to this section, the land transferred pursuant to subsection (a) shall revert to the United States under the administrative jurisdiction of the Archivist.

SEC. 515. (a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall, by not later than September 30, 2001, and with public and Federal agency involvement, issue guidelines under sections 3504(d)(1) and 3516 of title 44, United States Code, that provide policy and procedural guidance to Federal agencies for ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information (including statistical information) disseminated by Federal agencies in fulfillment of the purposes and provisions of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, commonly referred to as the Paperwork Reduction Act.

(b) CONTENT OF GUIDELINES.—The guidelines under subsection (a) shall—

(1) apply to the sharing by Federal agencies of, and access to, information disseminated by Federal agencies; and

(2) require that each Federal agency to which the guidelines apply—

(A) issue guidelines ensuring and maximizing the quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information (including statistical information) disseminated by the agency, by not later than 1 year after the date of issuance of the guidelines under subsection (a);

(B) establish administrative mechanisms allowing affected persons to seek and obtain correction of information maintained and disseminated by the agency that does not comply with the guidelines issued under subsection (a); and

(C) report periodically to the Director—

(i) the number and nature of complaints received by the agency regarding the accuracy of information disseminated by the agency; and

(ii) how such complaints were handled by the agency.

SEC. 516. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement a preference for the acquisition of a firearm or ammunition based on whether the manufacturer or vendor of the firearm or ammunition is a party to an agreement with a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States regarding codes of conduct, operating practices, or product design specifically related to the business of importing, manufacturing, or dealing in firearms or ammunition under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 517. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used to allow the placement in interstate or foreign commerce of diamonds that have been mined in the Republic of Sierra Leone, the Republic of Liberia, Burkina Faso, the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, or the Republic of Angola, except for diamonds the country of origin of which has been certified as the Republic of Sierra Leone by government officials of that country who are recognized by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

SEC. 518. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to propose or issue rules, regulations, decrees, or orders for the purpose of implementation, or in preparation for implementation, of the Kyoto Protocol, which was adopted on December 11, 1997, in Kyoto, Japan, at the Third Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which has not been submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2, of the United States Constitution, and which has not entered into force pursuant to article 25 of the Protocol: *Provided*, That the limitation established in this section shall not apply to any activity otherwise authorized by law.

SEC. 519. Within available funds, the Department of the Treasury and the General Services Administration are urged to use ethanol, biodiesel, and other alternative fuels to the maximum extent practicable in meeting their fuel needs.

SEC. 520. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Office of Management and Budget who makes apportionments under subchapter II of chapter 15 of title 31, United States Code, that prevent the expenditure or obligation by December 31, 2000, of at least 75 percent of the appropriations made for fiscal year 2001 to carry out the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.), the Food for Progress Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 1736o), and section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431(b)).

Mr. KOLBE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title V be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to title V?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the provision entitled Sec. 517 in title V of the bill on Treasury Postal Appropriations on the grounds that it violates clause 2(b) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has taken the leadership on this issue with regard to Sierra Leone. We visited Sierra Leone in the month of December.

This picture is of a young girl that we saw who had her arms cut off because of conflict diamonds. In Sierra Leone, the rebels have taken over the areas and are pursuing the war. And this picture is another young little girl with her arms cut off. They are pursuing the war by the sale of what they call conflict or blood diamonds.

On behalf of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), we offered an amendment, which was adopted unanimously by Republicans and Democrats in the subcommittee and not challenged in the full committee, to prohibit the importation of diamonds coming from certain countries, Sierra Leone and Liberia, where Charles Taylor in Liberia is doing terrible things, and Burkina Faso and other countries.

In the Congo, in the last 22 months, 1.6 to 1.7 million people have died. Thirty-five percent of these killed are under the age of 5.

So this amendment is here in order to stop conflict diamonds.

On this floor several weeks ago, this Congress voted not to send the money for U.S. peacekeeping. No one wants to send American soldiers. So there can be U.N. peacekeepers, at the minimum, which ought to prohibit the importation of what is called conflict or blood diamonds.

This is also in the best interests of the people of Sierra Leone but also the diamond merchants. Because if it ever gets out that every time a young woman or young man purchases a diamond, and 65 percent of the diamonds in the world are sold in our country, the American people do not want to buy blood diamonds, then I think the diamond market may very well be in trouble.

So, for this reason, we offer the amendment to stop this issue.

Keep in mind, too, the life expectancy in Sierra Leone is 25.6 years.

So I wanted to be heard. And I know my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), wants to be heard on this issue and the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs (Mr. ROYCE), who has been so good on this issue and has really focused on it, wants to be heard.

I do want to say that I understand the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) will be making an announcement that he is going to hold a hearing. I personally want to thank him for his willingness to do this, which will help us after the August break to focus on the issue. So I want to personally thank the gentleman very much for his willingness to do this.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for his help on this issue. I appreciate it very much. I also appreciate the help of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) on this issue. He has provided great leadership.

Mr. Chairman, while I understand that the distinguished chairman is raising a point of order on this section because of jurisdiction claims, I wish that this section could remain in this bill because of the immediacy of the problem in Africa.

Millions of people have died in Africa because of the bloodshed surrounding conflict diamonds. Rebel groups and military forces in Sierra Leone, Angola, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo have committed horrible atrocities to gain control of and to profit from diamonds and diamond mines. At least $10 billion in diamonds have been smuggled from these countries over the past decade.

