of H.R. 2879, I submit for the RECORD the letter I received from Thomas Williams who came up with the idea for the need of a marker on the Lincoln Memorial to commemorate the ''I have a Dream'' speech of Martin Luther King on August 28, 1963.

Beyond paying respect to Dr. King, this bill offers acknowledgment that our legislative system works as planned. For only in the United States can an idea of an interested individual result in good legislation, and I am hopeful—law. I thank Mr. Williams for his contribution to his country and to the future of our nation.

NOVEMBER 30, 1998.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NORTHUP: In October of 1997 my wife and I visited Washington, D.C. The city, with its buildings, statues and monuments, was rich with symbolism. Despite the vastness of the space and the beauty of its design, what struck me most during the trip was a single man sitting on the steps of the Capitol. He sat there in plain view of the police with a sign indicating (if memory serves me) that he had fought in the Viet Nam war but was not now receiving veteran's benefits. The guard there indicated it wasn't true, but what struck me most was the fact that a single citizen could sit peacefully on the steps of the Capitol without being escorted away because he was unworthy of the space he selected to rest. There, literally on the threshold of our nation's most-powerful leaders, he sat. Other nations, I thought, might be embarrassed by the scene. Nevertheless, I somehow felt that I had witnessed—there on the steps—a living testament to our freedom and our greatness.

Later that day, my wife and I walked to the Lincoln Memorial where, at the steps of the memorial to one of our nation's greatest presidents, Martin Luther King delivered the ''I Have A Dream Speech''. I looked for the spot on which Martin Luther King stood when he spoke. I looked for a marker to remind me and others that—for a single moment on a hot August day—a descendent of a slave held the most prominent space in our nation and delivered words that will always stay with that space. I couldn't find a marker or the words on those steps.

Several months later at my home in Louisville, Kentucky, I attended a service at the Cathedral of the Assumption in which the Church celebrated a moment of personal revelation by Thomas Merton, the monk. Forty years earlier, when walking out of the Starks building on what was then 4th and Walnut, he realized in a profound way that we are all one. The Church celebrated the 40th anniversary of that event with a simple Mass and marker. To me, the service and the marker were both reminders that the ordinary space we sometimes occupy can become forever changed by the deeds of a person who stood there. I am confident it was no accident that the Church waited 40 years to commemorate the event.

My visit to Washington and my attendance at the Merton mass sparked a vision and a question in my mind. Wouldn't it be right to celebrate the 40th year of Martin Luther King's ''I Have a Dream'' speech with a ceremony and a marker at the footsteps of the Lincoln Memorial? The anticipation and planning of such an event might lead to collective good. In my mind's eye, I saw a day in which the ''I Have A Dream'' speech would be delivered again for those who have never heard it. I saw a day in which Martin Luther King might be remembered for the inspiration he provided to all of our citizens.

Looking even further into the future, I saw a day when I could bring my yet unborn children to that spot where Martin Luther King spoke and I could show them that marker and read them the words of his dream. I could tell him that this is still a nation where a simple Kentucky farmer could rise to the heights of President and a son of a slave could inspire future generations with the power of his words and his compassion.

My vision and these thoughts I share with you are personal—but far from novel. Perhaps something like this is already in the works and I am simply unaware. In any event, I am writing for some practical suggestions for bringing this vision to a reality.

Sincerely,

TOM WILLIAMS.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2879.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2879 and add any extraneous material that they so desire.

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

There was no objection.

SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING THE TRAFFICKING OF BABY PARTS

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 350) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to private companies involved in the trafficking of baby body parts for profit.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 350

Whereas the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993 effectively lifted the ban on federally funded research involving the transplantation of baby body parts, and such Act made it a Federal felony for any person to knowingly, for ''valuable consideration,'' purchase or sell baby body parts (with a term of imprisonment of up to 10 years and with fines of up to $250,000 in the case of an individual and $500,000 in the case of an organization);

Whereas private companies have sought to meet the demand by both public and private research facilities by providing baby body parts;

Whereas the definition of ''valuable consideration'' under the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993 does not include reasonable payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage of baby body parts; and

Whereas private companies appear to believe that the definition of ''valuable consideration'' allows them to circumvent Federal law and avoid felony charges with impunity while trafficking in baby body parts for profit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the Congress should exercise oversight responsibilities and conduct hearings, and take appropriate steps if necessary, concerning private companies that are involved in the trafficking of baby body parts for profit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 350 and to insert extraneous material on the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 350, a much-needed resolution which would bring greater attention to a sordid trade in the bodies of aborted babies. I salute the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for working so diligently to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

I have a copy of a brochure from a company called Opening Lines recently of West Frankfurt, Illinois, which has now moved its base of operations to an undisclosed location. This brochure boasts, ''Our goal is to offer you and your staff the highest quality, most affordable, and freshest tissue, prepared to your specifications, and deliver it in the quantities you need when you need it.''

