



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 13, 2000

No. 90

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 13, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD A. PEASE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Father Peter M. Colapietro, Holy Cross Church, New York, New York, offered the following prayer:

Blessed are You, Lord God, Creator of all that was. Through You we live and move and have our being. All that we are and all that we will ever be as a Nation comes from Your goodness.

You have given this body the task of serving this Nation through justice and good law.

Let the light of Your divine wisdom direct the deliberations of all those gathered here and may that same light shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government.

May they all seek to preserve peace, promote world and national happiness and continue to bring us the blessings of liberty and equality.

We ask for this through Your Holy Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FILNER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

FATHER PETER COLAPIETRO

(Mr. SWEENEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to welcome Father Peter Colapietro, Pastor of the Holy Cross Church located in New York City's Hell's Kitchen.

Mr. Speaker, Father Peter has participated in a number of capacities, including having been with Holy Cross Church for the past 8 years.

Father Peter Colapietro is a very accomplished man, and I would like to just highlight a few of those accomplishments for Members of the House.

In 1992, he was appointed as member of the Mayor Citizens' Committee for Midtown. He has served in several capacities as chaplain in New York City departments and continues to serve a wide variety of our citizens, including serving as chaplain these days in the Department of Sanitation.

In addition, Father Colapietro was the president of the Washingtonville Neighborhood Association, chairman and cofounder of the Washingtonville Housing Partners, Incorporated, and a board member of both the Narcotics Guidance Council and Larchmont Mamaroneck Student Aid Fund.

Father Peter is a friend, a fellow New Yorker, a priest of the street, a priest

of the people and comfortable in any situation, as we can tell today. It has been a pleasure to have him here, and I welcome his participation today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain other 1-minute requests at the conclusion of business today.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on H.R. 4811.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 546 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. 4811.

□ 0905

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. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5961

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on the legislative day of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the amendment by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) had been disposed of, and the bill was open for amendment from page 13, line 10, through page 13, line 15.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSITION INITIATIVES

For necessary expenses for international disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction assistance pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$40,000,000, to remain available until expended, to support transition to democracy and to long-term development of countries in crisis: *Provided*, That such support may include assistance to develop, strengthen, or preserve democratic institutions and processes, revitalize basic infrastructure, and foster the peaceful resolution of conflict: *Provided further*, That the United States Agency for International Development shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations at least 5 days prior to beginning a program of assistance.

MICRO AND SMALL ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees, \$1,500,000, as authorized by section 108 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided*, That such costs shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That guarantees of loans made under this heading in support of microenterprise activities may guarantee up to 70 percent of the principal amount of any such loans notwithstanding section 108 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out programs under this heading, \$500,000, all of which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 2002.

DEVELOPMENT CREDIT PROGRAM ACCOUNT
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees, \$1,500,000, as authorized by section 635 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided*, That such funds shall be made available only for urban and environmental programs: *Provided further*, That for the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees, up to \$2,000,000 of funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Development Assistance", may be transferred to and merged with funds appropriated under this heading to be made available for the purposes of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That such costs shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 107A(d) (relating to general provisions applicable to the Development Credit Authority) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as contained in section 306 of H.R. 1486 as reported by the House Committee on International Relations on May 9, 1997, shall be applicable to direct loans and loan guarantees provided under this heading. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out credit programs administered by the Agency for International Development, \$6,495,000, all of which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development: *Provided*

further, That funds appropriated under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 2002.

PAYMENT TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE
RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the "Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund", as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1980, \$44,489,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, \$509,000,000: *Provided*, That, none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to finance the construction (including architect and engineering services), purchase, or long term lease of offices for use by the Agency for International Development, unless the Administrator has identified such proposed construction (including architect and engineering services), purchase, or long term lease of offices in a report submitted to the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days prior to the obligation of these funds for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the previous proviso shall not apply where the total cost of construction (including architect and engineering services), purchase, or long term lease of offices does not exceed \$1,000,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667, \$27,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, which sum shall be available for the Office of the Inspector General of the Agency for International Development.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II, \$2,208,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed \$840,000,000 shall be available only for Israel, which sum shall be available on a grant basis as a cash transfer and shall be disbursed within 30 days of the enactment of this Act or by October 31, 2000, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$695,000,000 shall be available only for Egypt, which sum shall be provided on a grant basis, and of which sum cash transfer assistance shall be provided with the understanding that Egypt will undertake significant economic reforms which are additional to those which were undertaken in previous fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in exercising the authority to provide cash transfer assistance for Israel, the President shall ensure that the level of such assistance does not cause an adverse impact on the total level of nonmilitary exports from the United States to such country and that Israel enters into a side letter agreement at least equivalent to the fiscal year 1999 agreement: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading not less than \$12,000,000 should be made available for assistance for Mongolia: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated for regional or global programs, except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. FILNER

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 39 offered by Mr. FILNER:

In title II of the bill under the heading "OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND", add at the end before the period the following: "": *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$3,500,000 shall be made available for programs carried out by the Kurdish Human Rights Watch for the Kurdistan region of Iraq".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment earmarks crucial funding in this bill for the Kurdish Human Rights Watch, a nonpolitical, nonprofit Kurdish-American service organization. For a decade and a half, this group has been working in Northern Iraq providing critical assistance to victims of torture and ethnic cleansing, rebuilding villages, teaching grassroots democracy building, monitoring human rights, and providing training on civil society.

Here is what the Kurdish Human Rights Watch does everyday. First, through community-based programs, it supports the urgent needs of Anfal victims, the internally displaced refugees and other victims of ethnic cleansing, torture and human rights abuses in Northern Iraq. A special emphasis is placed on helping women cope with grief of family loss and income. Outreach workers help each family conduct an assessment of their family's health and prevention plans. Counseling is provided alongside concentrated extensive case management for problems such as generating income, family reunification, and other survival issues.

Secondly, they assist in the rehabilitation and reconstruction of the destroyed infrastructure by years and years of war. The villagers most affected were women, children, and the elderly. With this aid, new wells will be drilled and pipes for drinking water supplied to the villages. The organization's engineers will help in the reconstruction of roads and houses.

Lastly, the Kurdish Human Rights Watch provides training focusing on coalition building and the importance of human rights, including civil society skills taught in workshops and community building experiences.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will provide critical funding for an organization that enables individuals, families, and communities to develop healthy lives and to become economically self-sufficient.

With these funds, Kurdish Human Rights Watch will develop the building

blocks for a free Iraq, a free Kurdish people and a nation where human rights and freedom are respected and guaranteed to all.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I just want to switch microphones so I can be closer to the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN). I ask the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), I beg the gentleman, I entreat the gentleman not to insist on his point of order. This is a technicality by our rules.

There are lots of precedents for this kind of earmark and amendment in the appropriations bills. I would hope that the suffering, the killing of a people in a very shaky part of the world would be aided by this Congress at this moment, and I ask the gentleman not to insist on his point of order.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, because it provides an appropriation for an unauthorized earmark and, therefore, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, just briefly, again, the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) is insisting on a technical rule of the House. The gentleman knows and we all know that these rules are waived in dozens and dozens, if not hundreds of occasions throughout our appropriations bills. We are trying to help a suffering people here. I would just hope the gentleman would not insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. PELOSI. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I say to the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), I understand the technicality of the point of order. I just wondered if the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) had any objection substantively or if it was just on the point of order.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), do I have any objection? Do I have any opposition to the substance did the gentlewoman say? No, I do not think so. I think that we cannot respond to everyone's request to violate the rules of the House. There have been ample opportunity for him to appear before our committee and for the committee to make these decisions.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise Members that it is inappropriate to yield when addressing the Chair on a point of order.

Does the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) wish to be heard further on the point of order?

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has spoken to that point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment proposes to earmark and require expenditure of not less than a certain level of funds in the bill. Under clause 2 of rule XXI, such an earmarking and establishment of a spending floor must be specifically authorized by law. The Chair has not been apprised of an authorization in law to support the proposed appropriation; accordingly, the point of order is sustained.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR IRELAND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$25,000,000, which shall be available for the United States contribution to the International Fund for Ireland and shall be made available in accordance with the provisions of the Anglo-Irish Agreement Support Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-415): *Provided*, That such amount shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 2002.

ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES

(a) For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989, \$535,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002, which shall be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for assistance and for related programs for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading not less than \$5,000,000 should be made available for assistance for the Baltic States: *Provided further*, That funds made available for assistance for Kosovo from funds appropriated under this heading and under the headings "Economic Support Fund" and "International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement" shall not exceed 15 percent of the total resources pledged by all donors for calendar year 2001 for assistance for Kosovo as of January 1, 2001, and shall not exceed \$150,000,000: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this Act for assistance for Kosovo shall be made available for large scale physical infrastructure reconstruction.

(b) Funds appropriated under this heading or in prior appropriations Acts that are or have been made available for an Enterprise Fund may be deposited by such Fund in interest-bearing accounts prior to the Fund's disbursement of such funds for program purposes. The Fund may retain for such program purposes any interest earned on such deposits without returning such interest to the Treasury of the United States and without further appropriation by the Congress. Funds made available for Enterprise Funds shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities.

(c) Funds appropriated under this heading shall be considered to be economic assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of

1961 for purposes of making available the administrative authorities contained in that Act for the use of economic assistance.

(d) None of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for new housing construction or repair or reconstruction of existing housing in Bosnia and Herzegovina unless directly related to the efforts of United States troops to promote peace in said country.

(e) With regard to funds appropriated under this heading for the economic revitalization program in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and local currencies generated by such funds (including the conversion of funds appropriated under this heading into currency used by Bosnia and Herzegovina as local currency and local currency returned or repaid under such program) the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall provide written approval for grants and loans prior to the obligation and expenditure of funds for such purposes, and prior to the use of funds that have been returned or repaid to any lending facility or grantee.

(f) The provisions of section 532 of this Act shall apply to funds made available under subsection (e) and to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided*, That notwithstanding this subsection and subsection (e), and notwithstanding section 532 of this Act, local currencies generated by, or converted from, funds appropriated by this Act and by previous appropriations Acts and made available for the economic revitalization program in Bosnia may be used in Eastern Europe and the Baltic States to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989: *Provided further*, That the use of such local currencies shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(g) The President is authorized to withhold funds appropriated under this heading made available for economic revitalization programs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, if he determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina has not complied with article III of annex 1-A of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina concerning the withdrawal of foreign forces, and that intelligence cooperation on training, investigations, and related activities between Iranian officials and Bosnian officials has not been terminated.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

(a) For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapters 11 and 12 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the FREEDOM Support Act, for assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union and for related programs, \$740,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That the provisions of such chapters shall apply to funds appropriated by this paragraph: *Provided further*, That such sums as may be necessary may be transferred to the Export-Import Bank of the United States for the cost of any financing under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 for activities for the Independent States: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available for the Southern Caucasus region, 15 percent should be used for confidence-building measures and other activities in furtherance of the peaceful resolution of the regional conflicts, especially those in the vicinity of Abkhazia and Nagorno-Karabagh.

(b) Of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than 12.5 percent should be made available for assistance for Georgia.

(c) Of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than 12.5 percent should be made available for assistance for Armenia.

(d) Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act shall not apply to—

(1) activities to support democracy or assistance under title V of the FREEDOM Support Act and section 1424 of Public Law 104-201;

(2) any assistance provided by the Trade and Development Agency under section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2421);

(3) any activity carried out by a member of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service while acting within his or her official capacity;

(4) any insurance, reinsurance, guarantee, or other assistance provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2191 et seq.);

(5) any financing provided under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; or

(6) humanitarian assistance.

(e) Not more than 25 percent of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for assistance for any country in the region. Activities authorized under title V (nonproliferation and disarmament programs and activities) of the FREEDOM Support Act shall not be counted against the 25 percent limitation.

(f)(1) Of the funds appropriated under this heading that are allocated for assistance for the Government of the Russian Federation, 50 percent shall be withheld from obligation until the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of the Russian Federation has terminated implementation of arrangements to provide Iran with technical expertise, training, technology, or equipment necessary to develop a nuclear reactor, related nuclear research facilities or programs, or ballistic missile capability.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(A) assistance to combat infectious diseases and child survival activities; and

(B) activities authorized under title V (Nonproliferation and Disarmament Programs and Activities) of the FREEDOM Support Act.

(g) None of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for assistance for the Government of the Russian Federation until the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the Russian Federation is in compliance with article V of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe regarding forces deployed in the flank zone in and around Chechnya.

(h) Of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than \$45,000,000 should be made available, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for assistance for child survival, environmental health, and to combat infectious diseases, and for related activities.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY

PEACE CORPS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), \$258,000,000, including the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for administrative purposes for use outside of the United States: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to pay for abortions: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 2002.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$305,000,000, to remain available until

expended: *Provided*, That any funds made available under this heading for anti-crime programs and activities shall be made available subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2001, the Department of State may also use the authority of section 608 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, without regard to its restrictions, to receive excess property from an agency of the United States Government for the purpose of providing it to a foreign country under chapter 8 of part I of that Act subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Secretary of State to provide, as authorized by law, contributions to the International Committee of the Red Cross, assistance to refugees, including contributions to the International Organization for Migration and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and other activities to meet refugee and migration needs; salaries and expenses of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1980; allowances as authorized by sections 5921 through 5925 of title 5, United States Code; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, \$645,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than \$14,852,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ASSISTANCE FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 2(c) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended (22 U.S.C. 260(c)), \$12,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the funds made available under this heading are appropriated notwithstanding the provisions contained in section 2(c)(2) of the Act which would limit the amount of funds which could be appropriated for this purpose.

NONPROLIFERATION, ANTI-TERRORISM, DEMINING AND RELATED PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses for nonproliferation, anti-terrorism and related programs and activities, \$241,600,000, to carry out the provisions of chapter 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for anti-terrorism assistance, section 504 of the FREEDOM Support Act for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund, section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for demining activities, the clearance of unexploded ordnance, and related activities, notwithstanding any other provision of law, including activities implemented through nongovernmental and international organizations, section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for a voluntary contribution to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and a voluntary contribution to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO), and for a United States contribution to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Preparatory Commission: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State shall inform the Committees on Appropriations at least 20 days prior to the obligation of funds for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Preparatory Commission: *Provided further*, That of this amount not to exceed \$15,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be made available for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to promote bilateral and multilateral activities relating to nonproliferation and disarmament: *Provided further*, That such funds

may also be used for such countries other than the Independent States of the former Soviet Union and international organizations when it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for the International Atomic Energy Agency only if the Secretary of State determines (and so reports to the Congress) that Israel is not being denied its right to participate in the activities of that Agency.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 129 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to international affairs technical assistance activities), \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, which shall be available notwithstanding any other provision of law.

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying loans and loan guarantees, as the President may determine, for which funds have been appropriated or otherwise made available for programs within the International Affairs Budget Function 150, including the cost of selling, reducing, or canceling amounts owed to the United States as a result of concessional loans made to eligible countries, pursuant to parts IV and V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and of modifying concessional credit agreements with least developed countries, as authorized under section 411 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and concessional loans, guarantees and credit agreements, as authorized under section 572 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100-461), \$82,400,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of this amount, not less than \$13,000,000 shall be made available to carry out the provisions of part V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this heading in this Act or under prior appropriations acts for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs may be used by the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) Trust Fund administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development amounts for the benefit of countries that are eligible for debt reduction pursuant to title V of H.R. 3425 as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(5) of Public Law 106-113: *Provided further*, That amounts paid to the HIPC Trust Fund may be used only to fund debt reduction under the enhanced HIPC initiative by—

- (1) the Inter-American Development Bank;
- (2) the African Development Bank; and
- (3) the Central American Bank for Economic Integration:

Provided further, That funds may not be paid to the HIPC Trust Fund for the benefit of any country that is credibly reported to be engaged in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights or in military or civil conflict that undermines its ability to develop and implement measures to alleviate poverty and to devote adequate human and financial resources to that end: *Provided further*, That 15 days prior to any agreement by the United States to make payments to the HIPC Trust Fund for the benefit of any country other than Bolivia and Mozambique, the Secretary

of the Treasury shall submit a reprogramming request under the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That prior to the payment of any amount to the HIPC Trust Fund to fund debt reduction by an international financial institution, the Secretary of the Treasury shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations, Banking and Financial Services, and International Relations of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Appropriations, Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, and Foreign Relations of the Senate—

(1) a written commitment by the institution that it will make no new market-rate loans to the HIPC member country beneficiary for a period of 30 months and no new concessional loans to the HIPC member country for a period of 9 months; and

(2) full documentation of any commitment by the HIPC member country to redirect its domestic budgetary resources from international debt repayments to private or public programs to alleviate poverty and promote economic growth that are additional to those previously available for such purposes prior to participation in the enhanced HIPC Initiative:

Provided further, That any limitation of subsection (e) of section 411 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 shall not apply to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That the authority provided by section 572 of Public Law 100-461 may be exercised only with respect to countries that are eligible to borrow from the International Development Association, but not from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, commonly referred to as "IDA-only" countries.

TITLE III—MILITARY ASSISTANCE
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND
TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 541 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$52,500,000, of which up to \$1,000,000 may remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the civilian personnel for whom military education and training may be provided under this heading may include civilians who are not members of a government whose participation would contribute to improved civil-military relations, civilian control of the military, or respect for human rights: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading for grant financed military education and training for Indonesia and Guatemala may only be available for expanded international military education and training and funds made available for Indonesia may only be provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to support grant financed military education and training at the School of the Americas unless the Secretary of Defense certifies that the instruction and training provided by the School of the Americas is fully consistent with training and doctrine, particularly with respect to the observance of human rights, provided by the Department of Defense to United States military students at Department of Defense institutions whose primary purpose is to train United States military personnel: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations, no later than January 15, 2001, a report detailing the training activities of the School of the Americas and a general assessment regarding the performance of its grad-

uates during 1998 and 1999: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to support grant financed military education and training at the School of the Americas unless the Secretary of State, without delegation, certifies that the instruction and training provided by the School of the Americas is consistent with United States foreign policy objectives and helps support the observance of human rights in Latin America.

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

For expenses necessary for grants to enable the President to carry out the provisions of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, \$3,510,000,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed \$1,980,000,000 shall be available for grants only for Israel, and not to exceed \$1,300,000,000 shall be made available for grants only for Egypt: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated by this paragraph for Israel shall be disbursed within 30 days of the enactment of this Act or by October 31, 2000, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That it is the sense of Congress that it is very disturbed by reports that Israel is preparing to provide China with an airborne radar system that could threaten both the forces of democratic Taiwan and the United States in the region surrounding the Taiwan Strait. The Congress urges Israel to terminate the existing contract to sell an airborne radar system to the People's Republic of China: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the Government of Israel requests that funds be used for such purposes, grants made available for Israel by this paragraph shall, as agreed by Israel and the United States, be available for advanced weapons systems, of which not less than \$520,000,000 should be available for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development: *Provided further*, That Foreign Military Financing Program funds estimated to be outlayed for Egypt during fiscal year 2001 shall be disbursed within 30 days of enactment of this Act or by October 31, 2000, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be nonrepayable notwithstanding any requirement in section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this paragraph shall be obligated upon apportionment in accordance with paragraph (5)(C) of title 31, United States Code, section 1501(a).

None of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to finance the procurement of defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under the Arms Export Control Act unless the foreign country proposing to make such procurements has first signed an agreement with the United States Government specifying the conditions under which such procurements may be financed with such funds: *Provided*, That all country and funding level increases in allocations shall be submitted through the regular notification procedures of section 515 of this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for assistance for Sudan and Liberia: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for demining, the clearance of unexploded ordnance, and related activities, and may include activities implemented through non-governmental and international organizations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for assistance for Guatemala: *Provided further*, That only those countries for which assistance was justified for the

"Foreign Military Sales Financing Program" in the fiscal year 1989 congressional presentation for security assistance programs may utilize funds made available under this heading for procurement of defense articles, defense services or design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for defense articles and services: *Provided further*, That not more than \$30,495,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated for necessary expenses, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only for use outside of the United States, for the general costs of administering military assistance and sales: *Provided further*, That not more than \$340,000,000 of funds realized pursuant to section 21(e)(1)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act may be obligated for expenses incurred by the Department of Defense during fiscal year 2001 pursuant to section 43(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, except that this limitation may be exceeded only through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading shall be available for any non-NATO country participating in the Partnership for Peace Program except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$117,900,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated or expended except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

TITLE IV—MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC
ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

For the United States contribution for the Global Environment Facility, \$35,800,000, to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as trustee for the Global Environment Facility, by the Secretary of the Treasury, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$576,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall: (1) seek to ensure to the maximum extent possible that for countries eligible for debt reduction under the enhanced Heavily Indebted Poor Country (HIPC) Initiative that have reached the completion point, the terms of new assistance by the International Development Association shall be on grant terms; and (2) submit a report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the Committees on Appropriations no later than June 30, 2001, on the progress achieved in achieving the objective in paragraph (1): *Provided further*, That \$10,000,000 shall be withheld from obligation until Congress is in receipt of said report: *Provided further*, That in negotiating United States participation in the next replenishment of the International Development Association, the Secretary of the Treasury shall accord high priority to providing the International Development Association with the policy flexibility to provide new grant assistance to

countries eligible for debt reduction under the enhanced HIPC Initiative.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE MULTILATERAL
INVESTMENT GUARANTEE AGENCY

For payment to the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$4,900,000, for the United States paid-in share of the increase in capital stock, to remain available until expended.