In the Congo, some 1.7 million people have died because of the fight to control Congo's natural resources. In Angola, the rebel movement UNITA pays for more weapons and kills more people because of its trafficking and control of Angola's diamonds. In Sierra Leone, an estimated 75,000 people have died because of the rebels' vicious campaign to control the country's diamonds.

Mr. HALL and I visited Sierra Leone and met and talked with hundreds of people who had their arms, legs, hands cut off by Sierra Leonian rebels—all to scare and intimidate the local population so the rebels could gain control of Sierra Leone's diamond producing region.

Many of the countries surrounding Sierra Leone have few to zero diamond mines. Yet countries such as Liberia, Burkina Faso, Togo, and the Ivory Coast have exported millions of carats of diamonds—Sierra Leone's diamonds—billions of dollars in value—to the diamond cutting centers in Antwerp, Israel, India, Holland, and New York.

Liberia and its president, Charles Taylor, supplied tons of weapons to the rebels in exchange for diamonds. Similar arms for weapons exchanges between governments and diamond stealing rebel groups has occurred in the case of Angola, the Congo, and other countries already named surrounding Sierra Leone.

This point of order would strike out of this bill language which prevents illicit conflict diamonds from entering the flow of U.S. commerce. This language would go a long way toward stunting the revenue—conflict diamonds—of many rebel groups in Africa. This language would save thousands and thousands of lives.

Because the Clinton Administration has been a complete failure on this issue, it is important for this House to speak out and take action and this language is a good start in that direction. The Administration has even gone out of its way to buddy up to the rebels in Sierra Leone and to Liberia's President, Charles Taylor. People have died as a result of this inexcusable negligence.

Because this problem is immediate, because the war and death fueled by the trafficking of conflict diamonds rage on unabated, this is a global crisis. Because the Administration has failed to address this issue, it is up to Congress to lead and that is why this language is so important.

I understand the reality of the legislative process though, and that this section of the bill is not protected.

I am grateful that Chairman CRANE has agreed to work with me and Mr. HALL on this issue and I look forward to the hearings his subcommittee will hold, hopefully as soon as we get back from August recess. I am hopeful that with Mr. CRANE's help, we can quickly draft legislation to prevent conflict diamonds from entering the U.S. and to help the people of Africa suffering at the hands of these rebel forces.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman form Ohio (Mr. HALL) is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for his not only recognizing me but for his work on this particular section of the bill concerning diamonds.

I just support everything that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has said. He and I are partners on this issue and so many issues. We have traveled together often.

The last time we were together in Africa was in Sierra Leone. The reason why this is germane and relative to us in America, people might ask, What does this have to do with us? Well, we buy 65 to 70 percent of all the diamonds in the world; and a good percentage of those, at least somewhere between 5 and 10 percent of them, are what we call illicit diamonds, conflict diamonds, blood diamonds. They come out of areas like Sierra Leone and the Congo, Angola, Liberia, Burkina Faso, Guinea.

What happens is that these diamond areas are seized by rebels. For example, in Sierra Leone, a rag-tag group of young people, 400 rebel soldiers, increased their whole lot, their whole army to about 25 to 26,000 overnight because they seized the diamonds mines.

What they do is they not only seize the diamond mines, they use the diamonds to trade for guns, pretty sophisticated guns, and buy drugs. And at the same time, they bring a lot of young soldiers into the rebel army, and they inflict cuts on their arms and on their heads and they put these drugs into them to the point where they go in and they commit all the atrocities.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and I visited amputee camps. We visited refugee camps where children's arms were cut off. They play this hideous game that when they go into a village they not only rape most of the women there, but they say to most of the villagers, stick your hand in this bag and pull out a piece of paper. If the piece of paper says ''hand,'' your hand gets chopped off. If the piece of paper says ''foot,'' they chop it off with a hatchet. If the piece of paper says ''ear'' or ''nose,'' they cut it off.

We have seen this over and over again. This is not just something that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and I are talking about. This has been proven over and over and over again by many human rights groups, by the U.N.

There are a lot of boycotts on diamonds from Sierra Leone to Angola to these countries that we have mentioned.

I reluctantly agree to allow this and not offer in the Committee on Rules an amendment to protect this particular section because I understand in talking to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) that he is going to have a hearing; and, hopefully, we can get some justification, we can stop this hideous kind of killings that are going on in the world.

The reason why it is relevant to us is that we buy most of the diamonds in the world, and in some cases our people need to know that diamonds are not a girl's best friend. Sometimes they cause death, maiming, killing, all kinds of atrocities.

So with that, we are hopeful we can get some action this year. We are hopeful that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the Committee on Ways and Means will do something about this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, these Sierra Leone diamonds that we are talking about and the conflict that is raging there are only a small part of Africa's production. However, the American public increasingly associates the devastation and the mayhem occurring in Sierra Leone with the sale of legitimately produced diamonds.

That makes it very difficult for other countries in Africa, like Botswana and Namibia and South Africa, to use the proceeds from the sale of their diamonds in order to produce an education for their population, clean water and health care.