This company was founded, according to its brochure, ''in order to provide a convenient and efficient way for researchers to receive fetal tissue without a lot of bureaucracy.''

The brochure explains that, ''We have simplified the process for procuring fetal tissue. We do not require a copy of your IRB approval or summary of your research, and you are not required to cite Opening Lines of the source of tissue when you publish your work. We believe in word-of-mouth advertising. If you like our service, you will tell your colleagues.''

Mr. Speaker, Congress has spoken forcefully on the matter of selling aborted baby parts before. There is no question that it is illegal in the United States for any person to buy or sell fetal tissue effecting interstate commerce.

Yet, the documents we have here show very clearly that, if this is true, that anyone can buy whatever part of a dead baby may be decided. According to this brochure, it is $50 for ears, $150 for lungs and hearts, $325 for a spinal column, and a pair of eyes cost $50. But the buyer is offered a 40 percent discount for a single eye. Prices are in effect through December 31, 1999.

Mr. Speaker, companies like Opening Lines and their main competitor, the

so-called Anatomic Gift Foundation, play a significant role in destroying the sanctity of innocent human life and apparently profit from this illicit activity even though it is illegal to buy and sell fetal tissue.

According to Opening Lines, ''Our daily average case volumes exceeds 1,500, and we serve clinics across the United States.''

How are they getting around the law? I think Congress and the American people deserve to know.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I know a lot of folks in this body, a lot of Members come down and speak so eloquently and passionately when it comes to such things as cruelty to animals, and in many ways they are justified in their eloquence and their beliefs. I would just hope that those same Members come down to this floor and speak as eloquently and passionately when it comes to the destruction and cruelty to innocent human beings.

I ask my colleagues to cast their votes in support of H. Res. 350 and ask that we work together to shed more light on this industry that has been operating in the shadows of darkness.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if my colleague from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) would be available to engage in a short colloquy with me.

Mr. Speaker, I just would like to try to clarify the intent behind this resolution before I make my statement. The reason is because, as I read the resolution, it says that it is a Federal crime for any person to knowingly for valuable consideration purchase or sell, quote, ''baby body parts,'' and then it goes on.

When I read this, I went and looked at the Federal statutes. I found no Federal statute which criminalizes specifically selling ''baby body parts.''

I was wondering if the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) was talking about either some insidious plot to take babies and kill them, and horribly, to sell the body parts; or if the gentleman was referring to the unlawful purchase of human organs as it would apply to minors, or, as I suspect from what the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) said, that the gentleman may be talking about the unlawful sale of organs or fetal tissues is prohibited by statute.

□ 1115

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DEGETTE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TANCREDO. The answer to the gentlewoman's question is, it is the latter.

Ms. DEGETTE. So it is the intention to talk about the unlawful sale of organs or fetal tissue.

Mr. TANCREDO. That is correct.

Ms. DEGETTE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

As I stated in the colloquy, any way we interpret this resolution, the unlawful sale of either children, of children's organs, or of fetal tissue would be illegal under Federal statutes. Murdering children would be illegal under 18 USC Section 1958(a) and, in fact, it would be a capital offense under Federal law. Unlawful purchase of human organs is also unlawful under 42 USC Section 274(e)(a), and, as noted by the gentleman from New York, it is also illegal to profit from the sale of organs or fetal tissues under 42 USC Section 289g-2(a). Those who partake in this illegal activity are subject to fines, 10 years in prison or both. And, obviously, it is a Federal crime to murder anybody, including babies or small children.

The reason I raise this issue in this way is because what we are discussing here today is a serious issue of medical ethics, and I think that it is incumbent upon all of us in Congress to make sure that proper protocols are being followed with respect to research and that no illegal activity is occurring. However, the use of inflammatory and imprecise language in resolutions such as this one does nothing to ensure that these laws are being enforced or that proper controls are in place. In fact, we do not even need to consider a resolution in Congress to request an oversight hearing.