□ 0915

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to reach ahead in order to consider this amendment en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 19 offered by Mr. ROYCE:

H.R. 4811

Page 39, strike line 19 and all that follows through line 6 on page 40.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California to consider the amendment at this point?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. ROYCE. Well, let me proceed, Mr. Chairman. This amendment goes to the issue—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Does the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) have another amendment to offer to this section of the bill?

Mr. ROYCE. I have the amendment printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. An objection was heard to the consideration of this amendment because of the provision that reaches ahead to another portion of the bill.

If the gentleman does not have another amendment to this section of the bill, the Clerk will continue to read.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the amendment of the gentleman from California, which is designated to strike \$4.9 million from the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency is obviously critical to the next amendment because it stands fundamentally as the offset of the next amendment that I am offering to be considered.

So I am hoping that we are able to determine the status of the Royce amendment because it does have implications for subsequent amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) sought to offer required unanimous consent to be offered because it amended more than one paragraph of the bill. An objection was heard to consideration of that amendment, therefore, the amendment en

bloc by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is not in order in its preprinted form.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, my understanding under the unanimous consent request last night is that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) was entitled, under the agreement, to speak on his amendment for 10 minutes and that this was the appropriate location for that amendment and the discussion this morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would reply to the gentleman from Illinois that the time agreements agreed to under the order of the House apply only if the amendment is otherwise in order. There were no waivers of other provisions that may apply that prevent an amendment from being in order, and such is the case here with the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) to reconsider his point of order. I know that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is in the unanimous consent request of last night as is the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

I think that it is not in violation of the spirit of the unanimous consent request as I see it, and if it is in the view of the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), I would hope that he would reconsider because we worked very late into the night, as he knows. We are trying to accommodate Members' schedules so that we can leave here today in a timely fashion. I would hope not to cast any doubt on the credibility of the unanimous consent request when the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) are clearly listed among those amendments that would be in order.

So I, as the ranking member on the committee, would hope that the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) would remove his objection to the unanimous consent request that is being posed here.

Perhaps the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) could repeat his request to give the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) another chance to have a clearer view of what it is.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding to me. I appreciate her efforts here.

Again, my request was to reach ahead in order to present my amendment en bloc.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, as the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) understands, the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is offset from MIGA, which is contingent upon the

amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) being heard.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentlewoman from California knows, we have worked until 2 o'clock this morning, but we have been working for 6 months on this bill. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), as other Members of Congress, has had ample opportunity to contact us and discuss his needs. We do not think we have heard from him.

If we start giving unanimous consent requests every Johnny-come-lately amendment that violates the rules we have adopted, we will be here forever. So I am trying to expedite the proceedings here in the House.

I still object.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, is it the understanding of the gentleman from Alabama that the amendment is printed in the RECORD and is in the unanimous consent, but, just for point of clarification, would the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) be able to propose his amendment regarding the African Development Bank with the offset from MIGA?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. No, Mr. Chairman, he would not, because his amendment is really an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE). The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) is taking about \$5 million out of the bill. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) is putting it back in. So, no, his amendment, I do not think, would be appropriate because there was no removal of the money he seeks to get.

Ms. PELOSI. But nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, when we have had offsets, they have been self-contained in one amendment; that is to say, if the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) wanted to increase the funding at the African Development Bank as he does, and he has an offset at MIGA.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will further yield, I think he has already tried. But, yes, I think the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), if his amendment is in order, then we will debate his amendment. But, no, amendments that are not made in order and require unanimous consent today I do not think, out of deference to our colleagues who we promised we would expeditiously get through this thing out of deference to the gentlewoman and those of us who stayed here last night and worked until 2 o'clock to try to accomplish this, if we start having unanimous consent requests, it is going to delay the process until Saturday. So I am going to object.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to this section of the bill, the Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL

The United States Governor of the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency may subscribe without fiscal year limitation for the callable capital portion of the United States share of such capital stock in an amount not to exceed \$24,500,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTER-AMERICAN INVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Inter-American Investment Corporation, by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$8,000,000, for the United States share of the increase in subscriptions to capital stock, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND

For payment to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States contribution to the fund, \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to the increase in resources of the Asian Development Fund, as authorized by the Asian Development Bank Act, as amended, \$72,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the African Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$3,100,000, for the United States paid-in share of the increase in capital stock, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 43 offered by Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

Under the heading "CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK," on page 41, line 3, strike "\$3,100,000" and insert "\$6,100,000".

On page 41, line 11, strike "\$49,574,000" and insert "\$95,983,000".

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes on the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. My amendment increases funding for the African Development Bank by \$3 million to a total of \$6.1 million, the original request by the administration and the amount approved by the Senate.

I am not completely sure about the reasons that the House continues to

short fund the African Development Bank, but let me tell my colleagues why I think the House should support my amendment.

Five years ago, the African Development Bank was in serious trouble. Management was in disarray, and they had exhibited poor financials. What a difference 5 years has made, however. Since then, the United States has led top-to-bottom reform with new management, a total rewrite of the Charter, scrubbed balance sheets and restructuring of capital and voting shares. Steady and determined United States engagement in the institution, including erasing our arrears, has gained us the leading voice in the leading African Development Institution.

In recent years, the primary United States objective with the African Development Bank has been to support and promote fundamental management and operational reforms. Specific reforms achieved include a complete reorganization with significant staff cuts, including the replacement of 70 percent of its managers. Senior officials, including board members, are now subject to term limits, and the private sector development unit has been upgraded. Independent units for Risk Management, Financial Control, Procurement, and Environment were created and staffed while major progress has been made and achieved in reforming the bank's procurement system.

The proportion of total arrears to outstanding loans has been significantly reduced through a stronger arrears clearance policy, and a disbursement of new bank resources to the African Development Bank is tied to reform implementation. On top of all of this, an information disclosure policy that was developed in partnership with the NGOs is now in place. What a change in just 5 years.

To ensure local interest as well as our own national interest, new protective procedures are in place. There is now increased nonregional ownership of the bank to 40 percent, with new voting rules requiring a 70 percent supermajority on major issues. These changes guarantee that key actions can be blocked and no substantive decision can be taken without substantial nonregional support.

Financial rating. These changes have resonated throughout the financing and bond rating community. All recent evaluations of the AfDB by private rating agencies, Moody's, Standard & Poors, Fitch/IBCA, acknowledge that the institution has been through an in-depth reform following the management shuffle implemented by President Kabbaj in 1995. President Kabbaj has implemented major reforms affecting nearly all areas of the bank: credit policy, asset-liability management, development of lending activities.

As a result of these reforms, the credit rating agencies have raised the AfDB's rating for its highly rated nonregional shareholders.

To quote the Fitch/IBCA rating agency, "These reforms help restore the

confidence of the shareholders, notably in non-African countries which . . . now attach increasing importance to the Bank's capacity to remain economically viable."

Another quote states, "Moody's rates the long-term debt of African Development Bank AAA . . . At these levels, the AfDB is rated at the top of Moody's rating scale. . . ."

The United States has a major stake in the successful development in Africa and is now engaged more intensively than ever. The African Development Bank, through hard loan operations and concessional financing, is uniquely positioned to help advance our interests and economic development in the region. United States investment in the Bank produces significant leverage: historically for every one United States dollar paid in capital, the bank has loaned about \$120. What an amazing return.

Steady and determined United States engagement in this institution, Mr. Chairman, including erasing our arrears, has gained us the leading voice in leading the African development institution. In light of solid progress on this wide-ranging reform agenda, the United States has agreed to participate in the 8-year, \$41 million, 5th General Capital Increase for the Bank authorized by Congress in fiscal year 2000.

We have seen that active United States engagement has produced sweeping reforms in Bank operations to strengthen its balance sheet, internal governance, and effectiveness. At a time when an effective United States role in Africa has never been more important, our support of the African Development Bank is a modest, but essential, investment in our future. We need to deliver upon our commitments.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, continuing to reserve my point of order, I just would remind the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) that, at his request, if he will recall, there was zero in the bill for the African Development Bank, and out of deference to the gentleman from Illinois, because he is a distinguished member of our subcommittee, I think we have been most generous. As I have expressed to the gentleman from Illinois, the bill now includes the \$3.1 million, which made a significant step toward protecting the African Development Bank. But that is as much as we can do.

□ 0930

In any event, we have already spent all of the money that has been allocated. There is no more money available. So the gentleman's amendment would be out of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it is in violation of section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations filed a suballocation of budget totals for fiscal year 2001 on July 12, 2000, House Report 106-729.

This amendment would provide new budget authority in excess of the subcommittee allocation made under section 302(b) and is not permitted under section 302(b) of the act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I would, Mr. Chairman.

I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman would not object to the gentleman from California's unanimous consent request, because that unanimous consent request would have provided the necessary offset for my amendment that would have made my amendment in compliance with the gentleman's stated prior reasons for his objections.

Because the gentleman has objected, I have no choice but to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) would increase the level of new discretionary budget authority in the bill, in breach of the applicable allocation of such authority, as estimated by the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 312 of the Budget Act and, as such, the amendment violates section 302(f) of the Budget Act.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the African Development Bank may subscribe without fiscal year limitation for the callable capital portion of the United States share of such capital stock in an amount not to exceed \$49,574,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to the increase in resources of the African Development Fund, \$72,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development by the Secretary of the Treasury, \$35,778,717, for the United States share of the paid-in portion of the increase in capital stock, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of such capital stock in an amount not to exceed \$123,237,803.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to increase the resources of the International Fund for Agricultural Development, \$5,000,000, to remain available until expended.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and of section 2 of the United Nations Environment Program Participation Act of 1973, \$183,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for the United Nations Fund for Science and Technology: *Provided further*, That not less than \$5,000,000 should be made available to the World Food Program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO) or the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS
OBLIGATIONS DURING LAST MONTH OF AVAILABILITY

SEC. 501. Except for the appropriations entitled "International Disaster Assistance", and "United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund", not more than 15 percent of any appropriation item made available by this Act shall be obligated during the last month of availability.

PROHIBITION OF BILATERAL FUNDING FOR INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 502. Notwithstanding section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, none of the funds contained in title II of this Act may be used to carry out the provisions of section 209(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by title II of this Act may be transferred by the Agency for International Development directly to an international financial institution (as defined in section 533 of this Act) for the purpose of repaying a foreign country's loan obligations to such institution.

LIMITATION ON RESIDENCE EXPENSES

SEC. 503. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed \$126,500 shall be for official residence expenses of the Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That appropriate steps shall be taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, United States-owned foreign currencies are utilized in lieu of dollars.

LIMITATION ON EXPENSES

SEC. 504. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed \$5,000 shall be for entertainment expenses of the Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year.

LIMITATION ON REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

SEC. 505. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed \$95,000 shall be available for representation allowances for the Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That appropriate steps shall be taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, United States-owned foreign currencies are utilized in lieu of dollars: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act for general costs of administering military assistance and sales under the heading "Foreign Military Financing Program", not to exceed \$2,000 shall be available for entertainment expenses and not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for representation allowances: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "International Military Education and Training", not to exceed \$50,000 shall be available for entertainment allowances: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act for the Inter-American Foundation, not to exceed \$2,000

shall be available for entertainment and representation allowances: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act for the Peace Corps, not to exceed a total of \$4,000 shall be available for entertainment expenses: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Trade and Development Agency", not to exceed \$2,000 shall be available for representation and entertainment allowances.

PROHIBITION ON FINANCING NUCLEAR GOODS

SEC. 506. None of the funds appropriated or made available (other than funds for "Non-proliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs") pursuant to this Act, for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used, except for purposes of nuclear safety, to finance the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology.

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SEC. 507. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance or reparations to Cuba, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Iran, Sudan, or Syria: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, the prohibition on obligations or expenditures shall include direct loans, credits, insurance and guarantees of the Export-Import Bank or its agents.

MILITARY COUPS

SEC. 508. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance to any country whose duly elected head of government is deposed by decree or military coup: *Provided*, That assistance may be resumed to such country if the President determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that subsequent to the termination of assistance a democratically elected government has taken office.

TRANSFERS BETWEEN ACCOUNTS

SEC. 509. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated under an appropriation account to which they were not appropriated, except for transfers specifically provided for in this Act, unless the President, prior to the exercise of any authority contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to transfer funds, consults with and provides a written policy justification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

DEOBLIGATION/REOBLIGATION AUTHORITY

SEC. 510. Obligated balances of funds appropriated to carry out section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act as of the end of the fiscal year immediately preceding the current fiscal year are, if deobligated, hereby continued available during the current fiscal year for the same purpose under any authority applicable to such appropriations under this Act: *Provided*, That the authority of this subsection may not be used in fiscal year 2001.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

SEC. 511. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation after the expiration of the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided in this Act: *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the purposes of chapters 1, 8, 11, and 12 of part I, section 667, and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and funds provided under the heading "Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States", shall remain available until expended if such funds are initially obligated before the expiration of their respective periods of availability contained in this Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any funds made available for the purposes of chapter 1 of

part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which are allocated or obligated for cash disbursements in order to address balance of payments or economic policy reform objectives, shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, effective upon enactment into law of this Act, the final proviso under the heading "Foreign Military Financing Program" contained in title VI of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(2) of Public Law 106-113) shall be null and void: *Provided further*, That the report required by section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall designate for each country, to the extent known at the time of submission of such report, those funds allocated for cash disbursement for balance of payment and economic policy reform purposes.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES IN DEFAULT

SEC. 512. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to furnish assistance to any country which is in default during a period in excess of one calendar year in payment to the United States of principal or interest on any loan made to the government of such country by the United States pursuant to a program for which funds are appropriated under this Act: *Provided*, That this section and section 620(q) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to funds made available for any narcotics-related assistance for Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or the Arms Export Control Act.

COMMERCE AND TRADE

SEC. 513. (a) None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for direct assistance and none of the funds otherwise made available pursuant to this Act to the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall be obligated or expended to finance any loan, any assistance or any other financial commitments for establishing or expanding production of any commodity for export by any country other than the United States, if the commodity is likely to be in surplus on world markets at the time the resulting productive capacity is expected to become operative and if the assistance will cause substantial injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity: *Provided*, That such prohibition shall not apply to the Export-Import Bank if in the judgment of its Board of Directors the benefits to industry and employment in the United States are likely to outweigh the injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity, and the Chairman of the Board so notifies the Committees on Appropriations.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be available for any testing or breeding feasibility study, variety improvement or introduction, consultancy, publication, conference, or training in connection with the growth or production in a foreign country of an agricultural commodity for export which would compete with a similar commodity grown or produced in the United States: *Provided*, That this subsection shall not prohibit—

(1) activities designed to increase food security in developing countries where such activities will not have a significant impact in the export of agricultural commodities of the United States; or

(2) research activities intended primarily to benefit American producers.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

SEC. 514. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Investment Corporation, the North American Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the African Development Bank, and the African Development Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any assistance by these institutions, using funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, for the production or extraction of any commodity or mineral for export, if it is in surplus on world markets and if the assistance will cause substantial injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity.

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 515. (a) For the purposes of providing the executive branch with the necessary administrative flexibility, none of the funds made available under this Act for "Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund", "Development Assistance", "International Organizations and Programs", "Trade and Development Agency", "International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement", "Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States", "Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union", "Economic Support Fund", "Peacekeeping Operations", "Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development", "Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General", "Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs", "Foreign Military Financing Program", "International Military Education and Training", "Peace Corps", and "Migration and Refugee Assistance", shall be available for obligation for activities, programs, projects, type of material assistance, countries, or other operations not justified or in excess of the amount justified to the Appropriations Committees for obligation under any of these specific headings unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are previously notified 15 days in advance: *Provided*, That the President shall not enter into any commitment of funds appropriated for the purposes of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act for the provision of major defense equipment, other than conventional ammunition, or other major defense items defined to be aircraft, ships, missiles, or combat vehicles, not previously justified to Congress or 20 percent in excess of the quantities justified to Congress unless the Committees on Appropriations are notified 15 days in advance of such commitment: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to any reprogramming for an activity, program, or project under chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 of less than 10 percent of the amount previously justified to the Congress for obligation for such activity, program, or project for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the requirements of this section or any similar provision of this Act or any other Act, including any prior Act requiring notification in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, may be waived if failure to do so would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare: *Provided further*, That in case of any such waiver, notification to the Congress, or the appropriate congressional committees, shall be provided as early as practicable, but

in no event later than 3 days after taking the action to which such notification requirement was applicable, in the context of the circumstances necessitating such waiver: *Provided further*, That any notification provided pursuant to such a waiver shall contain an explanation of the emergency circumstances.

(b) Drawdowns made pursuant to section 506(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 516. Subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, funds appropriated under this Act or any previously enacted Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, which are returned or not made available for organizations and programs because of the implementation of section 307(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2002.

INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

SEC. 517. (a) None of the funds appropriated under the heading "Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union" shall be made available for assistance for a government of an Independent State of the former Soviet Union—

(1) unless that government is making progress in implementing comprehensive economic reforms based on market principles, private ownership, respect for commercial contracts, and equitable treatment of foreign private investment; and

(2) if that government applies or transfers United States assistance to any entity for the purpose of expropriating or seizing ownership or control of assets, investments, or ventures.

Assistance may be furnished without regard to this subsection if the President determines that to do so is in the national interest.

(b) None of the funds appropriated under the heading "Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union" shall be made available for any state to enhance its military capability: *Provided*, That this restriction does not apply to demilitarization, demining or nonproliferation programs.

(c) Funds appropriated under the heading "Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union" for the Russian Federation and Ukraine shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(d) Funds made available in this Act for assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union shall be subject to the provisions of section 117 (relating to environment and natural resources) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(e) Funds appropriated in this or prior appropriations Acts that are or have been made available for an Enterprise Fund in the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union may be deposited by such Fund in interest-bearing accounts prior to the disbursement of such funds by the Fund for program purposes. The Fund may retain for such program purposes any interest earned on such deposits without returning such interest to the Treasury of the United States and without further appropriation by the Congress. Funds made available for Enterprise Funds shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities.

(f) In issuing new task orders, entering into contracts, or making grants, with funds appropriated in this Act or prior appropriations Acts under the headings "Assistance

for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union" and "Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union", for projects or activities that have as one of their primary purposes the fostering of private sector development, the Coordinator for United States Assistance to the New Independent States and the implementing agency shall encourage the participation of and give significant weight to contractors and grantees who propose investing a significant amount of their own resources (including volunteer services and in-kind contributions) in such projects and activities.

PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ABORTIONS AND INVOLUNTARY STERILIZATION

SEC. 518. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for the performance of involuntary sterilization as a method of family planning or to coerce or provide any financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilizations. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for any biomedical research which relates in whole or in part, to methods of, or the performance of, abortions or involuntary sterilization as a means of family planning. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be obligated or expended for any country or organization if the President certifies that the use of these funds by any such country or organization would violate any of the above provisions related to abortions and involuntary sterilizations: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion.

EXPORT FINANCING TRANSFER AUTHORITIES

SEC. 519. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation other than for administrative expenses made available for fiscal year 2001, for programs under title I of this Act may be transferred between such appropriations for use for any of the purposes, programs, and activities for which the funds in such receiving account may be used, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 25 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That the exercise of such authority shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

SPECIAL NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 520. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be obligated or expended for Colombia, Haiti, Liberia, Serbia, Sudan, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Zimbabwe, or the Democratic Republic of Congo except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

DEFINITION OF PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

SEC. 521. For the purpose of this Act, "program, project, and activity" shall be defined at the appropriations Act account level and shall include all appropriations and authorizations Acts earmarks, ceilings, and limitations with the exception that for the following accounts: Economic Support Fund and Foreign Military Financing Program, "program, project, and activity" shall also be considered to include country, regional, and central program level funding within each such account; for the development assistance accounts of the Agency for International Development "program, project,

and activity" shall also be considered to include central program level funding, either as: (1) justified to the Congress; or (2) allocated by the executive branch in accordance with a report, to be provided to the Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of the enactment of this Act, as required by section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

CHILD SURVIVAL AND DISEASE PREVENTION ACTIVITIES

SEC. 522. Up to \$10,500,000 of the funds made available by this Act for assistance under the heading "Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund", may be used to reimburse United States Government agencies, agencies of State governments, institutions of higher learning, and private and voluntary organizations for the full cost of individuals (including for the personal services of such individuals) detailed or assigned to, or contracted by, as the case may be, the Agency for International Development for the purpose of carrying out child survival, basic education, and infectious disease activities: *Provided*, That up to \$1,500,000 of the funds made available by this Act for assistance under the heading "Development Assistance" may be used to reimburse such agencies, institutions, and organizations for such costs of such individuals carrying out other development assistance activities: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this Act that are made available for child survival activities or disease programs including activities relating to research on, and the prevention, treatment and control of, Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome may be made available notwithstanding any provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under title II of this Act may be made available pursuant to section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 if a primary purpose of the assistance is for child survival and related programs.

PROHIBITION AGAINST INDIRECT FUNDING TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SEC. 523. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated to finance indirectly any assistance or reparations to Cuba, Iraq, Libya, Iran, Syria, North Korea, or the People's Republic of China, unless the President of the United States certifies that the withholding of these funds is contrary to the national interest of the United States.