I think the United States Congress must help ensure that the legitimate diamond industries in these countries are not adversely affected by the justifiable outrage over the anarchy and atrocities linked with conflict diamonds. And it was the message that the Subcommittee on African Affairs received from the African government and human rights groups at our hearing on May 9 on this issue.

Now we have a special responsibility because Americans purchase more than 60 percent of these diamonds. I think my colleagues have heard the testimony from my colleagues about the mayhem that is occurring today in Sierra Leone. We must do all we can to bring an end to the tragic conflict in diamonds coming out of Sierra Leone and coming out of Liberia. Because, frankly, the proceeds from the sale of those diamonds are being used in order to arm the Revolutionary United Front, the RUF, which has decapitated or struck the limbs off some 20,000 women and children to date.

If my colleagues go into Freetown, they will see countless numbers of maimed children on the streets as a result of this campaign of terror. And if we ask how did Fodoy Sankoh receive the financing to do this, it is from the sale of these conflict diamonds, it is from the fact that these diamonds have also gone over the border into Liberia where his ally, Charles Taylor, has also used them in order to obtain the funds for this activity.

I think we must applaud the recent efforts of the international diamond industry to prevent rebel groups from using illicitly obtained diamonds to finance senseless wars. It has instituted

new controls that will make it more difficult for conflict diamonds to be sold. But vigilance is necessary to prevent unscrupulous dealers from avoiding these new, tougher regulations.

I just want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for their efforts. I would hope that more Members of this body would join them in their efforts to ensure the vigilance of these regulations and to ensure that we can try to impose an embargo on Liberia and on Sierra Leone in order to prevent this senseless war from continuing.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chairman, clause 2(b) of rule XXI states that no provision changing existing law shall be reported in any general appropriation bill.

However, this provision would prevent the use of appropriated funds to allow the placement of diamonds from certain countries into foreign or domestic commerce.

Specifically, the provision imposes a new administrative burden on the U.S. Customs Service not authorized under existing law by requiring Customs to enforce a new certification requirement which would be based on the place of mining of the diamonds.

Under current law, no certification at all is required. In addition, Customs never examines the place of mining but makes origin determination based on cutting and polishing. This certification requirement places an extensive burden on Customs both in terms of procedural documentation requirements and substantive origin determination.

It clearly violates clause 2(b) of rule XXI, which prohibits legislating on an appropriations bill.

However, I would like to assure the gentlemen that have spoken this evening that I agree that the diamond trade in Africa is of grave concern to me. I plan to hold a hearing in the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means in September to examine this issue. I hope to work with the gentlemen, as well as the administration, to find a viable means to deal with this issue.

I do not support the use of trade sanctions, but recent action by the United Nations affirming the use of multilateral trade sanctions makes this an issue well worth considering.

In the meantime, however, I must insist on my point of order, and I urge the Chair to sustain the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) makes a point of order that the provision beginning on line 62, line 17, and ending on page 63, line 2, changes existing law in violation of clause 2(b) of rule XXI.

The provision limits funds in the bill for the placement in interstate or foreign commerce of diamonds that have been mined in certain countries with an exception for those diamonds where the country of origin has been certified as the Republic of Sierra Leone by specified international officials.

Clause 2(b) of rule XXI provides that a provision changing existing law may not be reported in a general appropriation bill. The provision imposes new duties on executive officials by requiring the Customs Service to investigate and certify the country of origin of a diamond with regard to its place of mining. The Chair is not aware that there are currently any country of origin requirements in law with relation to the mining of diamonds.

As such, the provision changes existing law in violation clause 2(b) of rule XXI. Accordingly, the point of order is sustained and the provision is stricken.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. DELAURO:
Strike section 509.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

□ 1715

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a simple amendment to strike language in this bill that unfairly penalizes the hardworking people of the Federal Government. This language prohibits health plans that participate in the Federal employees health benefits program from covering abortion. By doing so, it denies access to complete reproductive health services to nearly 1.2 million women of childbearing age who depend on this health benefits program for their medical care.

Every employee in the country has the option to choose a health care plan that covers the full range of reproductive health services, including abortion. Every employee, that is, except Federal employees. Since November 1995, Federal employees have been unable to choose a health care plan which includes coverage of this legal medical procedure.

Let me make one point very clear. This amendment does not provide government or taxpayer subsidies for abortion. The health care benefit, like the salary, belongs to the employee. The employee is then free to choose from a wide range of health plans that best meet their needs and then purchase that health plan with their own money. Again, with their own money.

This amendment does not mandate that any plan provide coverage for abortion against its objection. It simply allows Federal employees to have the option to purchase for themselves or their families a plan that suits their individual needs. An individual who does not want that coverage would have the choice, again the choice, not to purchase such a health plan.

Unfortunately, under current law and language included in this bill, Federal employees are left with no choice if tragedy strikes. I have heard the stories of Federal employees who are faced with a crisis pregnancy. This decision to end the pregnancy was the hardest decision of their lives. When they believed that their health insurance companies would pay for this health procedure and later found out Congress had restricted this coverage, they were harassed by creditors and forced into a financial battle over one of the most personal and emotional decisions that they will ever have to make.

Mr. Chairman, abortion is a legal medical procedure. That is right. No matter how many times we come to this floor and debate this issue, it remains a constitutionally protected legal medical procedure. The court just reaffirmed that a few weeks ago. Our opponents can try to chip away access to this right for young women, poor women, imprisoned women, women in the military, and in this case women who work for the Federal Government. They can write legislation that limits every nuance of this procedure and the issues surrounding it. But they have not won. Abortion is still a legal choice for women.