If, indeed, illegal acts are occurring, then the oversight and investigation subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce, of which I am a member and I believe the gentleman from New York is also a member, should investigate these acts and any violation of Federal law should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

When fetal research was legalized in 1993, in the NIH Revitalization Act, a portion of that legislation established the conditions under which federally-funded fetal tissue research can take place. This law provides that it should be unlawful for any person to knowingly acquire, receive, or otherwise transfer any human fetal tissue for valuable consideration. Specifically, it prohibits the purchase of human fetal tissue. It is interesting to note that a GAO report issued in 1997 determined that these requirements were in fact being met and no further complaints have been issued or detected, according to the NIH.

We called the company, Opening Lines, which the gentleman referred to in his opening statement, and we learned that they have closed their offices and could find no other evidence of them. However, as I noted a moment ago, if protocols are not being followed, and if, in fact, fetal tissue is being sold, then Congress should hold hearings, investigate this matter, and the perpetrators should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

But in establishing protocols and in thwarting illegal acts, we need to be mindful of the benefits that legitimate fetal tissue research has brought. Fetal tissue research has already resulted in significant advances in the treatment of Parkinson's Disease and even in more potential advances for Alzheimer's, diabetes, and many other serious medical conditions. There is a wide range of disorders and diseases that may benefit from fetal tissue transplantation research, including Alzheimer's disease, Huntington's disease, spinal cord injuries, leukemia, Down's syndrome, Tay-Sachs disease, hemophilia, epilepsy, cancer, and perhaps even brain damage caused by an accident or a stroke.

Scientists estimate that fetal tissue transplants could help approximately 1 million Parkinson's disease patients, 2.5 to 3 million people affected with Alzheimer's, 25,000 people suffering from Huntington's disease, 600,000 Type I diabetics, 400,000 stroke victims, and several hundred thousand persons who have suffered a spinal cord injury.

As the co-chair of the Congressional Diabetes Caucus and, more importantly, as the mother of a 5-year-old child who could benefit significantly from appropriate fetal tissue research, I want to ensure, and I know my colleagues want to ensure, that this critical research continues in an ethical manner so that we may find a cure for diabetes, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease, and these many, many other diseases in the near future.

Again, if there is illegal activity going on, we should fully investigate it. But let us not cloud this issue with hyperbole or inaccurate language. Let us make sure that all of the protocols are being followed and illegal activity is not going on.

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to respond that if anybody wants to use inflammatory language, that is not our intent, but this, again, is the price list from Opening Lines: A brain is $999, a kidney is $125, eyes at 8 weeks are $50, 40 percent discount for a single eye. That is the issue before us, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, if I were to tell my colleagues that human bodies were being dissected and that the parts were being methodically catalogued, preserved and sold for profit, they might well recoil at such a picture. They might think I was referring to the grotesque deeds carried out in Communist China, where buyers can place orders for specific organs from bodies of certain blood types. Prisoners matching the specifications are then slaughtered and their organs harvested and sold. Or perhaps, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues might think I was detailing the actions of Nazis, when they found the market in human hair, skin, and bones to be lucrative, so they turned the concentration camps into profit centers.

It is, indeed, a tragic commentary on our times, Mr. Speaker, that I must tell my colleagues that it is not Communist China nor is it Nazi Germany to which I refer, it is contemporary America. The specific sites are not prisons or concentration camps, they are abortion clinics. Unfortunately, entrepreneurs appear to have found a profitable niche within the abortion industry and have begun to traffic in the body parts of aborted babies.

Now, this practice was outlawed by the passage of the Health Revitalization Act, to which my colleague has referred. However, some unscrupulous individuals have found that by simply calling a charge a fee-for-service, that they could possibly avoid persecution and prosecution and turn a tidy profit on the sale of body parts.

Mr. Speaker, on this poster we can see that the price list advertised by Opening Lines, one of the companies doing business in this area, and by the way it is true that one of their outlets has gone to ground since this all came to light, but there are other companies out there doing the same thing, clearly and unabashedly this sets out the specific price for each part. It is not I who stand here talking about baby body parts and offending the sensibilities of my colleagues; it is, of course, the organizations that are involved with selling them. What else would we call the liver, 8 weeks; the spleen, 8 weeks; the pancreas, 8 weeks; intestines; mesentery; kidney without adrenal or kidney with adrenal? You can get either one. What would my colleagues call that if it is not a baby body parts list?