NOTIFICATION ON EXCESS DEFENSE EQUIPMENT

SEC. 524. Prior to providing excess Department of Defense articles in accordance with section 516(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations to the same extent and under the same conditions as are other committees pursuant to subsection (f) of that section: *Provided*, That before issuing a letter of offer to sell excess defense articles under the Arms Export Control Act, the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the regular notification procedures of such Committees: *Provided further*, That such Committees shall also be informed of the original acquisition cost of such defense articles.

AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENT

SEC. 525. Funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956.

DEMOCRACY IN CHINA

SEC. 526. Notwithstanding any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries, funds appropriated by this Act for "Economic Support Fund" may be

made available to provide general support and grants for nongovernmental organizations located outside the People's Republic of China that have as their primary purpose fostering democracy in that country, and for activities of nongovernmental organizations located outside the People's Republic of China to foster democracy in that country: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available for activities to foster democracy in the People's Republic of China may be made available for assistance to the government of that country, except that funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Economic Support Fund" that are made available for the National Endowment for Democracy or its grantees may be made available for activities to foster democracy in that country notwithstanding this proviso and any other provision of law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this or any prior Acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, that are provided to the National Endowment for Democracy shall be provided in a manner that is consistent with the last sentence of section 503(a) of the National Endowment for Democracy Act and Comptroller General Decisions No. B-203681 of June 6, 1985, and No. B-248111 of September 9, 1992, and the National Endowment for Democracy shall be deemed "the awarding agency" for purposes of implementing Office of Management and Budget Circular A-122 as dated June 1, 1998, or any successor circular: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the authority of this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, not to exceed \$1,000,000 may be made available to nongovernmental organizations located outside the People's Republic of China to support activities which preserve cultural traditions and promote sustainable development and environmental conservation in Tibetan communities in that country: *Provided further*, That the final proviso in section 526 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(2) of Public Law 106-113) is amended by striking "Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Center for Human Rights" and inserting "Jamestown Foundation".

PROHIBITION ON BILATERAL ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES

SEC. 527. (a) Funds appropriated for bilateral assistance under any heading of this Act and funds appropriated under any such heading in a provision of law enacted prior to the enactment of this Act, shall not be made available to any country which the President determines—

(1) grants sanctuary from prosecution to any individual or group which has committed an act of international terrorism; or

(2) otherwise supports international terrorism.

(b) The President may waive the application of subsection (a) to a country if the President determines that national security or humanitarian reasons justify such waiver. The President shall publish each waiver in the Federal Register and, at least 15 days before the waiver takes effect, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the waiver (including the justification for the waiver) in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF
SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 528. (a) Beginning not later than January 1, 2001, the Secretary of State shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations providing information on the use of funds appropriated in title VI of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(2) of Public Law 106-113). Each report shall include the following—

(1) the current and projected status of obligations and expenditures by appropriations account, by country, and by program, project, and activity;

(2) the contractors and subcontractors engaged in activities funded from appropriations contained in title VI; and

(3) the procedures and processes under which decisions have been or will be made on which programs, projects, and activities are funded through appropriations contained in title VI.

(b) For each report required by this section, a classified annex may be submitted if deemed necessary and appropriate.

(c) The last quarterly report required by this section shall be provided to the Committees on Appropriations by January 1, 2002.

COMPETITIVE INSURANCE

SEC. 529. All Agency for International Development contracts and solicitations, and subcontracts entered into under such contracts, shall include a clause requiring that United States insurance companies have a fair opportunity to bid for insurance when such insurance is necessary or appropriate.

STINGERS IN THE PERSIAN GULF REGION

SEC. 530. (a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the United States may not sell or otherwise make available any Stingers to any country bordering the Persian Gulf under the Arms Export Control Act or chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(b) ADDITIONAL TRANSFERS AUTHORIZED.—In addition to the defense articles otherwise authorized to be transferred by section 581 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Program Appropriation Act, 1990, the United States may sell or otherwise make available Stingers to any country bordering the Persian Gulf under the Arms Export Control Act or chapter 2 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, in order to replace, on a one-for-one basis, Stingers previously furnished to such country, provided that the Stingers to be replaced are nearing the scheduled expiration of their shelf-life.

DEBT-FOR-DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 531. In order to enhance the continued participation of nongovernmental organizations in economic assistance activities under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including endowments, debt-for-development and debt-for-nature exchanges, a nongovernmental organization which is a grantee or contractor of the Agency for International Development may place in interest bearing accounts funds made available under this Act or prior Acts or local currencies which accrue to that organization as a result of economic assistance provided under title II of this Act and any interest earned on such investment shall be used for the purpose for which the assistance was provided to that organization.

SEPARATE ACCOUNTS

SEC. 532. (a) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS FOR LOCAL CURRENCIES.—(1) If assistance is furnished to the government of a foreign country under chapters 1 and 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 under agreements which result in the generation of local currencies of that coun-

try, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall—

(A) require that local currencies be deposited in a separate account established by that government;

(B) enter into an agreement with that government which sets forth—

(i) the amount of the local currencies to be generated; and

(ii) the terms and conditions under which the currencies so deposited may be utilized, consistent with this section; and

(C) establish by agreement with that government the responsibilities of the Agency for International Development and that government to monitor and account for deposits into and disbursements from the separate account.

(2) USES OF LOCAL CURRENCIES.—As may be agreed upon with the foreign government, local currencies deposited in a separate account pursuant to subsection (a), or an equivalent amount of local currencies, shall be used only—

(A) to carry out chapters 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II (as the case may be), for such purposes as—

(i) project and sector assistance activities; or

(ii) debt and deficit financing; or

(B) for the administrative requirements of the United States Government.

(3) PROGRAMMING ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Agency for International Development shall take all necessary steps to ensure that the equivalent of the local currencies disbursed pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(A) from the separate account established pursuant to subsection (a)(1) are used for the purposes agreed upon pursuant to subsection (a)(2).

(4) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Upon termination of assistance to a country under chapters 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II (as the case may be), any unencumbered balances of funds which remain in a separate account established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be disposed of for such purposes as may be agreed to by the government of that country and the United States Government.

(5) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall report on an annual basis as part of the justification documents submitted to the Committees on Appropriations on the use of local currencies for the administrative requirements of the United States Government as authorized in subsection (a)(2)(B), and such report shall include the amount of local currency (and United States dollar equivalent) used and/or to be used for such purpose in each applicable country.

(b) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS FOR CASH TRANSFERS.—(1) If assistance is made available to the government of a foreign country, under chapters 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as cash transfer assistance or as nonproject sector assistance, that country shall be required to maintain such funds in a separate account and not commingle them with any other funds.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—Such funds may be obligated and expended notwithstanding provisions of law which are inconsistent with the nature of this assistance including provisions which are referenced in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference accompanying House Joint Resolution 648 (House Report No. 98-1159).

(3) NOTIFICATION.—At least 15 days prior to obligating any such cash transfer or nonproject sector assistance, the President shall submit a notification through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, which shall include a detailed description of how the funds proposed

to be made available will be used, with a discussion of the United States interests that will be served by the assistance (including, as appropriate, a description of the economic policy reforms that will be promoted by such assistance).

(4) EXEMPTION.—Nonproject sector assistance funds may be exempt from the requirements of subsection (b)(1) only through the notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

COMPENSATION FOR UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 533. (a) No funds appropriated by this Act may be made as payment to any international financial institution while the United States Executive Director to such institution is compensated by the institution at a rate which, together with whatever compensation such Director receives from the United States, is in excess of the rate provided for an individual occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, or while any alternate United States Director to such institution is compensated by the institution at a rate in excess of the rate provided for an individual occupying a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) For purposes of this section, "international financial institutions" are: the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the International Monetary Fund, the North American Development Bank, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

COMPLIANCE WITH UNITED NATIONS SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ

SEC. 534. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act to carry out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (including title IV of chapter 2 of part I, relating to the Overseas Private Investment Corporation) or the Arms Export Control Act may be used to provide assistance to any country that is not in compliance with the United Nations Security Council sanctions against Iraq unless the President determines and so certifies to the Congress that—

(1) such assistance is in the national interest of the United States;

(2) such assistance will directly benefit the needy people in that country; or

(3) the assistance to be provided will be humanitarian assistance for foreign nationals who have fled Iraq and Kuwait.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE

Mr. PAYNE. 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 Mr. PAYNE:
Page 70, line 14, after "IRAQ" insert "AND ANGOLA".

Page 70, line 22, after "Iraq" insert "and Angola".

Page 71, line 5, strike "Iraq and Kuwait" and insert "Iraq, Kuwait, or Angola, as the case may be".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment, which would be included in section 534, would add to the list of countries, "any country doing business with UNITA in Angola."

As my colleagues may know, UNITA is an organization that was formed and supported during the Cold War, and it is an organization that is supported and run by Jonas Savimbi, who during the end of the Cold War agreements were made with President dos Santos from the government and UNITA that an election should be held. An election was held and Mr. dos Santos was the victor of the election.

There was supposed to then be a turning in of weapons from UNITA. They were then supposed to take political seats in the government of Angola, but they have refused to stop the war. They have killed peacekeepers from the United Nations; shot down two planes, which ended up in the loss of life; and also Jonas Savimbi is dealing in illegal diamond sales, similar to the RUF in Sierra Leone.

We must stop the sale of illegal diamonds, whether it is the brutal RUF in Sierra Leone, who broke the Lome Peace Accords, and we feel that now those persons, Foday Sankoh and the rest who broke the accords should stand trial, or in Angola, where UNITA continues to wreak havoc on that country. They have become involved in the conflict in the Congo which has six other countries involved. They are continuing to refuse to go along with continued United Nations sanctions.

So we believe that the same countries that are in this bill, and that this amendment deals with, should be prohibited from having any funds for the governments of any country that supports UNITA. As I have indicated, there has been an appeal to Jonas Savimbi to lay down the arms, to give his arms up and to allow the people of Angola a peace for the first time in many, many years, where a civil war went on until 1974 when the Portuguese troops withdrew from Angola and the country then became independent. But since that time, the UNITA forces were supported by the United States Government, like the government of Zaire with Mr. Mobutu, another brutal dictator. And once again these are the legacies of the Cold War.

I think that we have a responsibility, since we had so much to do with the creation of these despots and these dictators and these brutal leaders, to help undo what we have done. What was done was felt in the best interest of democracy and our foreign needs, but now that that Cold War is over, I think we have an adequate responsibility to attempt to undo. So I would

hope that this amendment would be accepted. As I have indicated, it is simply asking that UNITA, the corporation, be added to the list of these other pariah countries of Iraq and others that are included in this section, and that it would prohibit any funds for the government of any country that supports UNITA.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from New Jersey talk with the chairman of the authorizing committee, who is here, to strike a section of the bill that is authorization on an appropriations bill that is inappropriate.

If the gentleman would wish to continue, I will be happy to withhold my point of order to allow him to finish his statement.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time and would just conclude by once again reiterating that we should prohibit funds to any country that supports UNITA. They are working against the best interests of the people of that country. They said that they would turn in their weapons, they said that they would stop the illicit selling of diamonds, which they have not, and they have continued to wreak havoc.

Mr. Chairman, there are more land mines in Angola than any other country in the world. There are more amputees per person than in any country in the world. Farmers cannot farm, children cannot play, vehicles cannot ride because of the continued business of UNITA. Illegal diamonds are continuing to be sold.

So I think it is a very humane point, and I would ask the gentleman to reconsider his opposition.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be made in order if changing existing law" applies.

I ask for the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask that the gentleman reconsider his point of order. I believe that this is in keeping with what we have in this section of the legislation. But in addition to that, I think it is only the right thing to do.

As we have indicated, people controlled by UNITA's area are selling diamonds, creating havoc; and I think that if the gentleman would reconsider, this should be inserted. It is not actually legislating; it is simply stating the sense of what is right should be included and was overlooked.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Section 534 constitutes a legislative provision permitted to remain in the bill by waiver in House Resolution 546.

A germane amendment merely perfecting section 534 may be in order. The instant amendment, however, by proposing to cover an additional nation in the legislative prescription in section 534, would insert additional legislation. The amendment is not merely perfecting. As such, it constitutes further legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI, and the point of order is sustained.

If there are no further amendments to this section, the Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUTHORITIES FOR THE PEACE CORPS, INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT, INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION AND AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

SEC. 535. (a) Unless expressly provided to the contrary, provisions of this or any other Act, including provisions contained in prior Acts authorizing or making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, shall not be construed to prohibit activities authorized by or conducted under the Peace Corps Act, the Inter-American Foundation Act or the African Development Foundation Act. The agency shall promptly report to the Committees on Appropriations whenever it is conducting activities or is proposing to conduct activities in a country for which assistance is prohibited.

(b) Unless expressly provided to the contrary, limitations on the availability of funds for "International Organizations and Programs" in this or any other Act, including prior appropriations Acts, shall not be construed to be applicable to the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

IMPACT ON JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 536. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to provide—

(a) any financial incentive to a business enterprise currently located in the United States for the purpose of inducing such an enterprise to relocate outside the United States if such incentive or inducement is likely to reduce the number of employees of such business enterprise in the United States because United States production is being replaced by such enterprise outside the United States;

(b) assistance for the purpose of establishing or developing in a foreign country any export processing zone or designated area in which the tax, tariff, labor, environment, and safety laws of that country do not apply, in part or in whole, to activities carried out within that zone or area, unless the President determines and certifies that such assistance is not likely to cause a loss of jobs within the United States; or

(c) assistance for any project or activity that contributes to the violation of internationally recognized workers rights, as defined in section 502(a)(4) of the Trade Act of 1974, of workers in the recipient country, including any designated zone or area in that country: *Provided*, That in recognition that the application of this subsection should be commensurate with the level of development of the recipient country and sector, the provisions of this subsection shall not preclude assistance for the informal sector in such country, micro and small-scale enterprise, and smallholder agriculture.

FUNDING PROHIBITION FOR SERBIA

SEC. 537. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the Republic of Serbia: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply to assistance for Kosovo or Montenegro, or to assistance to promote democratization: *Provided further*, That section 620(t) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall not apply to Kosovo or Montenegro.

SPECIAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 538. (a) Funds appropriated in titles I and II of this Act that are made available for Afghanistan, Lebanon, Montenegro, and for victims of war, displaced children, and displaced Burmese, may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law: *Provided*, That any such funds that are made available for Cambodia shall be subject to the provisions of section 531(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and section 906 of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985.

(b) Funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106, and chapter 4 of part II, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of supporting tropical forestry and biodiversity conservation activities and, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, energy programs aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions: *Provided*, That such assistance shall be subject to sections 116, 502B, and 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(c) The Agency for International Development may employ personal services contractors, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of administering programs for the West Bank and Gaza.

(d)(1) WAIVER.—The President may waive the provisions of section 1003 of Public Law 100-204 if the President determines and certifies in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate that it is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) PERIOD OF APPLICATION OF WAIVER.—Any waiver pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be effective for no more than a period of 6 months at a time and shall not apply beyond 12 months after the enactment of this Act.

POLICY ON TERMINATING THE ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL AND NORMALIZING RELATIONS WITH ISRAEL

SEC. 539. It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Arab League countries should immediately and publicly renounce the primary boycott of Israel and the secondary and tertiary boycott of American firms that have commercial ties with Israel and should normalize their relations with Israel;

(2) the decision by the Arab League in 1997 to reinstate the boycott against Israel was deeply troubling and disappointing;

(3) the fact that only three Arab countries maintain full diplomatic relations with Israel is also of deep concern;

(4) the Arab League should immediately rescind its decision on the boycott and its members should develop normal relations with their neighbor Israel; and

(5) the President should—

(A) take more concrete steps to encourage vigorously Arab League countries to renounce publicly the primary boycotts of Israel and the secondary and tertiary boycotts of American firms that have commercial relations with Israel and to normalize their relations with Israel;

(B) take into consideration the participation of any recipient country in the primary boycott of Israel and the secondary and ter-

tiary boycotts of American firms that have commercial relations with Israel when determining whether to sell weapons to said country;

(C) report to Congress annually on the specific steps being taken by the United States and the progress achieved to bring about a public renunciation of the Arab primary boycott of Israel and the secondary and tertiary boycotts of American firms that have commercial relations with Israel and to expand the process of normalizing ties between Arab League countries and Israel; and

(D) encourage the allies and trading partners of the United States to enact laws prohibiting businesses from complying with the boycott and penalizing businesses that do comply.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE ACTIVITIES

SEC. 540. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for "Economic Support Fund", assistance may be provided to strengthen the administration of justice in countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and in other regions consistent with the provisions of section 534(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, except that programs to enhance protection of participants in judicial cases may be conducted notwithstanding section 660 of that Act. Funds made available pursuant to this section may be made available notwithstanding section 534(c) and the second and third sentences of section 534(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 541. (a) ASSISTANCE THROUGH NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Restrictions contained in this or any other Act with respect to assistance for a country shall not be construed to restrict assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapters 1, 10, 11, and 12 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and from funds appropriated under the heading "Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States": *Provided*, That the President shall take into consideration, in any case in which a restriction on assistance would be applicable but for this subsection, whether assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations is in the national interest of the United States: *Provided further*, That before using the authority of this subsection to furnish assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations, the President shall notify the Committees on Appropriations under the regular notification procedures of those committees, including a description of the program to be assisted, the assistance to be provided, and the reasons for furnishing such assistance: *Provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion or involuntary sterilizations contained in this or any other Act.

(b) PUBLIC LAW 480.—During fiscal year 2001, restrictions contained in this or any other Act with respect to assistance for a country shall not be construed to restrict assistance under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to carry out title I of such Act and made available pursuant to this subsection may be obligated or expended except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply—

(1) with respect to section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any comparable provision of law prohibiting assistance to countries that support international terrorism; or

(2) with respect to section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any comparable provision of law prohibiting assistance to countries that violate internationally recognized human rights.

EARMARKS

SEC. 542. (a) Funds appropriated by this Act which are earmarked may be reprogrammed for other programs within the same account notwithstanding the earmark if compliance with the earmark is made impossible by operation of any provision of this or any other Act or, with respect to a country with which the United States has an agreement providing the United States with base rights or base access in that country, if the President determines that the recipient for which funds are earmarked has significantly reduced its military or economic cooperation with the United States since the enactment of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1991; however, before exercising the authority of this subsection with regard to a base rights or base access country which has significantly reduced its military or economic cooperation with the United States, the President shall consult with, and shall provide a written policy justification to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That any such reprogramming shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That assistance that is reprogrammed pursuant to this subsection shall be made available under the same terms and conditions as originally provided.

(b) In addition to the authority contained in subsection (a), the original period of availability of funds appropriated by this Act and administered by the Agency for International Development that are earmarked for particular programs or activities by this or any other Act shall be extended for an additional fiscal year if the Administrator of such agency determines and reports promptly to the Committees on Appropriations that the termination of assistance to a country or a significant change in circumstances makes it unlikely that such earmarked funds can be obligated during the original period of availability: *Provided*, That such earmarked funds that are continued available for an additional fiscal year shall be obligated only for the purpose of such earmark.

CEILINGS AND EARMARKS

SEC. 543. Ceilings and earmarks contained in this Act shall not be applicable to funds or authorities appropriated or otherwise made available by any subsequent Act unless such Act specifically so directs. Earmarks or minimum funding requirements contained in any other Act shall not be applicable to funds appropriated by this Act.

□ 0945

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in the bill beginning with "earmarks" on page 80, line 22, through the end of page 80, line 24 on the ground that it violates clause 2 of Rule XXI.

The rule I have referenced prohibits provisions changing existing law on general appropriations bills.

This language clearly is legislative and would override existing and future

legislation of our Committee on International Relations and other committees that have legislative authority over funds appropriated in this Act.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in the essence of time, I am willing to concede the point of order.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the provision removes earmarks and limitations contained in existing law. Similarly, the provision addresses earmarks and limitations in subsequent acts. As such, the provision constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the provision is stricken from the bill.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I proceed for an additional minute?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) is permitted to extend his remarks after the ruling on the point of order.

Mr. GILMAN. Although I am on my feet to object to a particular provision—

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will suspend, the Chair has ruled on the point of order.

Mr. GILMAN. I am not discussing the point of order, Mr. Chairman, just a comment to make about our distinguished chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The order of the House does not provide for any Member other than the chairman and the ranking member or their designees to strike the requisite number of words for purposes of debate.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, those authorities include the authority to set minimum funding levels and earmarks in ways that do not constitute appropriations.

Moreover, the House may have decided, or may decide in the future, to permit a variety of legislative actions in other Acts in particular, appropriate, cases and such actions should not be overridden by this sort of proviso. I would hasten to add that in most if not all cases our inclinations on earmarks and minimum funding levels have been worked out amicably with the Committee on Appropriations.

The fact that this provision, which is a law intended to apply during the year of its enactment only, is repeated from a previous year does not relieve it from being characterized as legislation, and I would refer to the authority cited in Section 1052 of the House Rules Manual, that is, Hinds' Precedents, Volume IV, Section 3822.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I must respectfully insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this section of the bill? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROHIBITION ON PUBLICITY OR PROPAGANDA

SEC. 544. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not authorized before the date of the enactment of this Act by the Congress: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$750,000 may be

made available to carry out the provisions of section 316 of Public Law 96-533.

PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS

SEC. 545. (a) To the maximum extent possible, assistance provided under this Act should make full use of American resources, including commodities, products, and services.

(b) It is the sense of the Congress that, to the greatest extent practicable, all agriculture commodities, equipment and products purchased with funds made available in this Act should be American-made.