Singling out abortion for exclusion from health care plans that cover other reproductive health care is harmful to women's health. The AMA has said that funding restrictions such as this one that delay or deter women from seeking early abortions make it more likely that women will continue a potentially health-threatening pregnancy to term. This is all the more true because the bill provides no exception for coverage of abortions when a woman's health or future fertility is at stake.

I urge my colleagues to give our public servants the right to choose the health care that is best for them. I ask them to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and claim the 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the DeLauro amendment. This amendment has been offered and defeated for the last 5 years, but our pro-choice colleagues are at it again. In effect, it would force taxpayers to fund abortion. The pro-life language which this would strike prevents taxpayer funds from paying for abortions in Federal employee health benefit plans except when the life of the mother is in danger or in cases of rape and incest.

In 1998, the Federal Government contributed on the average 72 percent of the money toward the purchase of health insurance for its employees. Because taxpayers are the employers of Federal workers, employers determine the benefits employees get. And a large majority of taxpayers do not want their tax dollars to be used to pay for abortion.

Mr. Chairman, should taxpayers be forced to underwrite the cost of abortions for Federal employees regardless of their income? According to a New York Times/CBS News poll, only 23 percent of those polled said that national health care plans should cover abortions, while 72 percent said those costs should be paid for directly by the women who have them.

When an ABC News/Washington Post poll asked Americans if they agree or disagree with the statement, ''The Federal Government should pay for an abortion for any women who wants it and cannot afford to pay it,'' 69 percent disagreed.

The Center for Gender Equality has reported that 53 percent of women favor banning abortion except for rape, incest and life of the mother exceptions. The pro-life language in the bill that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) seeks to gut includes these exceptions. Obviously, if 53 percent of women favor banning abortion aside from these exceptions, then they would not want their tax dollars paying for abortion on demand as this amendment intends.

In a Gallup poll from May of last year, 71 percent of Americans supported some or total restrictions on abortion.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the DeLauro amendment.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support my colleague's motion, because I believe that the approximately 1.2 million women of reproductive age who rely on FEHBP for their medical care should have the option of choosing a health plan which includes coverage for abortion.

I want to stress that women should have the option. In 1995, Federal employees had many options. Of the then 345 FEHBP plans, just about half, 178, covered abortion. If women wanted to participate in a plan that covered abortions, they could. If they found abortion objectionable, then they could opt for a plan that did not cover abortion. The choice was theirs, not mine, not yours, not this institution's.

That is why, although many of us are tired of constantly battling about this issue, I continue to speak about this because I believe that our approach should be to make terminating a pregnancy less necessary. If we agree, pro-choice, pro-life, that our goal should be less abortion, then our focus must be on what we can do to further that goal.

I am very pleased that this bill contains provisions that guarantee contraceptive equity for Federal employee families. We can do more to increase access to contraception and work harder to educate people about responsibility. That will help us make the difficult choice of abortion less necessary.

Making abortion inaccessible in my judgment is not the answer. Contraceptive methods may fail, pregnancies may go unexpectedly and tragically wrong. No matter how good the contraceptive technology and how much education we do, some women will need abortions and that should be their decision, not ours. Abortion must remain safe and legal. I oppose excluding abortion, among the most commonly surgeries for women, from health care coverage. I support allowing Federal employees to have the option of abortion coverage with their own money, their earned income, in these plans.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the DeLauro motion to strike and let us work for a day when abortion is truly rare.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, just a few minutes ago on this House floor we heard about the sad plight of some children in Africa. We deal with many cases of child abuse and persecution and the violence against children. Many of us believe that human life begins at conception. In fact, most Americans do. When you look at the brutality of the abortion procedure, whether it is burning the skin off the babies, whether it is cutting them up, whether it is blowing them to pieces as they bring them out, or the partial-birth abortion where they kill them with a blunt instrument when all but the head is out, it is a brutal procedure.

But this is not a debate over whether abortion is legal because whether I like it or not, abortion is legal. This is a question over whether people like me and other Americans in Indiana and other States around the country have to be forced to pay for the killing of what we believe is innocent, defenseless little children.

The earliest speaker here, the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut, said that these were plans paid for by Federal employees. She neglected a teensy-weensy little fact, and, that is, our health care plans, including mine, are 28 percent roughly, depending on which plan you choose, paid by you and 72 percent by everybody else. This is whether or not we have to be forced to pay for other people's choices.

The Supreme Court has been clear. We do not have to pay for someone's abortion. They have a right to choose abortion, but they do not have a right to have me violate my beliefs, the majority of the people of Indiana who share that belief and other parts of the country who share that belief have to pay for a procedure that they find offensive.

Now, the truth is, many Americans are on the fence here. They find abortion abhorrent, but they believe other people should be allowed to choose. But it is clear, the majority of Americans do not want what they believe is the blood on their hands, and I do not believe that we should be forced to pay for other people's abortion by subsidizing as we do in Congress 75 percent of the procedure.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 seconds. This amendment does not provide government or taxpayer subsidies for abortion. The health care benefit, like the salary, belongs to the employee. The employee is free to choose from a health care plan that best meets their needs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and also for her commitment and her consistent work in support of the rights of all women.