This issue is not about fetal research. I knew that was going to be the issue my colleague and others would like to sort of cloud this thing with, fetal tissue research, the many benefits that may accrue from that. Anyone can stand up and say this resolution is about increasing the possibility for nuclear war. Anyone can say anything they want. The fact is, it is very clear it is a resolution simply calling for an investigation. If there are no problems, if in fact everybody is operating within the law, as my colleague suggests and hopes, then there is nothing to fear from investigation, and that is all this asks for. It is not legislation correcting or changing anything, but there is certainly evidence that something out there is wrong. Something is amiss. It is not going according to the way people who wrote the 1993 law wanted it to go.

This organization was even more exuberant in their advertising when they said, ''Our goal is to offer you and your staff the highest quality, most affordable, freshest tissue prepared to your specifications, delivered in the quantities you need and when you need it.'' Now, this is not my stuff, this is not something I am making up, this is from their brochure.

It is important at this point to cite the specific language of the Health Revitalization Act which says it is a Federal felony for any person to knowingly, for valuable consideration, purchase or sell human body parts, or fetal tissue, however one wants to put it. When I looked at this, it was body parts.

Mr. Speaker, how much more clearly could we have said it when we wrote the law? We evidently need to do more to get the point across that the trafficking in human body parts is disgusting, dangerous, and completely unacceptable in a society which presumes to call itself civilized. I, therefore, have introduced this resolution, which calls upon the Congress to hold hearings to determine the extent to which this practice is going on and, if necessary, if necessary and only if necessary, to take appropriate steps to end it.

Now, the last thing is this GAO report to which my colleague referred. The GAO study actually did come back and say it was not happening; it was not happening in three places, the Colorado Health Sciences Center, Mount Sinai, and the University of South Florida. And they were only looking at one specific aspect of this, they were not looking at private companies, they were not looking at pharmaceutical companies. So it is disingenuous, at least, to say this study sort of exonerates the industry. It was a very narrow study and in those three places it was not happening. In a lot of other places it is.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H. Res. 350. When I heard from my staff last night that a resolution addressing illegal sale of fetal tissue would be offered on the floor today, my immediate reaction was if any illegality was taking place, it ought to be investigated immediately. Then I read the text of H.R. 350, with its use of terms like ''trafficking'' and ''baby body parts'', and I tried to call the company accused of wrongdoing, using the phone number listed in a Dear Colleague, and the number was not in service.

My colleagues, these are serious allegations and we ought to react to them responsibly. If there are legitimate complaints or evidence of illegality, Congress has the power to act. But instead of taking time on this floor, we could be working in committee conducting oversight of the National Institutes of Health, which is charged with protecting the integrity of federally funded research.

As the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), said, in 1997, as required by statute, the General Accounting Office investigated compliance with the detailed Federal regulations governing this research and the GAO found no evidence of wrongdoing or abuse. I would like to repeat that. The GAO found no evidence of wrongdoing or abuse.

And yesterday, the NIH confirmed the GAO conclusion, again stating that no complaints regarding fetal tissue research have been investigated by the National Institutes of Health's Office for Protection from Research Risks, and no compliance cases or institutional reports have been filed with the NIH since the GAO reported to Congress in March 1997. And the National Institutes of Health, my colleagues, has no record of any Member of Congress to date requesting a review or presenting any evidence of wrongdoing, despite the fact that the NIH is the agency charged with oversight of federally funded research. No Member of Congress has called the NIH or requested in writing any investigation.

Research involving fetal tissue is an integral part of the pioneering field of stem cell research which may offer millions of Americans, as the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) has said, suffering with diseases the opportunity to be cured. We should do everything we can to assure that this research proceeds in an ethical and cautious manner.

□ 1130

Allegations of wrongdoing, if substantiated, should be investigated, not, my colleagues, brought to the floor of the House to inflame. This resolution is not needed in order for oversight hearings to be held.

So why are we debating this on the House floor? Let us put aside the inflammatory words and work together with the NIH to get the facts. That is why I urge my colleagues to reject H. Res. 350.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of truth to what the gentlewoman from New York said. However, there is an absence of appropriate timing with that. There is no question we are going to have an oversight hearing on this. There is no question we are going to do it. There is no question that they are violating the law and the intent and purposes of the law. We are going to do that.

But this needs to be inflamed, I say to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), because this is exactly the slippery slope we said we would be going down.

Let me tell my colleagues what this process is creating. If I am in there to rent some space from their abortion clinic and I tell them that can I sell a brain for a thousand dollars, do my colleagues know what I am going to do if I am an abortionist? I am going to do an abortion now that is most important in saving the brain rather than in caring for that woman who is having a pregnancy terminated. Because money then becomes the driving object in my abortion, not in the care of the woman who has made a difficult decision and is giving up a life.