(c) In providing financial assistance to, or entering into any contract with, any entity using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency, to the greatest extent practicable, shall provide to such entity a notice describing the statement made in subsection (b) by the Congress.

(d) The Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress annually on the efforts of the heads of each Federal agency and the United States directors of international financial institutions (as referenced in section 514) in complying with this sense of the Congress.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENTS TO UNITED NATIONS MEMBERS

SEC. 546. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used to pay in whole or in part any assessments, arrearages, or dues of any member of the United Nations or, from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the costs for participation of another country's delegation at international conferences held under the auspices of multilateral or international organizations.

CONSULTING SERVICES

SEC. 547. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, 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 pursuant to existing law.

PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS—DOCUMENTATION

SEC. 548. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be available to a private voluntary organization which fails to provide upon timely request any document, file, or record necessary to the auditing requirements of the Agency for International Development.

PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS THAT EXPORT LETHAL MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

SEC. 549. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be available to any foreign government which provides lethal military equipment to a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined is a terrorist government for purposes of section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act. The prohibition under this section with respect to a foreign government shall terminate 12 months after that government ceases to provide such military equipment. This section applies with respect to lethal military equipment provided under a contract entered into after October 1, 1997.

(b) Assistance restricted by subsection (a) or any other similar provision of law, may be furnished if the President determines that furnishing such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States.

(c) Whenever the waiver of subsection (b) is exercised, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to the furnishing of such assistance. Any such report shall include a detailed explanation of the assistance to be provided, including the estimated dollar amount of such assistance, and an explanation of how the assistance furthers United States national interests.

WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE FOR PARKING FINES OWED BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

SEC. 550. (a) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds made available for a foreign country under part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, an amount equivalent to 110 percent of the total unpaid fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties owed to the District of Columbia by such country as of the date of the enactment of this Act shall be withheld from obligation for such country until the Secretary of State certifies and reports in writing to the appropriate congressional committees that such fines and penalties are fully paid to the government of the District of Columbia.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE PLO FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA

SEC. 551. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated for assistance for the Palestine Liberation Organization for the West Bank and Gaza unless the President has exercised the authority under section 604(a) of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1995 (title VI of Public Law 104-107) or any other legislation to suspend or make inapplicable section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and that suspension is still in effect: *Provided*, That if the President fails to make the certification under section 604(b)(2) of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1995 or to suspend the prohibition under other legislation, funds appropriated by this Act may not be obligated for assistance for the Palestine Liberation Organization for the West Bank and Gaza.

WAR CRIMES TRIBUNALS DRAWDOWN

SEC. 552. If the President determines that doing so will contribute to a just resolution of charges regarding genocide or other violations of international humanitarian law, the President may direct a drawdown pursuant to section 552(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, of up to \$30,000,000 of commodities and services for the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal established with regard to the former Yugoslavia by the United Nations Security Council or such other tribunals or commissions as the Council may establish to deal with such violations, without regard to the ceiling limitation contained in paragraph (2) thereof: *Provided*, That the determination required under this section shall be in lieu of any determinations otherwise required under section 552(c): *Provided further*, That 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations describing the steps the United States Government is taking to collect information regarding allegations of genocide or other violations of international law in the former Yugoslavia and to furnish that information to the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia: *Provided further*, That the drawdown made under this section for any tribunal shall not

be construed as an endorsement or precedent for the establishment of any standing or permanent international criminal tribunal or court: *Provided further*, That funds made available for tribunals other than Yugoslavia or Rwanda shall be made available subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

LANDMINES

SEC. 553. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, demining equipment available to the Agency for International Development and the Department of State and used in support of the clearance of landmines and unexploded ordnance for humanitarian purposes may be disposed of on a grant basis in foreign countries, subject to such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe.

RESTRICTIONS CONCERNING THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 554. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to create in any part of Jerusalem a new office of any department or agency of the United States Government for the purpose of conducting official United States Government business with the Palestinian Authority over Gaza and Jericho or any successor Palestinian governing entity provided for in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply to the acquisition of additional space for the existing Consulate General in Jerusalem: *Provided further*, That meetings between officers and employees of the United States and officials of the Palestinian Authority, or any successor Palestinian governing entity provided for in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles, for the purpose of conducting official United States Government business with such authority should continue to take place in locations other than Jerusalem. As has been true in the past, officers and employees of the United States Government may continue to meet in Jerusalem on other subjects with Palestinians (including those who now occupy positions in the Palestinian Authority), have social contacts, and have incidental discussions.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES

SEC. 555. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the headings "International Military Education and Training" or "Foreign Military Financing Program" for Informational Program activities or under the headings "Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund", "Development Assistance", and "Economic Support Fund" may be obligated or expended to pay for—

- (1) alcoholic beverages; or
- (2) entertainment expenses for activities that are substantially of a recreational character, including entrance fees at sporting events and amusement parks.

SPECIAL DEBT RELIEF FOR THE POOREST

SEC. 556. (a) **AUTHORITY TO REDUCE DEBT.**—The President may reduce amounts owed to the United States (or any agency of the United States) by an eligible country as a result of—

- (1) guarantees issued under sections 221 and 222 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;
- (2) credits extended or guarantees issued under the Arms Export Control Act; or
- (3) any obligation or portion of such obligation, to pay for purchases of United States agricultural commodities guaranteed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under export credit guarantee programs authorized pursuant to section 5(f) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of June 29, 1948, as amended, section 4(b) of the Food for Peace Act of 1966, as amended (Public Law 89-808), or section 202 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended (Public Law 95-501).

(b) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only to implement multilateral official debt relief and referendum agreements, commonly referred to as "Paris Club Agreed Minutes".

(2) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only in such amounts or to such extent as is provided in advance by appropriations Acts.

(3) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only with respect to countries with heavy debt burdens that are eligible to borrow from the International Development Association, but not from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, commonly referred to as "IDA-only" countries.

(c) **CONDITIONS.**—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only with respect to a country whose government—

- (1) does not have an excessive level of military expenditures;
- (2) has not repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism;
- (3) is not failing to cooperate on international narcotics control matters;
- (4) (including its military or other security forces) does not engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights; and
- (5) is not ineligible for assistance because of the application of section 527 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995.

(d) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only with regard to funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Debt Restructuring".

(e) **CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS INAPPLICABLE.**—A reduction of debt pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be considered assistance for purposes of any provision of law limiting assistance to a country. The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised notwithstanding section 620(r) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or section 321 of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975.

AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE IN DEBT BUYBACKS OR SALES

SEC. 557. (a) **LOANS ELIGIBLE FOR SALE, REDUCTION, OR CANCELLATION.**—

(1) **AUTHORITY TO SELL, REDUCE, OR CANCEL CERTAIN LOANS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may, in accordance with this section, sell to any eligible purchaser any concessional loan or portion thereof made before January 1, 1995, pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to the government of any eligible country as defined in section 702(6) of that Act or on receipt of payment from an eligible purchaser, reduce or cancel such loan or portion thereof, only for the purpose of facilitating—

(A) debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps; or

(B) a debt buyback by an eligible country of its own qualified debt, only if the eligible country uses an additional amount of the local currency of the eligible country, equal to not less than 40 percent of the price paid for such debt by such eligible country, or the difference between the price paid for such debt and the face value of such debt, to support activities that link conservation and sustainable use of natural resources with local community development, and child survival and other child development, in a manner consistent with sections 707 through 710 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, if the sale, reduction, or cancellation would not contravene any term or condition of any prior agreement relating to such loan.

(2) **TERMS AND CONDITIONS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the

President shall, in accordance with this section, establish the terms and conditions under which loans may be sold, reduced, or canceled pursuant to this section.

(3) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Facility, as defined in section 702(8) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall notify the administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 of purchasers that the President has determined to be eligible, and shall direct such agency to carry out the sale, reduction, or cancellation of a loan pursuant to this section. Such agency shall make an adjustment in its accounts to reflect the sale, reduction, or cancellation.

(4) **LIMITATION.**—The authorities of this subsection shall be available only to the extent that appropriations for the cost of the modification, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, are made in advance.

(b) **DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.**—The proceeds from the sale, reduction, or cancellation of any loan sold, reduced, or canceled pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the United States Government account or accounts established for the repayment of such loan.

(c) **ELIGIBLE PURCHASERS.**—A loan may be sold pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A) only to a purchaser who presents plans satisfactory to the President for using the loan for the purpose of engaging in debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps.

(d) **DEBTOR CONSULTATIONS.**—Before the sale to any eligible purchaser, or any reduction or cancellation pursuant to this section, of any loan made to an eligible country, the President should consult with the country concerning the amount of loans to be sold, reduced, or canceled and their uses for debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps.

(e) **AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.**—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only with regard to funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Debt Restructuring".

ASSISTANCE FOR HAITI

SEC. 558. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this or any previous appropriations Act for foreign operations, export financing and related programs shall be made available for assistance for the Government of Haiti until—

(1) the Secretary of State reports to the Committees on Appropriations that Haiti has held free and fair elections to seat a new parliament; and

(2) the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of Haiti is fully cooperating with United States efforts to interdict illicit drug traffic through Haiti to the United States.

(b) Not more than 11 percent of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106 and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, that are made available for Latin America and the Caribbean region may be made available, through bilateral and Latin America and the Caribbean regional programs, to provide assistance for any country in such region.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. CONYERS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 38 offered by Mr. CONYERS: Strike section 558 of the bill (page 94, strike line 10 and all that follows through line 3 on page 95).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to be here to see so many Haiti experts on the floor including, my good friend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN), both of whom I have traveled there with many times.

I propose that we strike the language because it creates a double standard against Haiti and it, further, is premature.

What the language does that I am objecting to is ask that the Committee on Appropriations get a report from the Secretary of State to say that Haiti has held free and fair elections to seat a new parliament and, secondly, that the Office of National Drug Policy should determine that the Government of Haiti is fully cooperating with the United States to interdict drug traffic through Haiti.

Now, let us take the second one first. Nobody in the Caribbean cooperates with the U.S. drug interdiction policy interfering with transshipments of drugs that go on throughout the Caribbean more than Haiti. It gives our Government total full operating license. And, in addition, I have heard our Coast Guard say that they have total cooperation.

Further, the Haitian Government has no navy, so they are anxious to have the continued support of the U.S.

Now, with the idea of holding up appropriations until the Secretary of State declares free elections, just a couple of things we need to understand. This is a double standard that does not apply to anybody else. And we have had far more seriously defective elections than Haiti.

Haiti had a great election. We admitted it. I was an international observer. It was reported in the paper. Record turn out. Record registration. Non-violence at the election. There was only one problem. There was a disagreement about the counting methodology after the election.

Now, how does that qualify for considering fraud? There was an honest disagreement of the counting process which our own State Department, the White House says can be resolved and is in the process of being resolved.

So lighten up. Let us give Haiti a chance. There is absolutely no reason for us to do that.

Now, the other reason is that we are sending in Federal observers for U.S. elections 200 years after this country. They have to come into Flint, Michigan, and many places throughout the country to protect the voters and their right to vote and to make sure that there is no fraud. So we do not want to

apply the standards of the U.S. to our country.

Furthermore, Peru had elections that closed out international observers. Those of us who went as international observers were able to see with our own eyes the fairness and the appropriateness of the election.

So let us let the Haitian Government, the election commission of Haiti, do its job before we start issuing these extremely punitive activities.

Now, remember what we did for Peru was prospective. After they had a not-so-good election, we said in the future they have got to do this and that. So please, to the chairman of this committee and the subcommittee chairman, let us give them a break.

Our Government is in the process of negotiating as we speak. A U.S. delegation is on the way to Haiti, I think they left last night, to work it out with the Government; and here we are calling the shots as if we know what is going to go down.

Let us give Haiti, the newest developing democratic nation in the western hemisphere, a small chance by striking this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, while I fully concur with the concerns voiced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and we want to do all we can to assist those in need in Haiti and promote democracy in that country, regrettably there are serious concerns about democratic institutions in Haiti today and our Nation needs to uphold those principles.

For these reasons, I will oppose the amendment. But our committee will continue to monitor events, as we have with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) in the past, of what is going on in Haiti to see what we can do to strengthen democratic institutions in that country.

Democracy is an important and paramount interest to all of us, and we would like to see Haiti move in the right direction. But I urge our colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, all I am suggesting, we are in agreement we want to move Haiti forward, but we should not be acting punitively before the election results are resolved. That is all I am saying is let us wait.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for his courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, I support what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is setting out to do. I want to follow up on what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations said, these are principles we want to uphold. And surely we do. But it seems unfair for us to single out Haiti.

If they want to write this to apply to every country, that is one thing, but it really seems kind of unfair to single out Haiti in this report. So holding the principles, we should apply them consistently.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS).

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I obviously heard this debate and ran over here. I very much am opposed to the amendment. There is no pretense democracy anymore in Haiti. It is not a democratic country.

I have recently had the opportunity to talk to Mr. Manus, who was the head of the election committee there. He was chased out of the country under threat of death under assassination by mob violence, a most brutal and terrifying prospect. And certainly he has come to our country seeking asylum as a result.

There is no judicial department that is working there. There is no real legislative branch. We are stuck with a situation in Haiti where we have committed billions of dollars and made the situation worse because we have backed the wrong people.

It is a tragic situation. To make it worse by adding more American taxpayers' dollars to the situation to promote a non-democratic form of government in a friendly neighboring country to me is an unconscionable act, and I surely hope we are not going to do that.

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

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and I have been to Haiti together. We know there is no military in Haiti. At our insistence, they have only a national police force and no navy. We have met with the President of Haiti. The government is working as well as they can. The election will bring the parliament back to action.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the election has been, by all observation, a total sham. The OAS has come back and said this is not even a pretense of democracy. There is no transparency.

The final blow for me, and I have been giving them the benefit of the doubt for a long time, as the gentleman knows, hoping against hope that things will get better, but when I spoke with Mr. Manus, that was the end of it. It is over.

□ 1000

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We only have two conditions on aid to the government of Haiti. Those two conditions happen to be free elections which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) just spoke about and cooperation with our fight against illegal drug trafficking. I am certain that the gentleman also supports these goals. The bill has no restrictions against aid to NGOs working in Haiti. It has zero restrictions on humanitarian aid. And with these two contingencies, I am certain if the gentleman from Michigan had time to analyze the language of the bill that he too would be supporting the bill as written.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to set forth my reasons for my opposition to the amendment offered by my friend the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. CONYERS.

First, I recognize and applaud the tireless efforts of the gentleman from Michigan in trying to help Haiti. I share his commitment to helping the people of Haiti overcome that impoverished nation's legacy of violence and dictatorship.

Haitians need to be able to compete in the global economy. We should assist Haiti by fostering private sector jobs, helping Haitians educate their children and gain access to clean water and decent healthcare, among other issues. I will be pleased to work with the gentleman from Michigan and other Members to support continued assistance that directly reaches the people of Haiti.

The Conyers Amendment would strike language that is straightforward and appropriate. This language permits U.S. assistance to flow to the government of Haiti only if the Secretary of State reports to the Committees on Appropriations that Haiti has held free and fair elections to seat a new parliament. The language in this bill will not prevent U.S. assistance from being directed to the people of Haiti directly or through non-governmental intermediaries.

On May 21, 2000, a broad majority of Haitians courageously and deliberately voted on a peaceful election day that contrasted sharply with a campaign that witnessed some 15 people—many of them opposition candidates and officials—murdered. Regrettably, that extraordinary popular expression of support for democracy was soon sullied by acts of manipulation and official intimidation by the Haitian National Police.

Sadly, it is now patently clear that the government of Haiti deliberately undermined the holding of free and fair elections. In fact, the president of Haiti's provisional electoral council, Mr. Leon Manus, was forced to flee Haiti in fear of his life.

After enduring efforts by the government of Haiti to undermine the Provisional Electoral Council's work, Mr. Manus refused to certify false results giving a super-majority of Senate seats to President Rene Preval's Fanmi Lavalas party. Mr. Manus stated: "At the top governmental level unequivocal messages were transmitted to me on the consequences that would follow if I refused to publish the false final results."

The international community, led by Organization of American States election observers

in Haiti, patiently and diplomatically pointed out to the government of Haiti that it had made a "mistake" in calculating votes in declaring winners for senate races. The government of Haiti ignored these diplomatic entreaties and scheduled run-off elections for July 9th.

A delegation from the Caribbean Community (CARICOM) visited Haiti just last week and made a reasonable proposal to President Preval that would have permitted him to save face and postpone the run-off election. Again, President Preval and his government rejected the good offices of the international community and pressed on with the run off election this past Sunday.

The Organization of American States election observers refused to monitor the run-off. Orlando Marville, the leader of the OAS electoral mission, explained: "We do not think they should allow the process to go forward as if nothing had happened. Fundamentally, if they say they are not going to change it, we cannot accept it as valid. This changes the whole nature of the elections. We are at the position where to observe the elections would send the wrong signal, which we do not want to do."

The Caribbean Community's envoy sent to investigate the elections, Sir John Compton, said Monday that the trade bloc "should not be tainted by recognizing Sunday's vote."

The White House has said: "We are deeply troubled that Haiti proceeded with run-off elections on Sunday despite the well-founded concerns of the Caribbean Community, the Organization of the American States and the United Nations."

U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan expressed his "regret" Monday that Haitian authorities held the run-off vote "without having resolved the outstanding issues related to the first round."

The language regarding Haiti in this bill is appropriate. We should not reward this government that has actively worked to derail and manipulate these elections.

Moreover, the language in this bill also conditions aid to the government of Haiti on the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy reporting that the government of Haiti is fully cooperating with United States efforts to interdict illicit drug traffic through Haiti.

We have a serious law enforcement problem in Haiti involving a massive flow of illegal drugs from Colombia to the United States. The government of Haiti is not only moving to seize absolute power, it is also becoming a consolidated narco-state. Current U.S. law prohibits counter-narcotics assistance being provided through individuals, including government officials, who conspire to violate U.S. drug laws.

Striking this language in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill would be the wrong thing to do. We must, instead, support this language and conduct a serious re-evaluation of our Haiti policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this section of the bill? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REQUIREMENT FOR DISCLOSURE OF FOREIGN AID IN REPORT OF SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 559. (a) FOREIGN AID REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—In addition to the voting prac-

tices of a foreign country, the report required to be submitted to Congress under section 406(a) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, fiscal years 1990 and 1991 (22 U.S.C. 2414a), shall include a side-by-side comparison of individual countries' overall support for the United States at the United Nations and the amount of United States assistance provided to such country in fiscal year 2000.

(b) UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE.—For purposes of this section, the term "United States assistance" has the meaning given the term in section 481(e)(4) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291(e)(4)).

RESTRICTIONS ON VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES

SEC. 560. (a) PROHIBITION ON VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS FOR THE UNITED NATIONS.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available to pay any voluntary contribution of the United States to the United Nations (including the United Nations Development Program) if the United Nations implements or imposes any taxation on any United States persons.

(b) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED FOR DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available to pay any voluntary contribution of the United States to the United Nations (including the United Nations Development Program) unless the President certifies to the Congress 15 days in advance of such payment that the United Nations is not engaged in any effort to implement or impose any taxation on United States persons in order to raise revenue for the United Nations or any of its specialized agencies.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section the term "United States person" refers to—

(1) a natural person who is a citizen or national of the United States; or

(2) a corporation, partnership, or other legal entity organized under the United States or any State, territory, possession, or district of the United States.

HAITI

SEC. 561. The Government of Haiti shall be eligible to purchase defense articles and services under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), for the Coast Guard: *Provided*, That the authority provided by this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 562. (a) PROHIBITION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be obligated or expended with respect to providing funds to the Palestinian Authority.

(b) WAIVER.—The prohibition included in subsection (a) shall not apply if the President certifies in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate that waiving such prohibition is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(c) PERIOD OF APPLICATION OF WAIVER.—Any waiver pursuant to subsection (b) shall be effective for no more than a period of 6 months at a time and shall not apply beyond 12 months after the enactment of this Act.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO SECURITY FORCES

SEC. 563. None of the funds made available by this Act may be provided to any unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of State has credible evidence that such unit has committed gross violations of human rights, unless the Secretary determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the government of such

country is taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the security forces unit to justice: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to withhold funds made available by this Act from any unit of the security forces of a foreign country not credibly alleged to be involved in gross violations of human rights: *Provided further*, That in the event that funds are withheld from any unit pursuant to this section, the Secretary of State shall promptly inform the foreign government of the basis for such action and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, assist the foreign government in taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the security forces to justice.

RESTRICTIONS ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES PROVIDING SANCTUARY TO INDICTED WAR CRIMINALS

SEC. 564. (a) BILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—None of the funds made available by this or any prior Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs, may be provided for any country, entity or municipality described in subsection (e).

(b) MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE.—

(1) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors of the international financial institutions to work in opposition to, and vote against, any extension by such institutions of any financial or technical assistance or grants of any kind to any country or entity described in subsection (e).

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Not less than 15 days before any vote in an international financial institution regarding the extension of financial or technical assistance or grants to any country or entity described in subsection (e), the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall provide to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives a written justification for the proposed assistance, including an explanation of the United States position regarding any such vote, as well as a description of the location of the proposed assistance by municipality, its purpose, and its intended beneficiaries.

