

value of our currency compared to others now makes our exports less price-competitive in Asian markets than our competitor exporters like Canada, Australia, Brazil, or the nations of the European Union. Thus, there is not only a dramatically reduced agricultural export market in Asia, we are also getting a reduced portion of the remaining Asian import business.

Clearly, an emergency agriculture relief package is needed immediately. Producers are in desperate need of a quick infusion of cash to help them deal with low prices and increasing costs. However, as important as that relief is, it is only a temporary fix. A long-term approach is clearly needed. This conference report, which includes significant improvements in the crop insurance program, is an important component of that effort.

This Member urges his colleagues to vote for the conference report for H.R. 2559.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report for H.R. 2559, the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000. I believe that this legislation is paramount to providing much needed assistance to our nations farmers and ranchers.

In 1996, Congress passed the Freedom to Farm bill, which was designed to limit government's role in agriculture. This legislation addresses some of the short falls of Freedom to Farm by providing temporary economic relief to our farm community, as well as implementing crop insurance reform.

The reforms to the crop insurance program will strengthen the farm safety net by providing producers improved risk management tools to address the inherent risks associated with farming. I believe that these reforms are necessary, and that they will remove need for the type of emergency assistance Congress has provided agricultural producers over the past two years.

I am especially appreciative that this conference report contains the House crop insurance reform language calling for the implementation of livestock pilot programs. These pilot programs would provide livestock producers with the necessary risk management tools to cope with disasters, weather shifts, and other natural acts beyond their control without fear that the cost of doing the right thing will put them out of business.

I am also supportive of the anti-fraud provisions in the crop insurance legislation. These provisions direct the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Farm Service Agency to work together to reconcile producer information on an annual basis, to identify producers and insurers who are abusing the program.

As I stated earlier, I believe that this is sound legislation. I want to commend all the conferees and committee staff for their hard work and dedication, particularly Chairman COMBEST and Ranking Member STENHOLM.

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to congratulate Congressman COMBEST of Texas for introducing the Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000. The conference report that we are voting on today will provide a badly needed overhaul of our crop insurance system.

All of us who represent and have grown up in rural areas know the importance of our nation's farmers. The weather over the past couple of years has not been very generous to Tennessee's farmers and now, more than ever, they need federal policy to help them these tough times.

Farming is not only a job that requires endless hours of hard work and planning. It also requires a substantial amount of courage to be a farmer. Our farmers take risks every year by putting their livelihood on the line in order to produce for their communities. They invest the money they have worked so hard to save in a crop or a number of crops with the hope that the rains will come and that a tornado and the insects will not.

But, as we all know, those conditions are never guaranteed. But my fellow Congressmen and I can guarantee them an affordable safety net. Providing our dwindling farming population with a cheaper and broader insurance program is the least we can do for the men and women who work to provide for each one of us in this House.

The provision in this conference report that makes catastrophic coverage available for all farmers for a simple fee is certainly appealing to Tennessee's farmers who have been hit by a recent wave of tornadoes and droughts over the past several years.

Tennessee's single crop and lower yield farmers are especially excited about the change in their actual production history formula. These farmers will now be able to insure more of their investments and feel more secure about their ability to support their families. Ladies and gentlemen these are only a few examples of the benefits of this legislation.

I call on each one of my fellow members of Congress to join me and support this conference report for America's courageous farmers.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2559 just passed.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE FROM THURSDAY, MAY 25, 2000 OR FRIDAY, MAY 26, 2000 TO TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 2000, AND RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE FROM THURSDAY, MAY 25, 2000 OR FRIDAY, MAY 26, 2000 OR SATURDAY, MAY 27, 2000 OR SUNDAY, MAY 28, 2000 TO MONDAY, JUNE 5, 2000 OR TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 2000

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 336) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 336

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (The Senate concurring), That when the House ad-*

journs on the legislative day of Thursday, May 25, 2000, or Friday, May 26, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 6, 2000, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, May 25, 2000, Friday, May 26, 2000, Saturday, May 27, 2000, or Sunday, May 28, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, June 5, 2000, or Tuesday, June 6, 2000, as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or at such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

□ 1130

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MAPPING OF HUMAN GENOME

(Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a moment this morning on a measure that affects all Americans and about which I am afraid this Congress is doing nothing, and that is the mapping of the human genome.

It is expected to be finished within the next month. We will know more about our human body than we have ever known before, and it will be a wonderful way to present health care.

We expect that, once we understand the human makeup, we will be able to do much more for prevention of diseases, and diseases that have plagued us over the centuries will be no more.

Unfortunately, there is a downside to this wonderful scientific venture, and that is the issue of health insurance. Discrimination is already taking place against people who are afraid to find out what their genetic makeup is for fear that it would cause them to lose their health insurance or that the rates and conditions would change to such an extent that they could no longer afford it.

We have a bill, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 306, which has good bipartisan support in the House by 220 sponsors at this time, more than enough to pass. I would like very much to see this come to the floor on the suspension calendar, on which I am sure it would pass, simply to give the peace of mind to every American

that the genetic makeup with which they were born would not cause them to lose their health insurance.

It is important for us to make sure that people understand we are not talking about a different population, we are talking about us. Each one of us is believed to be born with between five and 30 faulty genes. And it is the rank-est form of discrimination to deny health insurance on genetic grounds, because simply having a faulty gene does not ensure that they will get the condition and, if they did, it might be 40 years down the road. That discrimination is already taking place, Mr. Speaker.