So now what we have had is we violate this law and the intent of it, although technically they may not be, but in fact their intent is to, we are inducing through the profit motive abortionists to put the life of their patient at risk for monetary gain, a fetal brain for a thousand bucks.

How abhorrent can we be? Why should we not be inflamed? Why should we not be agitated? Why should we not be angry, in fact, when this process is going on exactly in contraindication to what we said in the law? We should inflame this. Everyone in America should know that the value of life has just gotten less, not the value of the fetus, the value of the very woman undergoing abortion. Because now her life is going to be put at risk because somebody is going to try to capture a brain intact regardless if that is the best and safest indication for that woman.

So we do need to send the letters, and we are going to, from the Subcommittee on Health, I assure my colleagues. We are going to have an oversight. And we should as a body say, this is not right. This should stop. There are all sorts of unintended consequences occurring because this procedure is ongoing.

The reason the phone is disconnected is just like the phones were disconnected a month ago at another one of them, because when everybody finds out, they shut down and move somewhere else simply because they know it is not right, not right ethically, not right morally, and not right legally. So I am inflamed about it. I am upset about it. Because the purpose of the law, what their intent is, is to go completely around that.

I assure my colleagues that the Subcommittee on Health and the Oversight and Investigation Committee of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Commerce is going to look at every aspect of this. And we already know what the answers are. We have had good undercover investigative reporting that has shown us the answers. But we are going to allow the people to give us the opportunity to do that.

I hope, in our heart of hearts, that as we protect abortion in this country, the first thing we do is protect the women undergoing the abortion.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just clarify my position since the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was directing his comments to me. I certainly respect his views on any issue. But my position was that I would respectfully suggest that the order in this House of Representatives is to have a hearing, to do an investigation, and not come to conclusions with the purpose of inflaming on the floor. I am delighted that they are going to have an investigation.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the purpose of the resolution is to raise the awareness of how foul, how dirty, how nasty, how abhorrent this is.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this resolution. The proponents of this resolution are attempting to corrupt medical research with the politics of abortion. They are attempting to stall proper research to save lives to gain political advantage. I am not surprised, but I am disappointed.

The resolution is totally misleading, and that may in fact be its real purpose. Sale of body parts for profit, the resolution talks about. No one is going out selling body parts, arms, or legs for any purpose.

Researchers do use stem cells and tissue samples from the earlier stages of fetal development to promote research for the treatment of Alzheimer's disease and Parkinson's disease and diabetes and other serious medical conditions. This is potentially life-saving research that can save thousands and thousands of lives. It is intended to alleviate pain and suffering and to save lives.

But we do in the talk about that, we talk about selling body parts, which does not happen. We talk about having abortions to generate body parts, which does not happen. And again, I agree with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY). This is backwards.

If the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) thinks that some foul stuff, as he put it, is going on, that some foul deeds are being committed, have an oversight hearing, look into it, find out the facts first. Do not declare the facts first and then investigate. We do that too often in this House these days, and this is a prime example of it.

I do not think those foul things are happening. I think it is a concoction; I think it is propaganda to inflame debate to stop medical research into life-saving techniques.

But if they are happening, let us find out; let us have a hearing. They will have a hearing. The gentleman says so. Fine. So why this resolution? This resolution is total demagoguery and ought to be rejected for the demagoguery it is. Let us have the hearings and find out the facts and then see what we ought to do, if anything.

Facts first. Action later. Demagoguery not at all.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of this resolution which says very simply that the House should hold hearings on the commercial trafficking in baby body parts.

Here is the issue in a nutshell. Based on reliable reports, abortion clinics are selling parts of babies, and the older the better, to middlemen. Those middlemen, in turn, sell them to researchers. This means more money for the abortion clinic. Instead of the problem of disposing of dead bodies, now abortion clinics have a lucrative means of getting rid of the ''unintended babies.'' This means money for the middlemen.

Just look at this price list that is duplicated, blown up from an article obtained from a national business which traffics in unborn baby body parts. Up here we see a liver, $150. But they can get it for $125 if it is from a younger baby, or they can get a 30 percent discount if it is ''significantly fragmented.'' A spleen is $75. Pancreas, $100. This is their document. A thymus, $100.