(3) DEFINITION.—The term "international financial institution" includes the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Multilateral Investment Guaranty Agency, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to the provision of—

(A) humanitarian assistance;

(B) democratization assistance;

(C) assistance for cross border physical infrastructure projects involving activities in both a sanctioned country, entity, or municipality and a nonsanctioned contiguous country, entity, or municipality, if the project is primarily located in and primarily benefits the nonsanctioned country, entity, or municipality and if the portion of the project located in the sanctioned country, entity, or municipality is necessary only to complete the project;

(D) small-scale assistance projects or activities requested by United States Armed Forces that promote good relations between such forces and the officials and citizens of the areas in the United States SFOR sector of Bosnia;

(E) implementation of the Brcko Arbitral Decision;

(F) lending by the international financial institutions to a country or entity to support common monetary and fiscal policies at the national level as contemplated by the Dayton Agreement;

(G) direct lending to a non-sanctioned entity, or lending passed on by the national government to a non-sanctioned entity; or

(H) assistance to the International Police Task Force for the training of a civilian police force.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—Every 60 days the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, shall publish in the Federal Register and/or in a comparable publicly accessible document or Internet site, a listing and justification of any assistance that is obligated within that period of time for any country, entity, or municipality described in subsection (e), including a description of the purpose of the assistance, project and its location, by municipality.

(d) FURTHER LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (c)—

(1) no assistance may be made available by this Act, or any prior Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs, in any country, entity, or municipality described in subsection (e), for a program, project, or activity in which a publicly indicted war criminal is known to have any financial or material interest; and

(2) no assistance (other than emergency foods or medical assistance or demining assistance) may be made available by this Act, or any prior Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for any program, project, or activity in a community within any country, entity or municipality described in subsection (e) if competent authorities within that community are not complying with the provisions of article IX and annex 4, article II, paragraph 8 of the Dayton Agreement relating to war crimes and the Tribunal.

(e) SANCTIONED COUNTRY, ENTITY, OR MUNICIPALITY.—A sanctioned country, entity, or municipality described in this section is one whose competent authorities have failed, as determined by the Secretary of State, to take necessary and significant steps to apprehend and transfer to the Tribunal all persons who have been publicly indicted by the Tribunal.

(f) SPECIAL RULE.—Subject to subsection (d), subsections (a) and (b) shall not apply to the provision of assistance to an entity that is not a sanctioned entity, notwithstanding that such entity may be within a sanctioned country, if the Secretary of State determines and so reports to the appropriate congressional committees that providing assistance to that entity would promote peace and internationally recognized human rights by encouraging that entity to cooperate fully with the Tribunal.

(g) CURRENT RECORD OF WAR CRIMINALS AND SANCTIONED COUNTRIES, ENTITIES, AND MUNICIPALITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall establish and maintain a current record of the location, including the municipality, if known, of publicly indicted war criminals and a current record of sanctioned countries, entities, and municipalities.

(2) INFORMATION OF THE DCI AND THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The Director of Central Intelligence and the Secretary of Defense should collect and provide to the Secretary of State information concerning the location, including the municipality, of publicly indicted war criminals.

(3) INFORMATION OF THE TRIBUNAL.—The Secretary of State shall request that the Tribunal and other international organizations and governments provide the Secretary of

State information concerning the location, including the municipality, of publicly indicted war criminals and concerning country, entity and municipality authorities known to have obstructed the work of the Tribunal.

(4) REPORT.—Beginning 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than September 1 each year thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit a report in classified and unclassified form to the appropriate congressional committees on the location, including the municipality, if known, of publicly indicted war criminals, on country, entity and municipality authorities known to have obstructed the work of the Tribunal, and on sanctioned countries, entities, and municipalities.

(5) INFORMATION TO CONGRESS.—Upon the request of the chairman or ranking minority member of any of the appropriate congressional committees, the Secretary of State shall make available to that committee the information recorded under paragraph (1) in a report submitted to the committee in classified and unclassified form.

(h) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may waive the application of subsection (a) or subsection (b) with respect to specified bilateral programs or international financial institution projects or programs in a sanctioned country, entity, or municipality upon providing a written determination to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives that such assistance directly supports the implementation of the Dayton Agreement and its Annexes, which include the obligation to apprehend and transfer indicted war criminals to the Tribunal.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 15 days after the date of any written determination under paragraph (1) the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives regarding the status of efforts to secure the voluntary surrender or apprehension and transfer of persons indicted by the Tribunal, in accordance with the Dayton Agreement, and outlining obstacles to achieving this goal.

(3) ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS AFFECTED.—Any waiver made pursuant to this subsection shall be effective only with respect to a specified bilateral program or multilateral assistance project or program identified in the determination of the Secretary of State to Congress.

(i) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—The sanctions imposed pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) with respect to a country or entity shall cease to apply only if the Secretary of State determines and certifies to Congress that the authorities of that country, entity, or municipality have apprehended and transferred to the Tribunal all persons who have been publicly indicted by the Tribunal.

(j) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) COUNTRY.—The term "country" means Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, and Serbia.

(2) ENTITY.—The term "entity" refers to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro, and the Republika Srpska.

(3) DAYTON AGREEMENT.—The term "Dayton Agreement" means the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, together with annexes relating thereto, done at Dayton, November 10 through 16, 1995.

(4) TRIBUNAL.—The term “Tribunal” means the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia.

(k) ROLE OF HUMAN RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS AND GOVERNMENT AGENCIES.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, and the executive directors of the international financial institutions shall consult with representatives of human rights organizations and all government agencies with relevant information to help prevent publicly indicted war criminals from benefiting from any financial or technical assistance or grants provided to any country or entity described in subsection (e).

TO PROHIBIT FOREIGN ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION SHOULD IT ENACT LAWS WHICH WOULD DISCRIMINATE AGAINST MINORITY RELIGIOUS FAITHS IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SEC. 565. None of the funds appropriated under this Act may be made available for the Government of the Russian Federation, after 180 days from the date of the enactment of this Act, unless the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate that the Government of the Russian Federation has implemented no statute, executive order, regulation or similar government action that would discriminate, or would have as its principal effect discrimination, against religious groups or religious communities in the Russian Federation in violation of accepted international agreements on human rights and religious freedoms to which the Russian Federation is a party.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

SEC. 566. (a) Funds made available in this Act to support programs or activities the primary purpose of which is promoting or assisting country participation in the Kyoto Protocol to the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) shall only be made available subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(b) The President shall provide a detailed account of all Federal agency obligations and expenditures for climate change programs and activities, domestic and international obligations for such activities in fiscal year 2001, and any plan for programs thereafter related to the implementation or the furtherance of protocols pursuant to, or related to negotiations to amend the FCCC in conjunction with the President's submission of the Budget of the United States Government for Fiscal Year 2002: *Provided*, That such report shall include an accounting of expenditures by agency with each agency identifying climate change activities and associated costs by line item as presented in the President's Budget Appendix: *Provided further*, That such report shall identify with regard to the Agency for International Development, obligations and expenditures by country or central program and activity.

AID TO THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO

SEC. 567. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be provided to the Central Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE MIDDLE EAST

SEC. 568. Of the funds appropriated in titles II and III of this Act under the headings “Economic Support Fund”, “Foreign Military Financing Program”, “International Military Education and Training”, “Peacekeeping Operations”, for refugees resettling in Israel under the heading “Migration and Refugee Assistance”, and for assistance for Israel to carry out provisions of chapter 8 of

part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 under the heading “Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related Programs”, not more than a total of \$5,221,150,000 may be made available for Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, the West Bank and Gaza, the Israel-Lebanon Monitoring Group, the Multinational Force and Observers, the Middle East Regional Democracy Fund, Middle East Regional Cooperation, and Middle East Multilateral Working Groups: *Provided*, That any funds that were appropriated under such headings in prior fiscal years and that were at the time of the enactment of this Act obligated or allocated for other recipients may not during fiscal year 2001 be made available for activities that, if funded under this Act, would be required to count against this ceiling: *Provided further*, That funds may be made available notwithstanding the requirements of this section if the President determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that it is important to the national security interest of the United States to do so and any such additional funds shall only be provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

ENTERPRISE FUND RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 569. Prior to the distribution of any assets resulting from any liquidation, dissolution, or winding up of an Enterprise Fund, in whole or in part, the President shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations, in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, a plan for the distribution of the assets of the Enterprise Fund.

CAMBODIA

SEC. 570. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States executive directors of the international financial institutions to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose loans to the Central Government of Cambodia, except loans to support basic human needs.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the Central Government of Cambodia.

FOREIGN MILITARY TRAINING REPORT

SEC. 571. (a) The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly provide to the Congress by March 1, 2001, a report on all military training provided to foreign military personnel (excluding sales, and excluding training provided to the military personnel of countries belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization) under programs administered by the Department of Defense and the Department of State during fiscal years 2000 and 2001, including those proposed for fiscal year 2001. This report shall include, for each such military training activity, the foreign policy justification and purpose for the training activity, the cost of the training activity, the number of foreign students trained and their units of operation, and the location of the training. In addition, this report shall also include, with respect to United States personnel, the operational benefits to United States forces derived from each such training activity and the United States military units involved in each such training activity. This report may include a classified annex if deemed necessary and appropriate.

(b) For purposes of this section a report to Congress shall be deemed to mean a report to the Appropriations and Foreign Relations Committees of the Senate and the Appropriations and International Relations Committees of the House of Representatives.

KOREAN PENINSULA ENERGY DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATION

SEC. 572. (a) Of the funds made available under the heading “Nonproliferation, Anti-

terrorism, Demining and Related Programs”, not to exceed \$35,000,000 may be made available for the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (hereafter referred to in this section as “KEDO”), notwithstanding any other provision of law, only for the administrative expenses and heavy fuel oil costs associated with the Agreed Framework.

(b) Such funds may be made available for KEDO only if, 30 days prior to such obligation of funds, the President certifies and so reports to Congress that—

(1) the parties to the Agreed Framework have taken and continue to take demonstrable steps to implement the Joint Declaration on Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula in which the Government of North Korea has committed not to test, manufacture, produce, receive, possess, store, deploy, or use nuclear weapons, and not to possess nuclear reprocessing or uranium enrichment facilities;

(2) the parties to the Agreed Framework have taken and continue to take demonstrable steps to pursue the North-South dialogue;

(3) North Korea is complying with all provisions of the Agreed Framework;

(4) North Korea has not significantly diverted assistance provided by the United States for purposes for which it was not intended;

(5) there is no credible evidence that North Korea is seeking to develop or acquire the capability to enrich uranium, or any additional capability to reprocess spent nuclear fuel;

(6) North Korea is complying with its commitments regarding access to suspect underground construction at Kumchang-ni;

(7) there is no credible evidence that North Korea is engaged in a nuclear weapons program, including efforts to acquire, develop, test, produce, or deploy such weapons; and

(8) the United States is continuing to make significant progress on eliminating the North Korean ballistic missile threat, including further missile tests and its ballistic missile exports.

(c) The President may waive the certification requirements of subsection (b) if the President determines that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States and provides written policy justifications to the appropriate congressional committees. No funds may be obligated for KEDO until 30 days after submission to Congress of such waiver.

(d) The Secretary of State shall, at the time of the annual presentation for appropriations, submit a report providing a full and detailed accounting of the fiscal year 2002 request for the United States contribution to KEDO, the expected operating budget of KEDO, proposed annual costs associated with heavy fuel oil purchases, including unpaid debt, and the amount of funds pledged by other donor nations and organizations to support KEDO activities on a per country basis, and other related activities.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

SEC. 573. Funds made available to grantees of the African Development Foundation may be invested pending expenditure for project purposes when authorized by the President of the Foundation: *Provided*, That interest earned shall be used only for the purposes for which the grant was made: *Provided further*, That this authority applies to interest earned both prior to and following the enactment of this provision: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 505(a)(2) of the African Development Foundation Act, in exceptional circumstances the board of directors of the Foundation may waive the \$250,000 limitation contained in that section with respect to a project: *Provided further*, That the

Foundation shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations in advance of exercising such waiver authority.

PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE
PALESTINIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SEC. 574. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to provide equipment, technical support, consulting services, or any other form of assistance to the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation.

IRAQ OPPOSITION

SEC. 575. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the funds appropriated under the heading "Economic Support Fund", not to exceed \$10,000,000 may be made available to support efforts to bring about political transition in Iraq, of which not to exceed \$8,000,000 may be made available only to Iraqi opposition groups designated under the Iraq Liberation Act (Public Law 105-338) for political, economic, humanitarian, and other activities of such groups, and not to exceed \$2,000,000 may be made available for groups and activities seeking the prosecution of Saddam Hussein and other Iraqi government officials for war crimes: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be made available for administrative expenses of the Department of State.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
BUDGET JUSTIFICATION

SEC. 576. The Agency for International Development shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a detailed budget justification that is consistent with the requirements of section 515, for each fiscal year. The Agency shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a proposed budget justification format no later than October 31, 2001, or 30 days after the enactment of this Act, whichever occurs later. The proposed format shall include how the Agency's budget justification will address: (1) estimated levels of obligations for the current fiscal year and actual levels for the two previous fiscal years; (2) the President's request for new budget authority and estimated carryover obligational authority for the budget year; (3) the disaggregation of budget data and staff levels by program and activity for each bureau, field mission, and central office; and (4) the need for a user-friendly, transparent budget narrative.

KYOTO PROTOCOL

SEC. 577. 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 States 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. The limitation established in this section shall not apply to any activity otherwise authorized by law.

WEST BANK AND GAZA PROGRAM

SEC. 578. For fiscal year 2001, 30 days prior to the initial obligation of funds for the bilateral West Bank and Gaza Program, the Secretary of State shall certify to the appropriate committees of Congress that procedures have been established to assure the Comptroller General of the United States will have access to appropriate United States financial information in order to review the uses of United States assistance for the Program funded under the heading "Economic Support Fund" for the West Bank and Gaza.

INDONESIA

SEC. 579. Funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Foreign Military Financing Program" may be made available for Indonesia if the President determines and submits a report to the appropriate congressional committees that the Indonesian government and the Indonesian armed forces are—

- (1) taking effective measures to bring to justice members of the armed forces and militia groups against whom there is credible evidence of human rights violations;
- (2) taking effective measures to bring to justice members of the armed forces against whom there is credible evidence of aiding or abetting militia groups;
- (3) allowing displaced persons and refugees to return home to East Timor, including providing safe passage for refugees returning from West Timor;
- (4) not impeding the activities of the United Nations Transitional Authority in East Timor (UNTAET);
- (5) demonstrating a commitment to preventing incursions into East Timor by members of militia groups in West Timor; and
- (6) demonstrating a commitment to accountability by cooperating with investigations and prosecutions of members of the Indonesian armed forces and militia groups responsible for human rights violations in Indonesia and East Timor.

MAN AND THE BIOSPHERE

SEC. 580. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be provided for the United Nations Man and the Biosphere Program or the United Nations World Heritage Fund.

CONSULTATIONS ON ARMS SALES TO TAIWAN

SEC. 581. Consistent with the intent of Congress expressed in the enactment of section 3(b) of the Taiwan Relations Act, the Secretary of State shall consult with the appropriate committees and leadership of Congress to devise a mechanism to provide for congressional input prior to making any determination on the nature or quantity of defense articles and services to be made available to Taiwan.

RESTRICTION ON UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE
FOR CERTAIN RECONSTRUCTION EFFORTS IN
CENTRAL EUROPE

SEC. 582. Funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for United States assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States should to the maximum extent practicable be used for the procurement of articles and services of United States origin.

RESTRICTIONS ON ASSISTANCE TO GOVERNMENTS
DESTABILIZING SIERRA LEONE

SEC. 583. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the government of any country that the Secretary of State determines there is credible evidence that such government has provided lethal or non-lethal military support or equipment, directly or through intermediaries, within the previous six months to the Sierra Leone Revolutionary United Front (RUF), or any other group intent on destabilizing the democratically elected government of the Republic of Sierra Leone.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the government of any country that the Secretary of State determines there is credible evidence that such government has aided or abetted, within the previous six months, in the illicit distribution, transportation, or sale of diamonds mined in Sierra Leone.

(c) Whenever the prohibition on assistance required under subsection (a) or (b) is exercised, the Secretary of State shall notify the Committees on Appropriations in a timely manner.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 56 offered by Mr. PAYNE:

Page 119, line 24, after "SIERRA LEONE" insert "OR ANGOLA".

Page 120, line 6, after "(RUF)" insert ", or to National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA)".

Page 120, line 8, before the period insert "or the democratically elected government of Angola, as the case may be".

Page 120, line 15, before the period insert "or in Angola".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have an amendment on what I think is probably one of the most horrendous situations that has occurred for the past 40 years in a country that was the first African country to receive its independence back in 1956 from Britain. It is the country of Sudan. The country of Sudan has seen an estimated 2 million people die from famine and war-related issues. In 1998 alone, 100,000 people died because the National Islamic Front government denied United Nations humanitarian food to be delivered to the needy people in the south of Sudan.

More people have died in Sudan than in Bosnia, Kosovo, Somalia, and Congo combined. We have seen food being deprived from people. We have seen the fact that the Antonovs, which are old Soviet planes, fly over communities. I was there several times where we actually would watch the chickens because the chickens would hear the planes from long distances and the children would then run when the chickens started to move around and then the older people would know that the planes are coming, the bombs are coming, you try to get out of it. It is one of the most horrendous situations. Two million people.

All we are asking is that there be nonlethal equipment, that the people be allowed to have food, that they could protect themselves from the aerial bombings, that they could have some semblance of order. The fact is that this would go to the National Democratic Alliance which is made up of the people in the south who are in the process of trying to move along.

At this time we have a technical difference. I understand that we are on the other section. So we would ask that the Clerk would once again read the title.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will state his point.

Mr. CALLAHAN. One amendment was read. The gentleman was talking about the contents of another amendment. I think what he is doing now is trying to swap amendments, or I think he first has to through unanimous consent take this amendment that has been read from the table. But I will leave that decision to the Chair, naturally.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey ask unanimous consent for the Clerk to report the amendment that was designated earlier?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the amendment which has been designated and which is pending.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I will assume that the debate that took place on the previous amendment would suffice for the gentleman's argument on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, with that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment which is currently pending.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 56 offered by Mr. PAYNE:

Page 119, line 24, after "SIERRA LEONE" insert "OR ANGOLA".

Page 120, line 6, after "(RUF)" insert ", or to National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA)".

Page 120, line 8, before the period insert "or the democratically elected government of Angola, as the case may be".

Page 120, line 15, before the period insert "or in Angola".

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the reason for the confusion was that last night we requested that this particular amendment be withdrawn and that the previous resolution asking for UNITA to have any country doing business with them withdrawn. So this amendment we would ask to be withdrawn. That is why the confusion came about. With that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask that that amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to withdrawing the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE)?

Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments made in order to this section of the bill?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to thank the chairman for all he has done to support basic education programs for

children and for his work to improve the lives of families in developing countries, a topic of concern we both share.

My interest in international basic education stems from my conviction which I know the gentleman shares that education is the key to development. Providing basic education in developing nations advances hope for children, advances hope for families, advances hope for communities, and advances hope for the countries we are trying to help.

It also produces clear results. A baby who is born to a mother with just 4 years of education is twice as likely to survive as a baby with an utterly uneducated mother. Every additional year of schooling beyond grade four that a child receives leads to a 10 to 20 percent increase in wages. At a national level, increases in literacy of 20 to 30 percent have led to increases in a country's gross domestic product of 8 to 16 percent.

While we have made progress, there is a long way to go. There are 113 million children who will never go to school. Two-thirds of these are little girls. Another 150 million on top of 113 million who do not go at all will drop out before they get to the fifth grade. The vast majority of these dropouts are little girls. To address this problem, I believe we need to continue and expand our financial commitment to international basic education. Over the last several years, funding for basic education for children has been set at a cap of \$98 million. Now, this year, thanks to the gentleman's leadership, the committee lifted the cap on the funding and increased funding by \$5 million to \$103 million from the child survival account. The gentleman recommended an additional \$15 million be provided from the economic support fund.

Mr. Chairman, I would like this debate to reflect the gentleman from Alabama's thoughts on the record about the commitment to children's education.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I look forward to working with him to support basic education for children. Naturally, I am supportive of that and I know the gentleman as well is supportive.

Mr. POMEROY. If the gentleman will yield further, I hope that as we continue the appropriations process the conferees would consider even increasing additional funds for basic education. Increasing the amount would bring us closer to our historic levels of funding for basic education. In the 1980s, now more than 10 years ago, U.S. support for education reached as much as \$180 million. Five years ago, funding for basic education for children was \$142 million. We are still well short of that, even with this important increase the gentleman has advanced.

I believe that funding will have to be increased further to meet the commit-

ment that our country has made at the World Education Forum in Dakar, Senegal, to get every child in school by the year 2015. Today with more than 113 million out of school, another 150 million dropping out before grade five, it shows that we have to step up this commitment to meet this important goal. Following the Dakar meeting of world leaders, it is particularly important that this Congress show that it is part of the program, part of this international commitment. I look forward to working with the gentleman to make sure this happens.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

VOLUNTARY SEPARATION INCENTIVES

SEC. 584. Section 579(c)(2)(D) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000, as enacted by section 1000(a)(2) of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106-113), is amended by striking "December 31, 2000" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 2001".