I want to urge this House to take up as expeditiously as possible H.R. 306 so that we can assure Americans that their health insurance will be kept intact.

#### PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT OF 2000

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 457, I call up from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 1692) to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The text of S. 1692 is as follows:

S. 1692

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 1999".

#### SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 73 the following:

##### "CHAPTER 74—PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTIONS

"Sec.

"1531. Partial-birth abortions prohibited.

#### "§ 1531. Partial-birth abortions prohibited

"(a) Any physician who, in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, knowingly performs a partial-birth abortion and thereby kills a human fetus shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than two years, or both. This paragraph shall not apply to a partial-birth abortion that is necessary to save the life of a mother whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, illness, or injury. This paragraph shall become effective one day after enactment.

"(b)(1) As used in this section, the term 'partial-birth abortion' means an abortion in which the person performing the abortion deliberately and intentionally—

"(A) vaginally delivers some portion of an intact living fetus until the fetus is partially outside the body of the mother, for the purpose of performing an overt act that the person knows will kill the fetus while the fetus is partially outside the body of the mother; and

"(B) performs the overt act that kills the fetus while the intact living fetus is partially outside the body of the mother.

"(2) As used in this section, the term 'physician' means a doctor of medicine or osteopathy legally authorized to practice medicine

and surgery by the State in which the doctor performs such activity, or any other individual legally authorized by the State to perform abortions: *Provided, however,* That any individual who is not a physician or not otherwise legally authorized by the State to perform abortions, but who nevertheless directly performs a partial-birth abortion, shall be subject to the provisions of this section.

"(c)(1) The father, if married to the mother at the time she receives a partial-birth abortion procedure, and if the mother has not attained the age of 18 years at the time of the abortion, the maternal grandparents of the fetus, may in a civil action obtain appropriate relief, unless the pregnancy resulted from the plaintiff's criminal conduct or the plaintiff consented to the abortion.

"(2) Such relief shall include—

"(A) money damages for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation of this section; and

"(B) statutory damages equal to three times the cost of the partial-birth abortion.

"(d)(1) A defendant accused of an offense under this section may seek a hearing before the State Medical Board on whether the physician's conduct was necessary to save the life of the mother whose life was endangered by a physical disorder, illness or injury.

"(2) The findings on that issue are admissible on that issue at the trial of the defendant. Upon a motion of the defendant, the court shall delay the beginning of the trial for not more than 30 days to permit such a hearing to take place.

"(e) A woman upon whom a partial-birth abortion is performed may not be prosecuted under this section, for a conspiracy to violate this section, or for an offense under section 2, 3, or 4 of this title based on a violation of this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 73 the following new item:

"74. Partial-birth abortions ..... 1531".

#### SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING ROE V. WADE AND PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION BANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) abortion has been a legal and constitutionally protected medical procedure throughout the United States since the Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade* (410 U.S. 113 (1973)); and

(2) no partial birth abortion ban shall apply to a partial-birth abortion that is necessary to save the life of a mother whose life is endangered by a physical disorder, illness, or injury.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that partial birth abortions are horrific and gruesome procedures that should be banned.

#### SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING A WOMAN'S LIFE AND HEALTH.

It is the sense of the Congress that, consistent with the rulings of the Supreme Court, a woman's life and health must always be protected in any reproductive health legislation passed by Congress.

#### SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING ROE V. WADE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) reproductive rights are central to the ability of women to exercise their full rights under Federal and State law;

(2) abortion has been a legal and constitutionally protected medical procedure throughout the United States since the Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade* (410 U.S. 113 (1973));

(3) the 1973 Supreme Court decision in *Roe v. Wade* established constitutionally based

limits on the power of States to restrict the right of a woman to choose to terminate a pregnancy; and

(4) women should not be forced into illegal and dangerous abortions as they often were prior to the *Roe v. Wade* decision.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) *Roe v. Wade* was an appropriate decision and secures an important constitutional right; and

(2) such decision should not be overturned.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CANADY OF FLORIDA

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANADY of Florida moves to strike all after the enacting clause of the bill, S. 1692, and to insert in lieu thereof the text of the bill, H.R. 3660, as passed by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE

Mr. CANADY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rule, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANADY of Florida moves that the House insist on its amendment to the bill, S. 1692, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CONYERS moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the Senate bill, S. 1692, be instructed to meet promptly with the managers on the part of the Senate on all issues committed to conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XX, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CANADY) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support the current motion to recommit by Mr. CONYERS.

Like the House Bill that was unfortunately passed in April, this act, despite its title is nothing more than an attempt to inhibit a woman's constitutional right to choose.

Although the majority conveniently skirts the issue of the 1973 Supreme Court decision of *Roe v. Wade*, this law is still in effect and we must recognize a woman's right to have an abortion especially if her life is threatened.

Yes, it is true that technological advancement in the medical field has enabled women to better monitor their pregnancies so that they may bring healthy children into this world. However, some pregnancies may involve problems that may threaten the life and/or health of the mother.

For example, continuing the pregnancy may result in severe heart disease, malignancies and kidney failure. In these situations, when a woman is faced with a life or death decision,