Look at this. A brain, $999. Notice they even use marketing techniques in this gruesome big business, selling it for one dollar less than a thousand dollars to make it, I guess, a more attractive purchase. And again, if it is fragmented, and what a terrible way to describe a baby's injured brain from an abortion, they can get a 30 percent discount. Almost like, step right up, ladies and gentlemen, do you want a baby's ear? Seventy-five dollars, $50 if a baby is less than 8 weeks old. How about eyes? A pair of eyes $75; $40 for one eye. Skin, a baby in a second trimester, $100. Spinal cord, $325.

Mr. Speaker, I wish this gruesome price list were a cruel Halloween hoax, but it is not. It is the price list for human body parts from aborted babies.

It is almost like the bureaucratization of the Nazi's final solution hammered out in conferences and committed to legal documents, except now it is in the form of capitalistic price lists organized for commerce, sanitized for the grim reality which it is.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw attention to the job of one young woman. Let us call her Kelly. Kelly's job at the abortion clinic was one of retrieving body parts from dead bodies for abortion and shipping them for profit to researchers who requested them. Here is her testimony. Kelly said: ''We had a contract with an abortion clinic that would allow us to go there on certain days. We would have a generated list of tissue that organizations were looking for. Then we would examine the patient charts.

''We only wanted the most perfect specimens that we could give. We were looking for eyes, livers, brains, thymuses, cardiac blood, cord, blood from liver, even blood from the limbs.''

Kelly quit her job one day when an abortion doctor came in and brought in two babies, two 5½-month-old twins still moving. She could not take it anymore.

It is time the Congress begin oversight hearings on this death-dealing business. We need to begin tracing this money trail. The bill before us today

does nothing more than call for hearings. It does not call for the elimination of trafficking. It does not require women to sign a consent form before their babies are sold for parts. It does not even prohibit Planned Parenthood or commercial middlemen from profiting. All it does is call for hearings. Surely, no one could reasonably oppose a hearing.

Let me anticipate one line of protest. Some will say that medical progress requires that we turn tragedy into a blessing for the living. Well, they are right. We must do all we reasonably can to erase human suffering. But the key is responsibility. We have a responsibility to the sick, the disabled, the children, the elderly.

Who among us does not have a loved one who suffers from some disease or ailment? But do not be fooled between false choices between medical research and no medical research. We have other options other than buying and selling dead children's body parts.

I urge Members to support this resolution.

And that's the issue we focus on today—not research—but the buying and selling of baby body parts for profit, for financial remuneration.

We can, we must, and we will do more to ease human suffering. But not at the ghastly price paid in dissecting babies, pricing their body parts, and distributing marketing lists.

The Nazis killed their unwanted children under the guise of the ''Realm's Committee for Scientific Approach to Severe Illness Due to Heredity and Constitution.'' Transportation of the patients to killing centers was carried out by ''The Charitable Transport Company for the Sick.''

We should not join the Nazi's rationalization of unbounded research on the powerless to build a master race. No, we must not.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this common sense non-binding legislation to call for congressional hearings on this issue.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, certainly no one in this chamber would ever advocate the improper sale of ''baby body parts'' or of ''fetal tissue.'' This is a very sensitive issue of medical ethics which is important for us to ensure is always being adhered to in the strictest way.

This issue, if there is an issue, even though no one has documented it, if there is an issue of improper sale of fetal tissue or of children or anything of that nature, the sponsor of the bill, the floor manager, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, any Member of this House could have requested NIH to investigate those allegations pursuant to the statute. That has never been done to date.

They could have brought this issue up during the NIH authorization hearings, which the Committee on Commerce has jurisdiction over. That has not been done. They could have requested an oversight investigations hearing into these very deeply troubling allegations. That has not been done.

After looking at what has not been done, it becomes clear that this practice of bringing this issue to the House floor to demagogue it is improper. We should go through the committee process and decide whether, in fact, these practices are occurring. And if they are, we should stop them immediately.

No one would favor the sale improperly of fetal tissue or any other kind of tissue. But let us call this what it is. If there is an issue, let us have a hearing, let us investigate it, let us prosecute anybody who is breaking the law.

That is what we should be doing, not standing here in November as the session is winding down and raising it on the floor for the first time.