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

SEC. 585. Section 635 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2395) is amended by adding a new subsection (I) as follows:

"(I)(1) There is hereby established a working capital fund for the United States Agency for International Development which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for the expenses of personal and nonpersonal services, equipment and supplies for: (A) International Cooperative Administrative Support Services; and (B) rebates from the use of United States Government credit cards.

"(2) The capital of the fund shall consist of the fair and reasonable value of such supplies, equipment, and other assets pertaining to the functions of the fund as the Administrator determines, rebates from the use of United States Government credit cards, and any appropriations made available for the purpose of providing capital, less related liabilities.

"(3) The fund shall be reimbursed or credited with advance payments for services, equipment or supplies provided from the fund from applicable appropriations and funds of the agency, other Federal agencies and other sources authorized by section 607 of this Act at rates that will recover total expenses of operation, including accrual of annual leave and depreciation. Receipts from the disposal of, or payments for the loss or damage to, property held in the fund, rebates, reimbursements, refunds, and other credits applicable to the operation of the fund may be deposited in the fund.

"(4) The agency shall transfer to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts as of the close of the fiscal year such amounts which the Administrator determines to be in excess of the needs of the fund.

"(5) The fund may be charged with the current value of supplies and equipment returned to the working capital of the fund by a post, activity or agency and the proceeds shall be credited to current applicable appropriations."

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language

appearing in the bill beginning with page 121, line 1, through page 122, line 12, on the ground that it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule I have referenced prohibits changes to law on general appropriations bills. This language amends the Foreign Assistance Act to authorize the establishment of a working capital fund for the Agency for International Development.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we will be happy to concede the point of order.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his concession. If I might continue with my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will briefly hear the gentleman on his point of order, although the point of order has been conceded and the Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I revise and extend my remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. After the point of order, the gentleman may revise and extend his remarks.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the point of order.

□ 1015

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, and recognizing the request of the distinguished chairman of the committee, I have some concerns about this motion.

As the gentleman knows, no funds would be appropriated to establish the Working Capital Fund, but the creation of the fund would result in overall savings to the Federal Government. In several overseas locations other agencies have requested USAID to provide various types of administrative support to other agencies, because USAID can provide the support at the lowest cost to the Federal Government. So I hope that the gentleman is aware that this language in the bill is a savings for the Federal Government.

Without a Working Capital Fund, USAID has difficulty becoming a service provider, because we cannot separately account for funds received from other agencies and cannot carry the funds from one year to the next. The fund would also enable an agency to use rebates from prompt payment. This would be an incentive for greater use of credit cards and again save money.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman may not yield when discussing a point of order.

The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair finds the provision directly amends existing law. Such provision constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the provision of the bill is stricken.

Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) may extend his remarks at this point in the record.

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Rule I have referenced prohibits changes to law on general appropriations bills. This language amends the Foreign Assistance Act to authorize the establishment of a working capital fund for the Agency for International Development.

The Administration, which evidently wants this provision, should have approached the Committee with legislative jurisdiction, the Committee on International Relations. Instead, the Administration engaged another Committee that lacks jurisdiction to amend the Foreign Assistance Act.

This is an unfortunate attitude and practice that we have seen from time to time in this and other Administrations and I regret that we have to consume the time of the Appropriations Committee on this sort of matter in this way.

The Administration has not submitted a draft bill to our Committee, nor have they engaged our International Relations Committee in any meaningful way.

I do understand that the Committee on Foreign Relations in the other body has reviewed similar legislation on a working capital fund for the Agency for International Development and our Committee on International Relations would be happy to work with the other body and the Administration from here on out and see if this provision is meritorious.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I must respectfully insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS
POPULATION FUND

SEC. 586. (1) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTION.—Of the amounts made available under "International Organizations and Programs", not more than \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 shall be available for the United Nations Population Fund (hereafter in this subsection referred to as the "UNFPA").

(2) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS IN CHINA.—None of the funds made available under "International Organizations and Programs" may be made available for the UNFPA for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(3) CONDITIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under "International Organizations and Programs" for fiscal year 2001 for the UNFPA may not be made available to UNFPA unless—

(A) the UNFPA maintains amounts made available to the UNFPA under this section in an account separate from other accounts of the UNFPA;

(B) the UNFPA does not commingle amounts made available to the UNFPA under this section with other sums; and

(C) the UNFPA does not fund abortions.

(4) REPORT TO THE CONGRESS AND WITHHOLDING OF FUNDS.—

(A) Not later than February 15, 2001, the Secretary of State shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees indicating the amount of funds that the United Nations Population Fund is budgeting for the year in which the report is submitted for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(B) If a report under subparagraph (A) indicates that the United Nations Population Fund plans to spend funds for a country program in the People's Republic of China in the year covered by the report, then the amount of such funds that the UNFPA plans to spend in the People's Republic of China shall be deducted from the funds made available to the UNFPA after March 1 for obliga-

tion for the remainder of the fiscal year in which the report is submitted.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POPULATION PLANNING

SEC. 587. (a) AUTHORIZATION.—Not to exceed \$385,000,000 of the funds appropriated in title II of this Act may be available for population planning activities or other population assistance.

(b) RESTRICTION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS THAT PERFORM OR ACTIVELY PROMOTE ABORTIONS.—

(1) PERFORMANCE OF ABORTIONS.—(A) Notwithstanding section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or any other provision of law, no funds appropriated by title II of this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

(B) Subparagraph (A) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

(2) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—(A) Notwithstanding section 614 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, or any other provision of law, no funds appropriated by title II of this Act for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, or engage in activities or efforts to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited.

(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

(3) APPLICATION TO FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS.—The prohibitions and certifications of this subsection apply to funds made available to a foreign organization either directly or as a subcontractor or subgrantee.

(c) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—The President may waive the restrictions contained in subsection (b) that require certifications from foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organizations.

(2) REDUCTION OF ASSISTANCE.—In the event the President exercises the authority contained in paragraph (1) to waive either or both subsections (b)(1) and (b)(2), then—

(A) assistance authorized by subsection (a) and allocated for population planning activities or other population assistance shall be reduced by a total of \$12,500,000, and that amount shall be transferred from funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Development Assistance" and consolidated and merged with funds appropriated by this Act under the heading "Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund"; and

(B) notwithstanding any other provision of law, such transferred funds that would have been made available for population planning activities or other population assistance shall be made available for infant and child health programs that have a direct, measurable, and high impact on reducing the incidence of illness and death among children.

(3) LIMITATION.—The authority provided in paragraph (1) may be exercised to allow the

provision of not more than \$15,000,000, in the aggregate, to all foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organizations with respect to which such authority is exercised.

(4) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—Upon exercising the authority provided in paragraph (1), the President shall report in writing to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. GREENWOOD:

Strike section 587 of the bill (page 124, strike line 4 and all that follows through line 15 on page 127).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to share one-half the time allotted to my amendment with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York will control 15 minutes, and may yield time to other Members.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I would like to claim the 30 minutes in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey will control 30 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood-Lowe amendment, for the following reasons. Family planning reduces abortion, it is just that simple. People who go to receive advice on family planning oftentimes go first because they believe that they may be pregnant, and if you say that you may not offer abortion services, you are cutting a substantial amount out of the value of family planning because of the opportunity that people seek to get that advice.

Secondly, this particular provision in the bill prohibits even advocating for a change in the law. Indeed, the way it is written it even prohibits advocating a change in the law to outlaw abortion. Anybody who lobbies their own government in order to affect abortion no longer qualifies for assistance under the bill.

Third and last, this provision is an absolute prohibition on family plan-

ning, and it has a waiver, and this year the waiver was acceptable to me because the President would exercise that waiver. But particularly for pro-choice Republicans, of whom I am one and my colleague from Pennsylvania is another, we do not know who will be President next year, and if our candidate for President is the President next year, which is my desire, I have no assurance that he will exercise the waiver.

So let me repeat that to pro-choice Republicans: We have no guarantee that this waiver, which we were willing to accept last year as a compromise, will in fact be exercised should it be the Republican candidate for President elected. Accordingly, the law would stand, and the law is no money for family planning, because the groups in question cannot make the certification. We are voting today on Greenwood to restore family planning. It is that important, that simple, and that clear.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment which would strike the global gag rule from this bill. This anti-democratic policy forces NGOs in the developing world to sacrifice their right to free speech in order to participate in our family planning programs. While restricting foreign NGOs in this way may only offend our democratic sensibilities, if we tried to do this at home, it would be absolutely unconstitutional.

Section 587 of this bill severely damages our international family planning programs. The demand for these programs is much larger than our limited funds can meet, and section 587 imposes an arbitrary cap on family planning which is \$156 million below the President's request.

Very simply, our family planning programs save lives. 600,000 women die each year of pregnancy-related causes that are often preventable. More than 150 million married women in the developing world want contraceptives, but have no access to them. Increasing access to family planning will save the lives of women and children and it will reduce the incidence of abortion worldwide. Striking this section will reduce the number of abortions performed each day. If you support this objective, you should support this amendment.

We need to consider the global gag rule within the overall context of U.S. foreign policy. What values do we want to export along with our foreign assistance? The gag rule says to our NGO partners abroad that we do not need to care about their rights, that freedom of speech, the very foundation of the American democracy, matters here, but it does not matter abroad, that our commitment to free speech and freedom of association, fixtures of our Constitution, end at our own borders. Is this the kind of message that we want to send?

Make no mistake, the United States is being watched. Each day Members on

both sides of the aisle condemn violations of human rights abroad. Each day we debate whether the United States should associate at all with foreign regimes who refuse to embrace Democratic ideals. Our neighbors around the world look to us as the definitive authority on democracy.

The words of the director of a family planning organization that receives our funding sums up the severe damage that we do to our own credibility by incorporating an anti-democratic policy such as the gag rule into our foreign assistance program:

We believe this requirement is profoundly anti-democratic and does a disservice to the legacy of the United States of America's fight for democracy. Democracy is nourished and strengthened by open debate and freedom of expression. Shackling the discussion of ideas impoverishes such public debate, and, in doing so, weakens democracy. We are now in the difficult position of having to choose between needed funding for an historic project on the one hand and essential democratic participation on the other. Either way, there is a cost to women's reproductive health and to democracy.

Mr. Chairman, if the oppression of ideas with which some do not agree and the use of economic power to crush dissent are ideals one thinks the United States should export, then vote against this amendment. But if believes, as I do, that the strength of our country lies in our unwavering commitment to democracy at home and abroad, then join us in voting yes to strike the global gag rule.

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

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 3½ minutes.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, this is clearly going to be an abortion debate. Others can try to turn it into recycling the old phrase about the gag rule, but this fundamentally an abortion debate, and whether those of us who strongly believe that abortion is taking the life of innocent children should have to pay, and in this question it is not for abortions in our country, but abortions overseas, whether we are going to export this doctrine of death.

I have worked hard in this Congress to fight against child abuse, to fight against domestic violence, to work for creative ways to stop violence in our schools. But it is hard to take a message to our young people that it is wrong to kill other young people, it is wrong to beat children, but if the child is in the womb, you can burn their skin off, you can cut them off, you can take the baby as they are coming out and hit them with a blunt object. Now, that is another form of violence.

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

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman aware that since 1973 it has been against the law to use one dime of these funds for abortions overseas, that the Helms amendment of 1973 prohibits the expenditure of any of these funds for abortion?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am aware that we have directly banned abortion funding, but the question and what we have tried to address and what this language tries to address is fungible funding.

The argument of many of us is that in an organization that on the one hand does abortions, and on the other hand does family planning, which I as an individual do not oppose and believe many of these countries do in fact need family planning, that does not take life once life has begun, that these funds, even though they are claimed to be privately raised, are in fact fungible.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is fine. Let us keep the debate honest and talk about fungibility. Let us not use language that implies that these funds can be directly used for abortion.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I do believe and what my point is is that these funds can be used directly for abortion, because the money is commingled, and while there is a book-keeping process, the fact is that the actual dollars that are used on abortion are fungible and can be used to commit these heinous acts, and that while we may have differences about the book-keeping, the fact is that this argument is often used when we get into voucher debates by the other side, that to give aid to a private school is promoting religion because those dollars then are fungible and can be used back and forth.

You cannot have it both ways. You cannot argue that the Republicans use fungible money when we advocate vouchers, but it is not fungible when we deal with the abortion argument.

The second question on the gag rule, this is not a question of freedom of speech. This is a question of whether taxpayers' dollars can be used to fund certain types of speech, particularly in countries where they may oppose even family planning in addition to abortion.

For example, in one of the more celebrated cases in the Philippines, where they had laws on what type of population methods could be allowed, we used American taxpayer dollars to try to change laws that at least half of the Americans in a deeply split general public do not favor. Why in the world would it be exporting our beliefs of freedom and democracy to use American taxpayer dollars to undermine democracy in other countries where they have concluded, like in Ireland or the Philippines or whatever the case may

be, that certain laws on abortion and population control are wrong?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) concerning the gag rule and other restrictions on family planning in this bill. Not only do family planning programs help millions by allowing poor women to space the birth of their children, it also saves lives and it is key to sound and sustainable development.

The most distressing aspect of the family planning language in this bill concerns the limits on free speech on organizations that provide much needed technical assistance to the poorest of the poor throughout the developing world. It is my conviction that freedom of speech is a fundamental American value that should be respected, not only in our own Nation, but overseas as well. Freedom of speech is an essential ingredient for democracy to thrive and it is critical to the success of sustainable development efforts promoted by our own Nation.

□ 1030

It is a principle that we wish to advocate throughout the developing world as an embodiment of the genius of the American Democratic experience.

Accordingly, limiting eligibility for U.S. development and humanitarian assistance by requiring foreign nongovernmental organizations to forgo their right to use their own funds to address, within legal and democratic processes, any issue affecting the citizens of their own country is abhorrent to the principles of American democracy and of those rights and privileges bestowed upon our people by our Constitution.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I urge our colleagues to support the Greenwood amendment that incorporates the principles of American democracy and ensures that foreign nongovernmental organizations and multilateral organizations shall not be subject to requirements relating to the use of non-U.S. Government funds for advocacy and lobbying activities, other than those that apply to U.S. nongovernmental organizations receiving assistance under the Act.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the Greenwood amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, on Tuesday this House voted 416 to 1 to defend the Vatican from a vicious campaign of anti-Catholic bigotry by major pro-abortion organizations.

The list of groups who seek the Vatican's ouster from the U.N., which includes the International Planned Parenthood Federation based in London, Planned Parenthood Federation of America, and Pathfinder, to name a few, reads like a Who's Who list of groups lavishly subsidized by U.S. taxpayers.

Many of these groups, Mr. Chairman, aggressively promote abortion on demand in foreign countries. Members will recall that about 100 countries around the world protect the lives of their unborn children from the violence of abortion. If only the family planners would stick with family planning alone, we would not be here arguing this issue today.

I think we should make no mistake about it, this debate is about fat subsidies to the abortion industry. This debate is about how Congress dispenses grant money. This is grant money, I say to my colleagues. There is no entitlement spending involved here. This is grant money. This is discretionary funds.

We have an obligation and a duty, I would respectfully submit, to put conditions on if we feel that it is warranted, and many of us, hopefully the majority of us, will feel that it is indeed warranted.

Mr. Chairman, abortion is violence against children. Earlier one of my colleagues talked about human rights. The most fundamental of all human rights is the right to life, to be free from violence. Chemical poisoning a child with a lethal injection or dismembering an unborn child by ripping his or her arms off the body, which is commonplace in abortion, is anything but benign and compassionate. It is violence against children. It is a gross violation of human rights. That is what this is about today.

Members will recall, Mr. Chairman, that the Mexico City policy is named after a U.N. Population Conference held in Mexico City in 1984. It was there that President Reagan announced that he would no longer contribute to organizations that perform or promote abortions. In its most effective and purest form, in place during the Reagan and Bush years, we generously supported family planning but withheld funds from organizations that promote or perform abortions.

The language in this bill is not the full Mexico City policy. I wish it were. The language in this bill is a compromise, and it is current law. From the pro-life perspective, this legislation is far from perfect. Although it begins by incorporating the pro-life Mexico City policy that was in force for 9 years under Presidents Reagan and Bush, it then gives the President the right to waive these conditions for some recipients. If the President chooses to exercise the waiver, up to \$15 million in U.S. population assistance can go to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortions overseas.

The good news is that the remaining \$370 million of our population assistance must either go to sovereign countries or NGOs that practice genuine family planning and not abortion.

Mr. Chairman, American taxpayers do not want their money going to groups that advertise themselves as family planners but in fact are performers and promoters of abortion around the world. Let us not forget, just a month ago there was a Los Angeles Times poll. It found that among all the women in the United States, when asked the question about abortion, 61 percent, of all women said that abortion was murder.

We hope through this legislation to put a very modest but necessary wall of separation between abortion and family planning, and restrict most U.S. funding of the abortion industry overseas.

Another part of the compromise, Mr. Chairman, transfers \$12.5 million to high-impact child survival programs if the President authorizes money for the abortion groups. This provision will have a direct impact on saving children's lives. It will be spent on immunizations for polio and diphtheria, oral rehydration therapy for children at risk of death from diarrhea, and other easily preventable and treatable diseases that currently kill hundreds of thousands of children annually in developing countries.

In other words, this is a moderate, reasonable compromise in which each side gets something but each side also has to give something up.

Frankly, some of us on the pro-life side had seriously considered offering the original Reagan-Bush Mexico City policy. I certainly wanted to do it. I've done so each year since the mid-sixties. But the fact that this is current law—a sustainable compromise—we felt on balance was the best way to proceed. Again, this is a compromise.

This moderate amendment, Mr. Chairman, is already in the bill offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN). So everyone understands the process, the effect of the Greenwood amendment would be to allow unlimited funding of international abortionists and the abortion lobbyists.

Indeed, the amendment would not only strike the pro-life restrictions, it would eliminate the \$385 million cap on U.S. spending for population assistance. This means that the administration could use any amount it wanted from the \$1.3 billion development assistance account for taxpayer subsidies to the international abortion industry.

Mr. Chairman, advocates of international abortion rights have once again dredged up the tired old argument that the Mexico City policy is a gag rule that violates free speech. But even if U.S. constitutional provisions applied to foreign organizations doing business on foreign soil, and the U.S. Supreme Court has said that they do not, the fact of the matter is free

speech would not give these organizations a right to Federal dollars.

Organizations that represent the United States in foreign countries are analogous to our ambassadors. They are our people on the ground. They are surrogates for U.S. foreign policy. Their advocacy in these countries on issues closely related to the U.S. programs they administer, as well as to their other activities, such as the actual performance of abortions, is highly relevant to whether they can effectively administer these programs.

The United States, I would submit, has no obligation to administer these programs through agents who fundamentally disagree with this goal. For the same reason that we would not hire casino lobbyists to run international anti-gambling campaigns, or a distillery to run an anti-alcohol campaign, it makes no sense to hire abortionists or abortion lobbyists to run programs that they claim are aimed at reducing abortions.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying supporters of the Greenwood amendment argue that our family planning grantees should be allowed to perform and promote abortion so long as their abortion-related activities are carried out with "their own money" rather than U.S. grant money.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bookkeeping trick. It ignores the fact that money is indeed fungible, and that when we subsidize an organization we inevitably enrich and empower all of its activities, as well as enhancing the domestic and international prestige of the organization by giving an official U.S. seal of approval.

Let me be clear on the important point: The Mexico City policy does not weaken international family planning programs. On the contrary, it strengthens them by ensuring that U.S. funds are directed to those groups that provide family planning but do not perform or promote abortion.

I urge a strong "no" on the Greenwood amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished ranking member of this committee and a fighter for human rights and freedom around the world.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me, and for her great leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood-Loweley amendment. I call upon our colleagues to vote for the motion to strike the restrictions in the bill because they erect barriers to the promotion of civil society abroad, the enhancement of women's participation in the political process, and the credibility of the U.S. in the international arena.

International family planning enables women and families throughout

the world to make key choices affecting the quality of their lives and their future. Each year 600,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes, more than one woman every minute every day. So I support the move to strike those restrictions.

Mr. Chairman, I want to use the rest of my time to say what is not stricken in the bill, because I think it is very important for Members to know that what is still in the bill, which is law, states "Provided further that none of the funds made available under this heading may be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning, or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortion, and that in order to reduce reliance on abortion in developing nations, funds shall be available only to voluntary family planning projects which offer, either directly or through referral to or information about, access to a broad range of family planning methods and services, and that any such voluntary family planning shall meet the following requirements:"

It goes on to reiterate that no Federal dollars may ever be used for the performance of abortion abroad. These prohibitions are still contained in the bill. The motion to strike is strictly about the gag rule which, as I mentioned, erects barriers to women's full participation in the political process and the promotion of civil society abroad.

I offer that language because we have had questions about how far this strike was. It certainly does not strike the basic law. I urge our colleagues to support this very important amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make simply three points. First of all, under no circumstances can American dollars be used to fund abortions abroad, period. No matter what anyone implies on this floor, that is the law of the United States of America and it cannot happen.

However, I am stunned that representatives in this democracy would stand up on the floor and advocate that our policy be to force citizens of another country to break their own laws. That is simply unheard of and unconscionable.

If in another country abortion is legal and referral to people who can do abortions is legal, then we should not force native citizens of that country not to be allowed to say to a woman who comes in where they can go to get an abortion if it is a legal medical procedure in their country and they have a right to it.

Why would we in a free society want to force, as a consequence of American aid, citizens in other countries to abrogate their own laws? Have we no respect?