I rise in strong support today of the DeLauro amendment that strikes the prohibition of abortion coverage within the Federal Employees Health benefits Plans. Approximately 1.2 million women of reproductive age rely on the Federal employees health benefits program. Denying them access to health services is denying them the right to lead healthy lives as they so choose. Restricting this fundamental right is discriminating against women in the public sector. We are currently denying these women access to a legal health service.

The DeLauro amendment would allow government employees to choose a health care plan that would cover the full range of reproductive services, including abortion. It is wrong to impose personal ideology on compensation benefits to millions of women. This provision would not result in government subsidized abortions. Instead, it would allow women in the public sector the same fundamental reproductive health services as women in the private sector.

Why should a woman be denied access to care simply because she chooses to work for the Federal Government? This is so unfair and it is wrong. The current prohibition has made it more difficult and more dangerous for women working in the Government to exercise their constitutional guarantee of freedom of choice. We must begin to take the politics out of providing health care for Federal employees.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say in answer to the previous speaker, opposition to abortion funding has nothing whatsoever to do with politics. Such charge is insulting today, we seek, to the maximum extent possible, to safeguard human rights for unborn children who cannot defend themselves.

Let me also say that every time we deal with pro-life text including language that proscribes funding for abortion, the issue, we are told is never about abortion. When we deal with the D.C. approps bill, it is about home rule. When we deal with the Hyde amendment on the health and human services appropriations bill, it's rich versus poor, rather that subsidizing the extermination of poor children by abortion. Our opponents on the issue always try to muddy the water suggesting that the debate is about something other than abortion. And today we're told it is a matter of Federal employees benefit packages. Sorry—that argument just doesn't cut it. Abortion is not a health benefit—it's the killing of a baby. Regrettably, the gentlewoman is offering an amendment today that would strike current law, that is to say, law that has been in effect this year, last year, every year except 2 years since I first successfully offered this back in the early 1980s.

□ 1730

So let me emphasize my hope that Members will reject this misguided, anti child amendment.

Mr. Chairman, with violence so commonplace nowadays, with our sensibilities accosted and numbed almost every day of the week by yet another outrageous act of violence at home or abroad or both, perhaps it is any wonder why we, as a society, continue to live in denial, for some it is very deep denial, about the inherent violence of abortion.

Abortion, Mr. Chairman, is not some benign act designed to cure or to mitigate a disease. I will never forget, I read a paper some years ago by Dr. Cates from the Center for Disease Control Abortion Surveillance Unit, and it was entitled ''Pregnancy, the second most prevalent sexually transmitted disease.''

Mr. Chairman, that is sick. A pregnancy, a maturing, living unborn child is not a disease. He or she is not a wart or a cancerous tumor or something that should be excised. Every one of us once were unborn children.

We should look at birth as an event that happens to each and every one of us, it is not the beginning of life. Unborn children when they are sufficiently mature and developed move on to a new address. Life is a continuum; birth is not the beginning but an event along the way.

But here is the CDC abortion surveillance authority demanding of everyone's early months calling pregnancy a sexually transmitted disease. I think that is as Orwellian and downright stupid as it gets.

Abortion, Mr. Chairman, is the antithesis of compassion and of nurturing. Abortion methods are acts of violence imposed on innocent boys and girls for whom the womb should be a place of refuge, hope, sanctuary—not an execution site.

Abortionists kill their human prey by either injecting poisons into their bodies directly or by putting high concentrated salt water into the amniotic fluid to snuff out the child's life.

High concentrated salt solutions injected into the baby's amniotic sac is barbaric—child abuse. The baby breathes in the caustic salty liquid, dies a slow, excruciatingly painful death. It usually take about 2 hours to kill the baby. The mother then goes into delivery and gives birth to a dead and very badly scalded body as a result of the corrosive effects of the salt.

These are commonplace abortions, and it would be paid for if the DeLauro amendment is approved.

Let me also remind Members that the most common method of child killing is dismemberment. A few minutes ago my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) showed us this picture, of a 2-year-old victim of the revolutionary united front the RUF, who had her arm sheared off by thugs. This was a horrible deed by the RUF in Sierra Leone.

Abortionists do the same to children in the womb every day in America. Amazingly, there are a few lucky ones who survive. Not so long ago The New York Post featured this picture of Ana Rosa Rodriguez, almost 2 years old, with her arm sliced off. Although the abortionist tried hard he did not kill her, she survived. She is one of those fortunate ones who somehow evaded the abortionist's deadly scalpel. She is a survivor, sans an arm.

Of course, all of us are aware of what happens in a partial birth abortion, which is child abuse in the light of day. Yet, such brutality too could be paid for if the DeLauro amendment is successful.

Mr. Chairman, since 1973, over 40 million children have been slaughtered mostly by dismemberment or chemical poisoning in America. That is the equivalent, Mr. Chairman, to the entire populations of 22 States in America combined from Connecticut to Maine to New Hampshire to Oregon. If we want to look at the bigger more populus States 40 million abortions is the equivalent of the entire populations of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan and New Jersey combined. Such staggering loss of children's lives should sound alarm bells—not foster denial or acquiescence. Clearly abortion has been sanitized. The cover up of abortion take the prize for ''most euphemisms.'' It has been marketed with great skill, cleverness, and deceit by the abortion lobby. The result 40 million dead children in America. 40 million kids, Mr. Chairman, who have had every hope and dream, every aspiration, every possibility of living obliterated by abortion. Their mothers too have been very much wounded by abortion.