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

□ 1145

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds. Again, as I stated at the outset, there are so many Members who rightfully and legitimately in their mind come to the floor to speak so passionately about saving the dolphins and saving the tigers and saving the whales. That may all be legitimate. I would just hope that they would feel the same way when it comes to the saving and sanctity of innocent human beings.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 3¾ minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of H. Res. 350 and urge swift and extensive oversight into the question of trafficking in the bodies of unborn babies killed by abortion. Mr. Speaker, the House has not addressed this issue since 1993, when the NIH Revitalization Act was passed by this body. At that time, many of us were deeply concerned, and expressed it on this floor, that research using the shattered bodies of aborted babies could quickly lead to a greater number of abortions, particularly if the demand for their body parts grew among researchers. Those concerns appear to have been well founded.

I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for offering this resolution and, as he pointed out earlier, it was a pro-life organization in Texas that compiled numerous documents about the horrific business of trafficking in baby body parts. The companies involved provide price lists for the individual parts. Let me read just some of those that are listed:

Liver, $150, but a 30 percent discount if significantly fragmented. Pancreas, under 8 weeks, $100. Ears, under 8 weeks, $75. Brain, under 8 weeks, $999, 30 percent discount if significantly fragmented. Intact trunk, with or without limbs, $500. Spinal column, $150. Skin, $100.

Mr. Speaker, this is almost too grotesque to imagine. Yet this is a real business and these are real babies, innocent children who have been deprived of their lives.

It is routine, Mr. Speaker, for pregnant women who are planning to abort their babies to be told that their children are nothing more than collections of cells or blobs of tissue. Yet these lists clearly give lie to that myth. Babies younger than 8 weeks have, as they point out on their price list, identifiable brains, livers, spleens, ears, and eyes, and they, as well as older babies, are being taken apart piece by piece, limb by limb, even skinned. Worst of all, there are profiteers waiting in the wings to make money from this tragedy by collecting and selling the pieces.

Among the questions that Congress must investigate, Mr. Speaker, is whether these private businesses are operating inside or outside the scope even of our current infirm law, and whether Federal law has the gaping loopholes that we suggested back in 1993 which allow these companies to claim significant payments for body parts as, quote, reasonable compensation for obtaining them.

We may also have to look at the clinics' financial interest, particularly where federally funded research is involved. When taxpayer funding of research using baby body parts was being defended 6 or more years ago, one thing that was said repeatedly was that these babies are already dead. The truth is, however, that they are not dead when a woman is asked to donate, and it may not even be true that the woman has decided to abort when she is presented with the prospect of handing over her baby's body parts for research purposes. And as we pointed out then, that may, among other factors, help tip the scale.

Mr. Speaker, many women are ambivalent about abortion, and the studies show that many are undecided even as they walk into the clinic doors. They hope to get objective counseling about their options, but abortion clinic employees, as we have known, are far from objective. Currently there is nothing in Federal law or regulations, and almost certainly nothing in the private sector, to prevent a so-called counselor from telling a woman who is undecided about abortion that if she decides to abort, some good can result if she donates her dead baby to research.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Colorado has pointed out to all of us, and again I want to salute him for bringing this to our attention, a woman who used to work for these middlemen has come forward to talk about their business arrangements with abortion clinics.

She has recounted that the abortion clinic would give her information on the women in the waiting room so that she could pick out the best candidates to fill their requests for organs and tissues, based on the women's medical history and stage or pregnancy. How far-

fetched is it to imagine that these women in particular were approached to get permission to dissect their babies bodies? The so-called safeguards in current law for federally funded research are inadequate in this area and need to be re-examined.

Mr. Speaker, the prospect of economic gain causes can poison even those practices established with the most benevolent intentions. Just yesterday there was a news story about concerns that have been raised over trafficking in human organs internationally for profit. A university professor who founded a group, Organs Watch, to investigate this, said "In the organs trade business, abuses creep in before you know it." The same abuses should be expected in the baby parts business.

I would be astounded if any Member of this body objected to this resolution. If the laws we have, and the enforcement of them, are so great, then hearings will bring that out. But if they are inadequate or are being ignored, then Congress should be made aware of that as well.

Mr. Speaker, the barest minimum that we can do is to have a full scale investigation into this and go wherever the leads may take us to try to stop this heinous practice.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting "yes" on this important resolution. Let's let some light shine on this grisly business.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, it's hard to escape the conclusion that this resolution—by its very name—is designed to attack and cast doubt on fetal tissue research.

First, let's be clear. The law that authorizes fetal tissue research, The NIH Revitalization Act of 1993, which I helped author, contains strong protections against the abuses alleged in this resolution. While we should be concerned if these protections are violated, this inflammatory resolution clearly means to whip up opposition to all fetal tissue research by substituting sound bites for facts. The facts are that fetal tissue research is subject to Federal, State and even local regulation. It is subject to informed consent. It is subject to audit by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. Violations of Federal protections are subject to criminal penalties.