When I think of the worry on the floor of this House over the sovereignty issue when we get into trade matters, will the World Trade Organization impose its views on our laws, and the answer to that is no, we do not allow that, we do not allow international agreements to impose themselves in a way that contradicts our domestic law, yet that is exactly what this provision in this bill would do in terms of following U.S. money with a requirement for citizens in other countries to literally abrogate their law.

Let me tell Members why we really have to strike this provision. If a woman comes in and she is already pregnant and she wants a termination, and I am the health person, do Members really want me to say, "I cannot say that word, so you will have to leave and go someplace else to talk to other people?" No. We want to be able to say to that woman, look, maybe she does not have to have an abortion. Maybe she could carry this pregnancy because we can help her after that not to get pregnant again.

Because that is what we are trying to do: We are trying to teach family planning services. We are trying to give women the power to control their reproductive capabilities responsibly.

If she then says, "No, I absolutely have to for a lot of reasons: I have 10 children, we cannot afford it," whatever it is, "and if I cannot get it here, I will go to the back alley," do Members not think it is better for us to say, well, she can legally get a safe, clean abortion, and then come back and we will help her? Through the power of knowledge in a free society, we will help her prevent this and she will never again get in this position where she faces an unwanted pregnancy.

Contraceptives are the right answer to abortion. I urge a "yes" vote on the motion to strike.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 seconds to respond briefly.

The plain text and the implementation by the Clinton administration and by the Reagan-Bush administrations proves that the Mexico City Policy has nothing whatsoever to do with counseling for abortions. That is not on the table, it is not being considered. As much as I would rather it be the case, it is not part of this amendment.

Secondly, the Mexico City Policy does provide for abortions for rape, incest, or life of the mother with their own funds.

Finally, the Policy reflects our intent that every effort to treat a woman suffering from an incomplete abortion be done and is fully authorized by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

□ 1045

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote no on the proposed amendment, the Greenwood motion to strike.

The compromise language already in the bill is the result of long negotiations between this Congress and the President last year. At that time those of us in the House who believe in the sanctity of life felt strongly that no taxpayer money should be used to fund groups that perform or promote abortion or lobby for abortion laws overseas.

The President, needless to say, does not agree with our position; and so we did what we are supposed to do in the legislative process, we compromised. We did not get everything we wanted, and neither did the President.

Mr. Chairman, these negotiations took a long time and a lot of effort to produce the best possible result for all concerned. More to the point, the President signed it. To remove the compromise language would undo all of that hard work. Why reopen a controversy that has already been settled?

I would like to remind my colleagues that under the Reagan-Bush administration, international family planning funds were abortion free, and they got their yearly grants as long as they were abortion free. Most family planning organizations agreed to those conditions. Only two disagreed, one which is responsible for 200,000 abortions a year in the United States refused funds in order to continue their proabortion activities.

The second day after President Clinton was first inaugurated, he issued executive orders. One of the first executive orders he issued was the Mexico City reversal of the pro-life policies, and so the organizations through most of the Clinton administration have received their yearly subsidy with the ability to promote and perform.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that removing this language is really a radical departure of the well being of the American people. The effect of this amendment would be to allow virtually unlimited funding to the international abortion industry and the abortion lobbyists. It would remove the cap of \$385 million, which is the grant money they receive every year, and even the President says that abortions should be rare. A vote for this amendment is a vote to spend.

They could potentially spend up to \$1.3 billion to promote abortion worldwide to lobby other governments against the abortion laws. This is not something the House should be voting for. More than half the nations of the world have laws restricting abortions.

Why should we use taxpayer money from the United States to fund international family planning and lobbyists? Who are we to be sending lobbyists into foreign lands to change policies of other governments that even the American people would not want? Being a superpower does not give us that sort of authority.

The Mexico City policy also recognizes that money is fungible: in one pocket, out the other. The U.S. taxpayers do not want their money going to organizations which do this.

Let us vote against this amendment and urge my colleagues to support the present language.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), a leader on international family planning.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and many others for their leadership on this issue.

First and foremost, family planning helps prevent abortion. No U.S. dollars are used for abortions around the world. This amendment is about saving women's lives. It is about women dying to the tune of over 600,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, while we are debating this motion to strike, over 65 women will die around the world from pregnancy-related causes. This safe delivery kit costs \$1.25; yet it can mean the difference between life and death. Its contents are simple, a plastic sheet, a bar of soap, some gauze, a razor; yet in rural areas and emergency situations, this saves women's lives.

The language we are striking restricts the use of a foreign NGOs own funds. In America, this language is unconstitutional. Around the world, it is unconscionable.

The gag rule is enough to make us gag. It cripples foreign NGOs ability to practice democracy in their own countries. The United States has always been very proud of exporting what is best about our country, our ideals, democracy; but this bill exports one of the worst, if not the worst of our country, our own internal politics.

We cannot afford to stifle the international debate on family planning by tying the hands of NGOs with this antiwoman gag rule. It forces NGOs to choose between their own democratic rights, to organize and to determine what is best in their own countries and desperately needed resources of U.S. family-planning dollars.

This is not a choice we should be forcing on the women of the world, and many of the poorest countries that are often struggling democracies. I urge a yes vote on this important motion to strike.

First and foremost, this is not about abortion.

It's about women dying, to the tune of 600,000 a year.

And it's about saving women lives. No U.S. federal funds have been used or around the world for abortions.

During the time we are debating this amendment, 65 women will die from pregnancy related complications.

This kit, a safe delivery kit, is used around the world where women lack access to adequate health care facilities. It's contents are simple—a sterile sheet of plastic, on which the baby is delivered, a bar of soap, a sterile surgical blade, two rolls of umbilical tape, and cotton gauze bandages.

There few items are enough, to enable women in rural or emergency situations to deliver their babies in safe and sterile conditions.

These kits cost just \$1.25, but their value is priceless. In some cases, these simple tools mean the difference between life and death.

The language in this bill says that a non-governmental organization that receives US AID family planning funds cannot use its own funds to provide legal abortion services or to lobby for or against abortions. This language restricts the use of a foreign NGO's own funds.

In America, this language is unconstitutional.

Around the world, it's unconscionable.

The Gag Rule is enough to make you gag. It cripples foreign NGO's ability to practice democracy in their own countries.

It cripples NGO's in countries like El Salvador, where abortion is illegal even if a woman will die as a result of the pregnancy.

The Gag Rule bars NGO's from even writing a letter to legislators supporting changes in laws to save women's lives.

Many opponents of international family planning like to refer to China's one child policy as a reason not to support programs in China.

But with the Gag Rule, not only will women and families not get the contraception and resources they need to plan their families, but NGO's will be silenced from lobbying their own government to change abortion laws.

International family planning is about the rights of women and men to decide freely the size of their families whether it be in India, Ecuador or China.

The United States has always been dedicated to exporting the very best of our country, from our ideas of freedom and democracy to products that help make life better.

Unfortunately, this bill exports one of the worst, if not the worst, of our country—our internal politics.

There is a terrible irony in all this. In the name of preventing abortion, this policy actually works to increase abortions.

Last year alone, with the Gag Rule in place, thousands of young women lacking information to prevent or postpone pregnancy underwent dangerous and often fatal abortions.

However, with US family planning funds at the President request, 2.2 million abortions can be prevented.

We can't afford to stifle the international debate on family planning by tying the hands of NGO's with an anti-women Gag Rule.

It forces NGO's to choose between their democratic rights to organize and determine what is best in their own countries and desperately needed resources of US family planning dollars.

This is not a choice we should be forcing on the poorest of nations who are often the ones with struggling democracies. Let's support this women of the world and provide the resources for them to make informed decisions, instead of exporting unconstitutional policies.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" and strike the onerous, anti-democratic Gag Rule.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, rigid ideological dogmatic rhetoric always turns logic on its head and always brutalizes the truth.

Let me describe reality outside of the realm of such dogmatic rhetoric. In

March of this year, I traveled to India and to Bangladesh, and in those countries, I visited family planning clinics; and let me tell my colleagues what I saw.

We went to India, New Delhi, to one of the most terrifyingly brutal areas of poverty I have ever witnessed, down dirty roads filled with dung, poor children with their hands out, starvation, disease, flies everywhere, into a little brick clinic. In that clinic I saw impoverished Indian women on their knees getting a lecture about how to use family planning services.

Sometimes women in this neighborhood come to this clinic in search of an abortion. Why do they do that? They are not pregnant because of irresponsible sexual conduct. They are pregnant by their husbands, and they are there sometimes desperate for an abortion because they have already more children than they can feed, and they tire of watching their children starve to death.

Abortion is not their first choice; it is their last choice. In my vision, when those women, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. JOHNSON) said, come in such desperate straits to that clinic, I want American dollars, small amounts of American dollars to be used there to say to that woman, you have had several abortions, there is a better way. We have family planning services available to you, so you need not again become pregnant when you cannot feed the children at your breast as it is, and your body suffers from hemorrhaging because you have had too many pregnancies too closely spaced together.

The impact of the language that we are trying to strike is to make this situation worse, because the President will exercise the waive, and \$12.5 million that could have been spent for family planning to prevent the 1,600 women from dying every hour, to prevent the millions of children from starving around the world, to prevent the millions of abortions that happen for lack of these services. Some of that money will be cut, and women in places like India and Bangladesh and around the world will not get these services, and some of them will die. Many of them will have abortions, and many of them will give birth to children who will starve to death. That is the result of what is happening on the floor today.

It is unconscionable, and it happens every time Members of Congress try to impose their own personal religious beliefs on the women of the world. It is wrong, and it is un-American; and it should not stand.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK).

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment that would allow up to \$1.3 billion to subsidize international abortion clinics,

and it would also undermine foreign countries' laws on abortion.

Congress has repeatedly banned the use of funds, taxpayer dollars to pay for abortions within our own borders, except when the life of the mother is endangered or in cases of rape and incest.

Money is fungible. Any organization that is involved in international family planning efforts and performs abortions and lobbies to increase legal access to abortion on demand should not receive taxpayer dollars.

To these organizations, abortion is a form of birth control. Mr. Chairman, abortion is not a method of birth control. Once a baby is conceived, instead of asking taxpayers to fund an abortion, we should focus our efforts on making sure that the child survives.

At the Beijing +5 conference held last month, the international community made a clear statement that abortion on demand is not a universal goal. The United States should not be funding efforts to change the abortion laws in other countries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), a distinguished leader on women's health.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I have been appalled time and time again by the audacity of antichoice legislators to restrict women's reproductive options in the United States and worldwide. This annual right of quote, "we will show the women who is boss," end quote, legislation has allowed millions of women to die in the Third World.

Mr. Chairman, we stand here every year; and we say 600,000 women die every year, and nobody bats an eyelash. Do not tell me that a poll of people in the United States would approve of that. If the question asked on that poll is would you like the international family planning law of the United States to allow 600,000 women to die, we would get a far different answer.

The problem is that the harshest lesson that people learn about us is that we will allow them to die. Nothing else that we do in foreign aid, nothing else purposefully allows women to die.

The truth of the matter is we will never hear a word here about the woman herself, because mothers do not matter. The children that she leaves motherless at home, they do not matter. The fact that there are unsanitary conditions in which they live do not matter. What matters is the policy and beliefs of some Members of this House, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on the motion to strike.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lowey-Greenwood motion to strike section 587, relating to the global gag rule and limiting vital U.S. assistance for voluntary international family planning.

I am a firm believer in voluntary international family planning. Let me make this clear. International family planning prevents abortions. I do not think anyone can dispute that.

The global gag rule is dangerous because it prevents U.S. funds from reaching critical health care providers in developing nations and dictates how these NGOs can spend funds from other donors besides the U.S. government. We have every right to decide policy for U.S. funds, but not for other nations and private donors. In fact, no U.S. dollars can be used to perform abortions overseas.

Mr. Chairman, I support this prohibition. It is up to the governments and citizens in these nations to decide their own policies. In Malawi, in sub-Saharan Africa, which I recently visited, I witnessed how villagers from miles around used one central health care facility for all of their needs. These people have no options.

If the U.S. fails to fund them, they cannot use the hospital down the road. This is literally one-stop health care shopping with no alternatives. If it is not funded, women will have no access to contraception or any other health care and neither will their families.

Mr. Chairman, I am also opposed to the global gag rule because it is patently undemocratic. If such restrictions were placed on NGOs here, they would be a clear violation of the first amendment.

How can we claim to export democracy when we export limitations on free speech? Mr. Chairman, this is no compromise. This is legislation placed into an appropriations measure, despite the Republican leadership's claim that they would accept no controversial riders.

Mr. Chairman, I think the number of Members on the floor today clearly demonstrates the controversy surrounding this issue. And to call it a compromise when it took holding vital U.N. funding hostage, placing U.S. national security at risk to get the administration to let it in is disingenuous, misleading and downright preposterous.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Lowey-Greenwood amendment.

□ 1100

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3¾ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment and any amendment that would strike the agreed-upon language in section 587 of the Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

Last fall, for the first time during his term, the President signed legislation to restrict the use of United States taxpayer dollars to groups that perform or promote abortions overseas. This version of the so-called "Mexico City policy" allowed no more than \$15 million of United States population assistance funds to go to foreign organizations that promote or perform abortions overseas.

This amendment proposed today would strip that language that the President signed into law last year and allow almost unlimited United States taxpayer subsidies of the international abortion industry.

Now, I know my colleagues on the other side are fond of saying that no United States dollar goes to that purpose, but as we all know, that is an accounting maneuver. This is just another attempt by the pro-abortion side, I believe, to promote their agenda and to create, furthermore, gridlock over this contentious issue of funding for international abortion-related organizations.

The language that this amendment seeks to strike was agreed upon by both sides last year to resolve a stalemate. Unfortunately, the pro-abortion side is unwilling to accept anything other than a total victory for the international abortion industry.

What my colleagues will not acknowledge is that section 587 does not weaken international family planning programs. Rather, it strengthens them by ensuring that United States funds are directed to those groups that provide family planning but not to those who perform abortions or promote abortion as a form of birth control.

Furthermore, it would restrict funding to those organizations that seek to overturn the pro-life laws of more than 100 countries overseas, clearly something that the vast majority of United States taxpayers do not want to see their taxpayer funds being used for.

Abortion is not birth control, and the taxpayers should not be forced to pay for it.

This is a bad amendment, and I encourage my colleagues to vote against it and any other amendment that threatens the language now included in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

It has been said that some of the people on this side of this argument are motivated primarily by religious arguments. As a physician who has personally witnessed an abortion, I do not know how anybody could support abortion after actually seeing one with their eyes. I do not think this is a religious debate. It is certainly a moral debate. It is certainly a debate about what is the appropriate use of United States taxpayer dollars when one considers that millions of Americans feel very strongly that abortion is murder, that this is a very, very reasonable policy for us to have in the bill, and that it is very inappropriate for it to be overturned.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, striking this language would be a victory for women and children and democracy around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a fighter for democracy.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, let me just thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time and for her strong leadership on behalf of the families throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment today to strike the global gag rule which denies United States family planning assistance to any overseas organization that uses its own non-United States funds to provide abortion services or reproductive choice advocacy.

Approximately 600,000 women die each year from preventable complications related to pregnancy and childbirth. Complications are the leading cause of death and disability among women between the ages of 15 to 49 in developing countries.

Now, most of these women are poor, and many have infectious diseases such as HIV or AIDS and are struggling just to survive day by day.

Now, this amendment does not require United States foreign aid funds to be used for abortions. Women throughout the world should have fundamental access to health care and family planning services and health education.

Support for this amendment means saving lives, promoting women's and children's health. To do less is fundamentally undemocratic and morally wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform Members that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 10¼ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) has the right to close debate.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, which would undermine the values in human rights in other countries.

Our current law is designed to prevent taxpayer funds from being used to undermine the values of foreign families by subsidizing organizations which work to undermine pro-life laws that are already in place. This proposed amendment would change this good law.

As legislators, we have the tremendous responsibility of being in charge of other people's money. The dollars we spend do not belong to us. They are the result of hard work of people throughout this land. How we spend these dollars is a decision which is entrusted to us with the effects reaching all around the globe.

Mr. Chairman, Americans value human life, and how we spend our dollars reflects these values. We work to end violence and bring peace throughout the world and promote women's health. Yet, without the foreign family value protections that are in our current law, we would be asking the United States taxpayer to subsidize organizations from the international abortion industry.

Organizations who actively lobby to overturn laws that protect the unborn in other countries do not deserve the subsidies of the United States taxpayers. We support life and health, not death and destruction.

Laws which recognize the sanctity of human life and restrict abortions are currently in place in approximately 100 countries throughout the world.

If this amendment passes, laws that protect unborn children in countries like the Philippines, Nepal, Ghana could be in jeopardy because organizations which promote abortion abroad and lobby to change pro-life laws will be receiving funding from United States taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, abortion is already a hotly debated topic at home. There is certainly no agreement here. But with no agreement here at home, how can we use taxpayer dollars to try to change laws about abortion in other lands. This makes no sense.

This is not about poor people doing family planning. This is about giving taxpayer dollars to men and women in suits and skirts who are lobbying to change laws that reflect the values of other countries.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and support our current law, which honors the values of foreign families and their governments.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), who has been a fighter for women's rights around the world.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. I rise, Mr. Chairman, in strong support of the motion to strike this gag rule from this bill, because congressional support for reproductive health services in developing countries becomes more important every day.

Voluntary family planning services increase child survival, promote safe motherhood, and give women around the globe the help they need to control their lives. Without international family planning, women in developing nations face more unwanted pregnancies, more poverty, and more despair.

Mr. Chairman, it is ironic that the same people who deny women the choice of an abortion also seek to eliminate support for family planning programs. These are the programs that reduce the need for abortion. These same people would not allow organizations that participate in family planning programs to use their very own

funds to provide information and services to women around the globe.

Give women around the world the help they need and vote for the Greenwood-Lowey amendment.

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

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the anti-Mexico City policy amendment and in support of the rights of United States citizens to refuse to subsidize the taking of lives of millions of unborn children throughout the world.

This amendment has nothing to do with the intended purposes of the international family planning. It has everything to do with promoting United States taxpayer-funded abortions.

Mr. Chairman, last November, President Clinton accepted a compromised version of the Reagan-Bush Mexico City policy, which followed the precedent that taxpayers' funds should not be used to pay for abortion services.

The compromise capped population assistance at \$385 million and allowed \$15 million to be used for abortion services or given to agencies that conducted abortion services. This year's Foreign Operations appropriations bill contains the same language that was agreed to last year. More importantly, it reinforces our overseas population assistance efforts to the original intent, to teach individuals the concept of responsible family planning so we could reduce the number of abortions by reducing the number of unplanned pregnancies.

This compromise is not perfect. It does not honor our long-standing tradition of not forcing United States taxpayers to subsidize abortion services for others when they have a moral or religious objection to it. It did, however, move us back in that direction. Now some Members want to undo the compromise that took 7 years of an administration to achieve.

Some of us would like to see all funding for foreign abortion services zeroed out. I am strongly pro-life and believe that every life deserves protection. I do not believe the taxpayers should ever be forced to pay for abortion services. But I am now here today to offer such an amendment because we believe we should honor the spirit of the compromise we reached last year.

Mr. Chairman, not only would this amendment strike the compromise of population assistance, but it would strike the transfer of \$12.5 million to further child survivor programs should the administration choose to fund abortion services.

I urge a no vote on this amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who understands that respecting our constitution here and abroad is an important obligation of Americans.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me urge an enthusiastic vote for the Greenwood-Lowey amendment. Let me agree with the distinguished gentleman from California who has indicated that we do not know what will happen after this Presidential election if the present candidate for the Republican nomination is elected as it relates to pro-choice at all, the opportunity to choose.

But the most important issue we have here today is that the language that this amendment seeks to strike would prohibit family planning. I remind my colleagues what I have said, family planning for poor women around the world, simply the opportunity to be educated about their own body.

I, too, joined the President in going to Bangladesh and India and Pakistan. What an enormous experience to see a family planning clinic that was not destructive or devastating, but was uplifting and educating women and men and families, and it was uniting families, and it was getting men to respect women and women to respect men and to work as mothers and fathers to provide the best for children that they have.

How can we here in the United States Congress deny that very real opportunity that each and every one of us have? We have a right to choose here. Allow those who are neighbors who are fighting for democracy to do the very same thing.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I intend to put a question to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) if I might have his attention. There is not a dime in this bill that will go for an abortion. But we have heard from the other side that money is fungible and so that the money that otherwise might be freed up could be seen for abortion.

The United States allocates more or close to \$1 billion every year in economic aid to Israel. Abortion is legal in Israel, and, in some cases, the government of Israel will fund poor women abortions.

How can the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) support money for economic aid to Israel if he really believes the fungibility argument?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

□ 1115

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, let me just say there is at least, hopefully, only one government per country, whereas there is a myriad of NGOs—a large number of NGOs, NGOs that are trying to lobby governments to topple pro-life laws. That is what we are talking about.

Way back in 1984 we accepted a compromise to fund countries, again, because there is only one government per country.

But when we talk about a nongovernmental organization, if this nongovernmental organization does not take the money, another will step up to the plate and procure the grant.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would ask the gentleman if it is fungible in the case of Israel?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I do not think so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, today, of course, we are considering H.R. 4811, the fiscal year 2001 foreign operations appropriations bill, and I rise in strong opposition to the amendment at hand.