I have been working in the pro-life movement for 28 years. I work with crisis pregnancy centers. There has been an increase in healing outreaches, Project Rachel reaches out to women in distress, who have had abortions, who are in great need of healing and reconcilliation. Many of those women are the walking wounded. Abortion hurt them physically, emotionally and psychologically.

Since 1973, Mr. Chairman, 40 million kids killed by abortion will never know the thrill of a sunset, the simple joys of life, like eating and drinking or sleeping in on a Saturday morning, a snow day. They will never have that. They have been terminated. They will never know the joy of playing sports, soccer or baseball. They will never know what it is like to date or marry or raise kids or to give of oneself for others. They will never know the power of prayer, or power of faith in God to usher in his will on earth, as it is in heaven.

All of this and more has been denied these kids because of abortion. The so-called right to choose robs children of their birthright and a lifetime of meaning and challenges have been snuffed out as a result of abortion.

Mr. Chairman, the other day in Middlesex County, New Jersey, I attended a crisis pregnancy dinner. Two of the ladies got up to the microphone and thanked the director of that center who helped them avert abortion through love and genuine concern. Both women were going in to get abortions. But both of them had the child instead. They gave very strong and compelling comments on what it was like to be reached out to and to love. What I found to be unexpected was that just a few moments later, two young teenage girls stepped up to the microphone. They too thanked the director of that crisis pregnancy center and their moms who had just spoken, because their lives had been saved from certain death.

They were articulate. Both had dreams and hopes, all because they were alive. Abortion Mr. Chairman takes the life of a child. There are alternatives—crisis pregnancy centers, adoption—so let us help you. If we subsidize abortion and facilitate abortion girls like those two potential victims are less likely to survive and are more likely to be aborted.

I do believe, Mr. Chairman, that some day, researchers, sociologists and historians and others will marvel how the best and the brightest of our day, many of those in positions of power in government, our judiciary, the media, the medical profession, and academia, could have embraced the killing of 40 million children and demanded that it not only be sanctioned, and regarded as a woman's right, but paid for by the U.S. taxpayer. Just as we look at the pro-slavery crowd of yesteryear, and say ''how could they'' they too will be aghast at our moral obtuseness and callousness.

With the bill before us today, at least we can take a stand against funding the killing of unborn babies. The underlying language that the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) would strike continues, as I said at the outset, current law that proscribes the Federal employees

health benefits program from subsidizing most abortions.

I respect each Member on the other side of this issue but find it extremely disappointing and vexing that you fail to understand the terrible wrong you do to children and their mothers.

Vote no on DeLauro.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the remaining time on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 7¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to, first of all, thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for yielding the time to me, and also for offering the amendment.

We in this House of Representatives, as well as Federal employees across this country, enjoy the rights of deciding a benefit given to them, along with their salary, that belongs to them to choose the health plan that suits them and their children.

I believe that we ought to allow these wonderful Federal women employees that right, a right to a procedure that is legal, a right to a procedure that everywhere else, except in Federal employees status cannot be selected, because this Congress, I might add, will not allow it.

I am wondering why this provision is not, as we hear so many times using authorizing on an appropriations bill, someone should rule it out of order. I believe this section 509 is authorizing on an appropriations bill and should stand on its own in proper legislation and in the proper committee of jurisdiction.

Why are we now taking a procedure that is legal for thousands of women, heads of households, I am a mother, I have never had to use abortion, praise the Lord, but some people may find in their lifetime they have to make that decision.

God has blessed women to bear children, and women ought to be allowed with their God and their husband or significant other to make that decision. I praise and applaud the woman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for offering the amendment. This amendment discriminates against women Federal employees. Who are we, 435 of the finest citizens in the most powerful government, to decide what God has decided that a woman must or must not do with her body? I think it is appalling.

I think section 509 is authorizing on an appropriations bill and ought to be ruled out of order.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that both sides have an additional 5 minutes each, 10 minutes equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Each side will be granted an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me the time, and I rise in very strong opposition to this amendment.

The gentlewoman offered this amendment last year and it was defeated by a vote of 188 to 230. The provision that the gentlewoman is offering seeks to strike language that has been included in this legislation for years.

The funding restriction in the bill addresses the same core issue as the Hyde amendment, should the Federal Government be in the business of funding abortions? Should taxpayers be forced to underwrite the cost of abortions for Federal employees?

This debate is not one involving the legality of abortion. It is about using taxpayer dollars for abortions.

The point is that the vast majority of Americans feel very strongly that taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortions in the United States of America.

Some people may try to claim that this is just another medical procedure. We all know that this is not just another medical procedure. It is a very unique procedure where one of the participants in the procedure ends up dead.

I have been a practicing internist for 20 years, and I would argue that the unborn baby in the womb is not a potential life. It meets all of the medical criteria for a life. The criteria that I used as a practicing physician to determine whether somebody is alive or dead, a beating heart, active brain waves; indeed, using modern ultrasound technology today, we can show as early as just a few weeks of life activity on the part of the developing fetus, moving arms and moving legs.