Congress and the American public have already decided that fetal tissue research is both legal and ethical. It is crucial to women's health and reproductive research. It is enormously promising for Parkinson's disease, multiple sclerosis, Alzheimer's disease, Tay-Sachs disease and juvenile diabetes. It could help cure victims of stroke and brain cancer. We should always do appropriate oversight. But a resolution that talks about "baby body parts" is not the way to do it. This resolution uses rhetoric to conceal its attack on the hopes of Americans with Alzheimer's and MS. It resorts to linguistic tricks to mask its impact on American mothers seeking cures to genetic birth defects—mothers who could have healthier babies as a result of fetal tissue research.

I am very disappointed in the House. In the waning days of this Congress, we should be enacting the Patients Bill of Rights. We should be working on the Medicare drug benefit. But instead, once again, the House Republican leadership is kow-towing to its pro-life right-wing with misleading and sensationalist rhetoric.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 350.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRING IN SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2280, VETERANS BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999, WITH AMENDMENTS

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 368) providing for the concurrence by the House with amendments in the amendment of the Senate to H.R. 2280.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 368

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 2280, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to have concurred in the Senate amendment with the following amendments:

(1) Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of such veterans.".

(2) In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the Senate, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Veterans' Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 1999".

(b) REFERENCES TO TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 2. DISABILITY COMPENSATION.

(a) INCREASE IN RATES.—Section 1114 is amended—

(1) by striking "$95" in subsection (a) and inserting "$98";

(2) by striking "$182" in subsection (b) and inserting "$188";

(3) by striking "$279" in subsection (c) and inserting "$288";

(4) by striking "$399" in subsection (d) and inserting "$413";

(5) by striking "$569" in subsection (e) and inserting "$589";

(6) by striking "$717" in subsection (f) and inserting "$743";

(7) by striking "$905" in subsection (g) and inserting "$937";

(8) by striking "$1,049" in subsection (h) and inserting "$1,087";

(9) by striking "$1,181" in subsection (i) and inserting "$1,224";

(10) by striking "$1,964" in subsection (j) and inserting "$2,036";

(11) in subsection (k)—

(A) by striking "$75" both places it appears and inserting "$76"; and

(B) by striking "$2,443" and "$3,426" and inserting "$2,533" and "$3,553", respectively;

(12) by striking "$2,443" in subsection (l) and inserting "$2,533";

(13) by striking "$2,694" in subsection (m) and inserting "$2,794";

(14) by striking "$3,066" in subsection (n) and inserting "$3,179";

(15) by striking "$3,426" each place it appears in subsections (o) and (p) and inserting "$3,553";

(16) by striking "$1,471" and "$2,190" in subsection (r) and inserting "$1,525" and "$2,271", respectively; and

(17) by striking "$2,199" in subsection (s) and inserting "$2,280".

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may authorize administratively, consistent with the increases authorized by this section, the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85–857 who are not in receipt of compensation payable pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.

Section 1115(1) is amended—

(1) by striking "$114" in clause (A) and inserting "$117";

(2) by striking "$195" and "$60" in clause (B) and inserting "$201" and "$61", respectively;

(3) by striking "$78" and "$60" in clause (C) and inserting "$80" and "$61", respectively;

(4) by striking "$92" in clause (D) and inserting "$95";

(5) by striking "$215" in clause (E) and inserting "$222"; and

(6) by striking "$180" in clause (F) and inserting "$186".

SEC. 4. CLOTHING ALLOWANCE FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS.

Section 1162 is amended by striking "$528" and inserting "$546".

SEC. 5. DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES.

(a) NEW LAW RATES.—Section 1311(a) is amended—

(1) by striking "$850" in paragraph (1) and inserting "$881"; and

(2) by striking "$185" in paragraph (2) and inserting "$191".

(b) OLD LAW RATES.—The table in section 1311(a)(3) is amended to read as follows:

"Pay grade rate	Monthly
E–1	$881
E–2	881
E–3	881
E–4	881
E–5	881
E–6	881
E–7	911
E–8	962
E–9	[1]1,003
W–1	930
W–2	968
W–3	997
W–4	1,054
O–1	930
O–2	962
O–3	1,028
O–4	1,087
O–5	1,198
O–6	1,349
O–7	1,458
O–8	1,598
O–9	1,712