The Supreme Court, the Court that created legalized abortion in America, has actually ruled on this issue upholding the Hyde amendment language. The Court said, abortion is inherently different from other medical procedures because no other procedure involves the purposeful termination of a potential life. They used the word potential there, I say it is a life.

Mr. Chairman, I reject this amendment and I would encourage all of my colleagues to vote against it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for yielding the time to me, but also for introducing this amendment, because I rise in strong support of it. It would simply prevent discrimination against Federal employees in their health care coverage.

It was 5 years ago when Congress voted to deny Federal employees abortion coverage that was already provided to most of the country's workforce through their private health insurance plans. This discriminatory decision was another attempt to diminish the benefits of Federal employees and their right to choose an insurance plan that best meets their health care needs.

I heard the term that this is being funded by the Federal Government. It is not. The government simply contributes to the premiums of Federal employees in order to allow them to purchase health insurance; this contribution is part of the employee benefit package, just like an employee's salary or retirement benefits.

Currently, if we look at the private sector, approximately two-thirds of private fee-for-service health insurance plans and 70 percent of HMOs provide abortion coverage.

When this ban was reinstated 5 years ago, 178 of the FEHBP plans out of 345 offered abortion coverages. Women could choose, they could decide whether to participate in a plan with or without this coverage. Thus, the employee could make that decision.

Quite frankly, it is insulting to our Federal employees that they are being told that part of their compensation package is not under their control.

Mr. Chairman, approximately 1.2 million women of reproductive age rely on FEHBP for their health coverage. What we are doing, unless we adopt this amendment, is denying 1.2 million women for making their own right to choose a health care plan.

□ 1745

I urge my colleagues to support the DeLauro amendment and ensure that Federal employees are once again provided their legal right to choose.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

(Mr. COBURN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to offend anybody in this body, but I think we ought to really characterize what this debate is about, and that is whether or not we are going to use taxpayer dollars to allow a woman to kill her unborn baby. I mean, we can say that is not a politically correct statement; but that is what abortion is, is an unborn human being, a child, is being killed. Now, we can say, no, that is not it; it has no standing, but the fact is the Supreme Court recognizes that death in this country only occurs when there is an absence of brain waves and heartbeat.

At 19 days post-conception, infants, children in their mother's womb, meet that.

The other contention that I think we ought to talk about, very frankly, is whether or not killing an unborn child is health care. Who is that health care for, and should we ask the taxpayers of this country to subsidize the taking of unborn life? The fact is the vast majority of Americans today do not believe that abortion is the right thing to do, by far. It is growing every day as they see the truth about abortion.

The fact is that we do not consider the rights of the unborn child, except if the child is injured unintentionally in a car wreck or injured in some other way. Then it has standing. But if it has standing at those times, we are going to say the rest of the time it has no standing. Mark my words, our country will change this.

We can all disagree about whether or not this is a right or a wrong thing to do, but the fact that we should not subsidize it and the fact that the American people, by a large majority, do not want us subsidizing it, speaks very plainly to the fact that they know what the truth is: abortion is not health care. Abortion is taking the life of an unborn human being that is unique, has never been here before, never been created before, is totally unique, has the attributes of life, a beating heart, active brain waves.

We can deny that because it is convenient to rationalize our moral choice for an inadvertent sexual activity. This amendment would pretend that rape, incest and the life of the woman does not exist. They are excepted in this. So the fact is we are protecting the true health of the woman in recognizing the right under our constitution of this unborn child.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen from whom we have heard tonight have every right to support their ideologies against abortion. That is their right. It is their personal ideology, and I cannot disapprove of their personal ideology; but I only ask them one thing. It is not their right to impose their personal beliefs to the Congress or to this country. If I had my way, there would be a lot of my personal beliefs that I would be able to impose on this Congress, but the Constitution of this country does not give me that right. It does not give any man in this country the right to choose a woman's right to choose. It is her right; and if she does not follow her religious and moral constraints, she has to pay for it. I do not have to pay for hers, but as an elected official I cannot say this because I agree or disagree with someone then they do not have a right to choose.

No matter how poignant the stories or the anecdotal information we have heard here tonight, it does not give anyone the right to choose. I support the DeLauro amendment. I believe in justice and fairness to women, as well as to men.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that I have the utmost respect for the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), but the statement she just made ignores one person's rights, and that is the rights of the unborn. Read our Declaration of Independence. Read our Constitution. Regardless of what the law is, in the scheme of the long-term measure of us as a society, it is going to be said that we did the wrong thing.

Legally, we have the right to abortion in this country. We are not disputing that. That is the law. I would just state that the fact is the judgment in history on our society is not going to be whether or not we recognize the woman's right to choose. It is going to be whether we recognize the innocent's right to life.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, there are about 1.2 million women of reproductive age who depend on the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program for their health care, and our congressional staff makes up a large number of those women. So I ask Members to look at their female staff who work so hard for all of us, who serve our districts and ask how they can stand not to provide these young women with reproductive health services, health services that would allow their health plans to cover abortion services. How could they not allow them to be covered even if their health or future fertility were at stake?

As Members of Congress, we have an obligation to offer women in public service a full range of reproductive health options, including abortion services. I want all of us to vote for the DeLauro amendment to allow Federal plans to offer health services to cover abortions.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 45 seconds remaining. The gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the DeLauro amendment to strike the provision which bans Federal health plans from offering abortion coverage. Approximately two-thirds of private fee-for-service plans and 70 percent of HMOs provide abortion coverage.

Until 1995, the Federal Government in its employee benefit plans likewise provided this coverage, but we have allowed the anti-choice forces in this House to substitute their judgment and their morality and their opinions to impose those opinions and judgments on the women in the workforce of the United States. This is shameful and unjust.

We should not allow the ideological bias of some Members to decide what more than a million employees of the Federal Government can do with their own compensation.

By specifying what they can do with their own compensation, we are seriously intruding into their privacy and their control over their own salaries and benefits.

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago it was alluded to the fact or to the assertion that what will be remembered in the future is what we do with respect to the lives of innocents. Well, the fact is there is a difference of opinion as to when life begins, and we say that a woman must have the ability to make her own moral choices and not have the Government make that choice. The Supreme Court says that, too; but we are misusing the power of this House to say we cannot impose our will on the women of America in terms of whether they choose to have an abortion. We cannot substitute our judgments for theirs, but we can substitute our judgment for those who happen to work for the Federal Government because we can make sure that their insurance will not cover it. That is wrong. They have the right to make their own moral judgments. Every woman must make a moral judgment for herself and we should not substitute the judgments of the Members of this House for theirs. That is an arrogant form of moral imperialism, and we should not do it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleague, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), and congratulate her for her leadership and support of a woman's right to choose and rise in strong support of her amendment.

This is the 151 vote on choice since the beginning of the 104th Congress; and once again, this Congress is attempting to deny women access to legal health services.

Mr. Chairman, it was only 5 years ago that I and millions of other women employed in Federal service received a notice in the mail that our health insurance coverage by law would no longer cover abortion. It was one small notice in the mail but one giant step backward for a woman's right to choose.

This amendment would simply give health care providers of Federal employees the option of providing a full range of reproductive health services, including abortion. This restriction is another attempt by anti-choice forces on the other side of the aisle to make abortion less accessible to women. Not only does it discriminate against women in public service, but it endangers their health. It is wrong and unfair, and that notice took us backward. We need to correct it with this amendment and take women forward once again.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been called an amendment on choice or life. I have argued this amendment repeatedly and have lost. This amendment is, I think, about whose money is it.

Now, I have propounded this argument before, and it has been rejected by the majority of this House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) said, and numerous other speakers have said about our money, that it is the taxpayers' money, the Federal Government's money. Now, a Federal employee is in a unique position in that 100 percent of their compensation package, salary, health benefits and retirement, are paid by the taxpayer. If one adopts the premise of the opponents of this amendment, then the Federal employee ought to be in the position of being told how to spend 100 percent of their money. That is the logical conclusion one must draw from the arguments being made today.

The Federal employee goes to work and is told we are going to pay X number of dollars, we are going to get health benefits and there is going to be a retirement system. That is their compensation package.

We take the position, apparently, that with respect to part of it, we are going to tell them how to spend it. We do not tell any other employees in the Nation how they can spend their package. We do not do it. So all of this is turned into a device to the same argument that deeply divides our Nation.

□ 1800

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, we take this debate and convert it into a debate over an issue that deeply divides this Nation and is an excruciatingly difficult issue. That is unfortunate, because in my opinion, this ought not to be a difficult issue. Because it is about whether or not Federal employees are equal to all other employees in terms of spending their money. It is not the taxpayers' money; they earned it, and the taxpayer converted it to the Federal employee in return for the services they perform for the Federal Government. It is the Federal employees' money.

Now, yes, part of that compensation is, we pay 72 percent of the benefits, but they choose the policy, and they have a wide variety of policies, because we have an excellent program as part of their compensation package.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to try to look at what the substance of this does. I tell my friend, and good friend from New Jersey, the issue that he argues passionately about I respect him for. It is not, however, the issue raised by this amendment, I would suggest to him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I think my position on this matter of choice is fairly well known. I have long supported a woman's right to choose. I find myself in a somewhat different position today here, as the chairman of the subcommittee.

What we have attempted to do as a subcommittee is to cut through this Gordian's knot by taking the position that this House has spoken about fairly clearly in the last couple of years. On the one hand, we do have the prohibition, which the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) seeks to strike, that prevents health benefits for Federal employees from including any kind of abortion service. On the other hand, we do also have the provision in there which was debated and fought over this last year which allows for contraceptive services to be offered for those who have Federal employment health benefits.

While this is a difficult position and one that I may not completely support myself, I do believe the position of the committee and the position of the House is in this legislation and should be supported. For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 560, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) will be postponed.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4871) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

## MODIFICATION TO ORDER OF THE HOUSE OF TODAY LIMITING AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4871, TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATION ACT, 2001

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, to correct apparently an error in propounding my earlier unanimous consent request, I now ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4871 in the Committee of the Whole, pursuant to House Resolution 560 and the order of the House of earlier today, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) be permitted to offer an amendment regarding Federal contracts in lieu of an amendment regarding Federal election contracts.

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

There was no objection.

## TREASURY AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 560 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4871.

□ 1804

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4871) making appropriations for the Treasury Department, the United States Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) had been postponed and title V was open for amendment at any point.

Pursuant to the order of the House today, the previous order of the House