This bill includes language carried over from last year's bill, as has already been discussed. This language was a carefully crafted compromise which limits the amount of funding that can be distributed to foreign organizations that perform or promote abortions overseas. This amount was capped at \$15 million. Of course, that is \$15 million more than we would like to have seen; however, the agreement prevented hundreds of millions of dollars more from going into the abortion industry.

The compromise also transfers \$12.5 million to child survival programs if the President approves any U.S. subsidies for foreign abortion providers or promoters. This transfer would have the direct tangible effect of saving the lives of children around the world through immunization and oral rehydration therapy. These measures would prevent or treat diseases that currently take the lives of hundreds of thousands of innocent children every year.

The proposed amendment would strike this language and allow up to \$1.3 billion in U.S. funds to flow freely to the international abortion industry. This is of great concern to me personally, and I believe that it should not be allowed. Economic development and health care are how to help families in other countries, not the funding of groups that have performed abortions in the name of birth control.

I sincerely request my colleagues to join with me today in opposing this amendment and reaffirming the Mexico City policy compromise that we agreed to and passed into law last year. The language currently in the bill will save the lives of countless children around the world, both born and unborn.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), one of my colleagues who was also on that trip to India and saw the abject conditions that these men, women, and families are living in.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, as a new Member, I have to admit that I really did not understand until I got here how dramatically what we do here

affects, for better or for worse, in the most intimate ways, the lives of men and women and children every single day in all parts of the globe.

We are the only superpower in this world, and our capacity right now to do good in the face of starvation and disease and poverty is so great that it makes me weep with frustration that we are doing so little. But I am truly overwhelmed by the audacity that we would use our great power to require the clinics like we saw, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), to certify that they will not, with their own non-U.S. dollars, conduct any activity related to abortions so that they can control their own families and take care of the children that they have.

It is on behalf of those men and women and children that I urge support for the motion to strike.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a woman who has been fighting for equal opportunity, democracy in the United States and around the world, and who understands the importance of striking this antidemocratic amendment.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I ask Members to stand back for a moment from the gag rule. Seldom have so many violations of cardinal American principles, which enjoy overwhelming support and respect in our own country, been embodied in one law.

Look at what is at stake here: free speech, female and family sexual autonomy, baseline protection of pregnant women and the most vulnerable children, reduction of abortions around the world. It is impossible to believe that any American would force on foreigners what no Member could or would do in our own country.

The direct effect between suppression of speech and its effects is not always apparent. We must not allow this cut-off-your-nose-to-spite-your-face gag rule to reap what it will sow in maternal and infant deaths, high-risk and unintentional pregnancies, escalated and unnecessary rates of abortion.

Support American principles, vote for the Greenwood-Lowe amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a distinguished Member of the Committee on the Judiciary who truly understands that we cannot do unto others what we would not do unto our own NGOs at home.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, this bill would place an international gag rule on organizations that use their own non-U.S. supplied funds to provide abortion services, or even to refer people or to mention abortion services.

The American people support family planning and realize that it is necessary, successful, and addresses a critical need. Nearly 600,000 women a year die of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth, and more than 150 million married women in the developing world want contraceptives but have no access to them. International family planning efforts have been remarkably successful and have saved women's lives, improved women's health, and reduced poverty.

It is shocking that proponents of the so-called Mexico industry restrictions claim that these family planning programs increase the number of abortions when, in fact, it is clear that these efforts have prevented more than 500 million unintended pregnancies. The Mexico City restrictions are pernicious, unnecessary, and harmful. They would severely limit family planning efforts and result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women, and more abortions. They are a clear restriction on free speech which we would never tolerate in this country. Why should America export restrictions on free speech?

Mr. Chairman, this bill would place an international gag rule on organizations that use their own non-U.S. funds to provide abortion services. This policy is clearly unacceptable, and is not supported by the President or by the American people. Last year, in a repugnant effort that held UN dues payments hostage to family planning restrictions, we were forced into an unworkable compromise. We cannot allow this to happen again. We must remain strong and oppose the global gag rule that threatens women's lives.

The American people support family planning and realize that it is necessary, successful, and addresses a critical need. According to the World Health Organization, nearly 600,000 women die each year of causes related to pregnancy and childbirth, and more than 150 million married women in the developing world want contraceptives, but have no access to them.

International family planning efforts have been remarkably successful and have saved women's lives improved women's health, and helped reduce poverty. I am shocked that proponents of these so-called "Mexico City" restrictions claim that our family planning programs, increase the number of abortions, when, in fact, studies show that these efforts have prevented more than 500 million unintended pregnancies.

There is no need to impose this type of gag rule on organizations that use their own money to further their objectives and to make women's lives safer. The "Mexico City" restrictions are pernicious, unnecessary, and harmful. They severely limit family planning efforts and result in more unwanted pregnancies, more fatalities among women, and more abortions. They are a clear restriction on free speech. What an American export. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Thank you.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if the only remaining speaker will be the gentleman from

Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) after myself.

The CHAIRMAN. All the time of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of our time.

Mr. Chairman, a moment ago we heard the golden rule espoused, "do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Well, let me just suggest that what we are trying to do with our foreign policy is to have a consistent ethic of life, of protecting mothers and babies and not sacrificing the children. To treat "others" with respect, dignity and compassion. And that includes unborn babies. You can't cherry pick the gold rule.

Earlier the word brutalizing was used by my friend from Pennsylvania. It is the baby, I would respectfully submit, who is brutalized in an abortion. Again, we are trying to promote a consistent ethic that affirms both mother and child.

I take a back seat to no one, as a Member of this body for the last 20 years, in promoting maternal health care both domestically and abroad. As a member of the Committee on International Relations, I have offered amendments to boost spending to help women be healthier in the developing world.

Earlier, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) talked about the Mexico City Policy as being antiwoman. Nothing could be further from the truth. This policy is pro-life, pro-mother, and pro-child, and absolutely not antiwoman. Such a charge is absolutely ludicrous. If Mrs. MALONEY's charge was accurate, then the majority of the women in America are antiwoman. The LA Times poll that I mentioned earlier, found that 61 percent of all the women in America believe abortion to be murder, 61 percent of the women in America are not antiwoman. It just does not follow logic, and I think hurling such statements at us, it degrades the level and caliber of our debate.

Mr. Chairman, advocates of this pro-abortion amendment keep telling us over and over again that we should subsidize foreign abortionists and abortion lobbyists so long as they do not use U.S. dollars for the actual abortions and the actual lobbying. But this ignores the real effect of subsidizing the international abortion industry. These groups are the partners and the representatives of the U.S. Government in the countries where they operate.

Do my colleagues think the average poor person in Peru or Nigeria has any idea what the financial records look like from these organizations? All they know is that these groups are representing the United States and they are performing and promoting abortions. They have no way of knowing which dollars are paying for which activities. They do not ask for an accounting exercise. So they get the

strong message that the U.S. family planning program is about exporting abortion on demand, pushing abortion on poor people around the world.

Mr. Chairman, this is not just a hypothetical possibility. These are the facts on the ground in country after country throughout the developing world. The largest U.S. population grantees are also the most prominent and vigorous advocates of abortion on demand. What a profound tragedy. The Greenwood amendment would make this situation even worse by removing any limits at all on U.S. subsidies for the international abortion industry. I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, just to echo the arguments eloquently made by the gentleman from New Jersey.

I want to encourage my colleagues to vote against this amendment and remind them that this is the very same legislation currently in the bill that passed last year and was signed into law by the President, and, of course, ratified by the Senate.

So all Members have to do is look at their voting record last year to see how they voted. The House overwhelmingly voted for this last year, and I would encourage all of our colleagues to vote against the Greenwood amendment which strikes last year's language.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I once heard an old African American woman, much wiser I think on this issue than anyone who has spoken in this Chamber today. She lived through the time when abortion was illegal in the United States. And she said that when a woman knows in her heart that it is right to have a child, she will risk her life to have that child; and when she knows in her heart that it is wrong for her to have that child, she will risk her life not to have that child.

Women have sought abortions legally and illegally all over this world for as long as we can remember. They do so under the most desperate circumstances. In Bolivia, not too long ago, it was not only illegal to have an abortion, it was illegal to seek family planning services. And when they did a survey of their hospitals in Bolivia, they found that 50 percent of the beds were occupied by women suffering from botched illegal abortions.

That is what this language does. The language that we move to strike promotes abortion in the name of limiting abortion. That is the twisted logic. It sacrifices the lives of young women, and it sacrifices the lives of little children on the altar of blind rigid dogma. It is the logic that says we must burn to purify. That logic has been wrong throughout history every time it has been applied. Millions have suffered from that blind brutal logic.

That is the moral low ground. We stand on the moral high ground. I urge

the Members of the Congress to use their hearts and their minds and put aside the politics of this issue for the moment; put aside the pragmatism of moving this bill, and adopt the Greenwood amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is not permitted under the order of the House to strike the last word while an amendment is pending. The gentlewoman may ask unanimous consent that both sides have additional time.

Ms. PELOSI. I ask unanimous consent, then, Mr. Chairman, to extend the time.

The CHAIRMAN. For what period?

Ms. PELOSI. For 5 minutes on my side, but pleased to yield 5 minutes to the other side as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

Mr. CALLAHAN. There is objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to request reconsideration by the distinguished chairman of the motion to request 5 more minutes.

□ 1130

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would yield, as she knows, we have established these boundaries on these amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) would renew her request, the gentleman may reserve the right to object for a brief colloquy.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman may not strike the last word.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes. What can I do, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman renews her unanimous consent request to add 5 additional minutes to both sides, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) reserves the right to object and is recognized under his reservation.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to request the extension of the time so that I can yield time to the distinguished Democratic leader for the 5 minutes so he can speak to the issues that we have been speaking to this morning, and I respectfully request the cooperation of the chairman in that regard.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI)?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Five additional minutes will be added to each side of the debate. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) will control 5 additional minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) will control 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) the distinguished leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and I thank the chairman for allowing this additional debate to go on.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lowey-Greenwood amendment. The inadequate funding and restrictions on our international family planning assistance in this bill should be rejected. And that is only one of the many glaring flaws in this bill that I hope we can correct this afternoon.

As we heard so eloquently last night, the funding in this bill for debt relief is clearly inexcusable. With the funding provided in this bill, governments in developing nations will continue to stagger under huge loads of debt. Millions of people in Africa, South America, Central America will be deprived of much needed education, health care and development. These governments will have to repay loans before addressing the fundamental need of their people.

Another outrageous shortcoming in this bill is the cut in funding requested to fight the global HIV/AIDS pandemic.

People in America, our constituents, are just in many cases beginning to learn of the tragedy of AIDS in Africa and around the world. This is a crisis that has affected us and people around the world for many years now. But in African nations it reaches alarming proportions.

I led a delegation that some of my colleagues accompanied me on in December to Nigeria and Zimbabwe and South Africa. It is one thing to intellectualize and theorize about this problem. It is quite another thing to confront dying humanity by the thousands and thousands.

Twenty-two million people in Africa are infected with HIV/AIDS. Many, many more thousands are infected each week, each month.

This issue, in my opinion, is the moral imperative of our time. How much longer will we go on and say it does not matter, it does not concern me that 22 million people are probably going to die?

I can theorize about it. But when I confront it head on, as we did in a village in Zimbabwe where everyone we met was infected with HIV/AIDS, it is a different matter.

There has never in the history of the world been a threat to life like this. If

an Army were raging through Africa killing millions of people, we would be mounting armies to go to Africa to save lives. We say we are concerned with life.

This is the issue of life in our world today. I beg the Members to vote for these amendments, to move our world in the right direction to provide the assistance and the aid that people are crying out for.

Finally, I will say we met the head doctor of the largest hospital in Johannesburg. He is a pediatrician. He said that half the children that are born in the hospital right now are infected with HIV/AIDS and will die within the next year; and we cannot even provide, he said, the medication that we know we can provide that costs about \$8 to make sure that the children of HIV-infected AIDS patients will be free of AIDS. And it is 70 percent effective. Eight dollars. Eight dollars to make sure that a child who will be born will not die.

This is the moral issue of our time. I pray that this House and all of our great Representatives will stand and deliver on the moral issue, the most important moral issue we will ever face. Vote for these amendments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will try to be brief and just say that the eloquence of the minority leader and his comments are something that many of us agree with. But he was speaking to the issue of AIDS not the pending pro-abortion amendment.

HIV/AIDS certainly is a devastating scourge on the planet. To date it has claimed the lives of millions of victims and we must find a cure. When Mr. GEPHARDT talked about the \$8 for medicine it's worth pointing out that I raised the issue myself at the Committee on International Relations over a year ago. Thankfully, some of the drug companies have offered to provide certain AIDS drugs at cost to foreign governments and NGOs in an effort to mitigate the transference of AIDS to newborns. Since then I have requested our Agency for International Development to make money available to purchase those kinds of drugs to ensure HIV-free babies.

Mr. GEPHARDT really spoke to amendments that will follow this, although he did make a passive reference to the pending legislation.

Mr. Chairman, let me just also say that this vote is not about family planning, it is about abortion promotion and the performance of abortion. Our hope is to continue the wall of separation between the taking of human life by abortion and the prevention of human life. And that policy, which was in effect for 9 years during the Reagan-Bush years worked extremely well. During those years—and now—the United States was and continues to be the largest donor to family planning programs in the world. As a matter of fact, no one even comes close.

The current policy is both pro-family planning and pro-life.

Because many of us believe that the most elemental of all human rights is the right to life, that babies should not be subjected to the violence of abortion, to dismemberment, to chemical poisoning and other methods of battering. The ugly face of abortion, the cruelty of the methods is often masked and sanitized by the advocates of abortion. They do not want to talk about what is done to the baby to procure "fetal demise." It is too ugly. I believe, however, that we need to face the brutal truth of what abortion does to a baby. And the wounds it inflicts on the mother. It is violence against children.

I urge a no vote, a no vote on the pending amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to the minority leader and the gentlewoman from California's (Ms. PELOSI) request for additional time, I will tell my colleague that I removed my objections because I know the minority leader is busy, especially in his new role running for vice president, and I want to accommodate him every way we can. But I would encourage the gentlewoman to restrain if she possibly can from asking for unanimous consent requests, because Members have schedules and I would appreciate very much her not asking for unanimous consent requests for extended time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding from a previous ruling of the parliamentarian that that was in order, or else I would have informed my colleague in advance of the request. But I did not think it was an extraordinary request. But I hear what he is saying, and I appreciate that. I will do my best.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage Members to vote no on all three amendments coming up and remind them that last year I think it was a near unanimous vote for the bill which included this exact same language and which the President signed into law. So I would urge a no vote on all three amendments.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I oppose Section 587 of this bill for two reasons. The first is that this language belongs in an authorizing bill and not an appropriations bill. This is a very complex and controversial issue. The attention that this issue requires can only be properly

addressed by the International Relations Committee. The second reason I oppose this language is because I believe that it is bad policy.

Our foreign assistance dollars are used to help people in developing countries. One of the greatest challenges facing these countries is quality of health care. Family planning services are the fundamental services that are directly needed by women and children. Further, these services provide the basis from which to address infectious diseases, especially HIV/AIDS. Without family planning services, you cannot effectively address the overall health needs of people in the developing world. It is as simple as that.

The restrictions in Section 587 further inhibit an already over-challenged program. USAID has not even begun to meet the increasing demand for family planning services. Bureaucracy coupled with historically low funding effectively cripple this program. Safeguards have been in place and enforced for over two decades to be sure that U.S. law is followed by international organizations. If we want to improve the health care provided with U.S. funds to people in developing countries, we must begin to facilitate the delivery of these services instead of making it more difficult.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for offering this amendment and encourage our colleagues support it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Greenwood-Lowey amendment to strike Section 587 from H.R. 4811.

Section 587, known as the "global gag rule" or the Mexico City language, is not just anti-family planning, it is anti-democracy and anti-free speech. Section 587 denies U.S. family planning assistance to any organization operating overseas that uses its own non-U.S. funds to provide abortion services or engage in advocacy related to abortion.

Voluntary family planning prevents maternal and child deaths, unintended pregnancies, unsafe abortions, and HIV/AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases. Time and again, studies have shown that access to international family planning programs is one of the most effective means of reducing abortions. Additionally, in many communities, the local family planning provider is the only source of primary health care for the entire family.

These important programs should not be burdened by restrictions that would be illegal if imposed in the United States. More than illegal, they would be unconstitutional. Why would we want to undermine the right of foreign NGOs to freedom of speech and the right to participate in their countries' democratic processes? That's what Section 587 demands.

Why would we want to erect barriers to the development of democracy in these countries, the promotion of civil society, and the enhancement of women's participation in the political and economic mainstream? That's what Section 587 demands.

And why would we want to undermine the international credibility of the United States' commitment to promote women's health and women's participation in democracy abroad? That's what Section 587 demands.

Section 587 is an extremist position. I urge my colleagues to strike it from this bill. Support the Greenwood-Lowey amendment.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood Amendment, which

will strike Section 587 of this foreign aid spending bill.

Today, we have a chance to help developing nations around the world by correcting an egregious error in U.S. foreign policy: the global gag rule.

The gag rule is a shameful policy that punishes developing nations for doing precisely what we consistently encourage them to do: strengthen their democratic institutions by promoting and protecting freedom of speech.

The gag rule forbids U.S. foreign assistance from going to organizations that use their own, non-U.S. funds to lobby their government on reproductive issues.

The promotion of free speech is a principal goal of U.S. foreign policy and essential to the development of democratic forms of government. The United States—which prides itself on its protection of basic human rights, like freedom of speech—should not restrict these rights in other nations.

I hear all the time—and wholeheartedly agree—that opening up trade with China will lead to greater freedoms to speak in that country, which in turn will promote democracy.

But when it comes to family planning, we suddenly want to stifle voices within developing nations. We want to limit their right to speak out. We force them to relinquish their right to free speech in order to participate in U.S.-supported family planning programs. We force on these NGOs restrictions that would be unconstitutional were they imposed on U.S. organizations.

Mr. Chairman, intentional family planning programs worldwide save the lives of mothers and children, profoundly benefit women's social and economic situations, and dramatically reduce the incidence of abortion.

The global gag rule on international family planning stifles the ability of these programs to operate, placing the lives of mothers and their children at stake.

These misguided restrictions were included as part of the FY 2000 Consolidated Appropriations bill and they are again included in Section 587 of the bill we are considering today.

If we do not remove this provision, we will defund organizations that help reduce the number of abortions worldwide. These organizations provide voluntary, preventative family planning services. They help prevent a number of serious global problems, including: mother and infant mortality, unemployment, illiteracy and Third World debt.

According to the U.S. Agency for International Development, every day approximately 1,600 women die of complications stemming from pregnancy and childbirth. That is about 600,000 women dying each year from pregnancy-related causes. And complications from pregnancy and childbirth are the leading cause of death and disability for women in developing countries aged 15 to 49.

Studies show family planning and reproductive health services can help prevent one in four of those needless deaths. And, in addition to preventing maternal deaths, family planning can reduce the millions of long-term illnesses and disabilities that result each year from pregnancy-related complications.

Family planning also helps women space births, which is critical to improving the health of their children. Just by increasing the time between births or the age of first motherhood, family planning can reduce infant and child mortality by up to 25 percent.

Mr. Chairman, we need to repeal the global gag rule. Let's pass this amendment, and let's put an end to this annual debate.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would strike the global gag rule from this bill.

This anti-democratic policy forces NGOs in the developing world to sacrifice their right to free speech in order to participate in our family planning programs. And while restricting foreign NGOs in this way may only offend our democratic sensibilities, if we tried to do this at home it would be absolutely unconstitutional.

Section 587 of the bill, severely damages our international family planning programs. The demand for these programs is much larger than our limited funds can meet, and Section 587 imposes an arbitrary cap on family planning, which is \$156 million below the President's request. Very simply, our family planning programs save lives. Six hundred thousand women die each year of pregnancy-related causes that are often preventable. More than 150 million married women in the developing world want contraceptives, but have no access to them. Increasing access to family planning will save the lives of women and children, and it will reduce the incidence of abortion worldwide. Striking this section will reduce the number of abortions performed each day—if you support this objective, you should support this amendment.

We need to consider the global gag rule within the overall context of U.S. foreign policy. What values do we want to export along with our foreign assistance?

The gag rule says to our NGO partners abroad that we don't care about their rights. That freedom of speech, the very foundation of American democracy, matters here, but it doesn't matter abroad. That our commitment to free speech and freedom of association, fixtures of our Constitution, end at our own borders. Is this the kind of message we want to send?

Make no mistake: the United States is being watched. Each day, members of this Congress on both sides of the aisle condemn violations of human rights abroad. Each day we debate whether the United States should associate at all with foreign regimes who refuse to embrace democratic ideals. Our neighbors around the world look to us as the definitive authority on democracy.

I think the words of the director of a family planning organization that receives our funding sums up the severe damage we do to our own credibility by incorporating an anti-democratic policy such as the gag rule into our foreign assistance program.

"We believe this requirement is profoundly anti-democratic and does a disservice to the legacy of the United States' fight for democracy," the director wrote. "Democracy is nourished and strengthened by open debate and freedom of expression; shackling the discussion of ideas impoverishes such public debate and, in doing so, weakens democracy . . . We are now in the difficult position of having to choose between needed funding for a historic project on the one hand, and essential democratic participation on the other. Either way, there is a cost to women's reproductive health and to democracy."

If the suppression of ideas with which some don't agree, and the use of economic power to crush dissent—are ideals you think the United States should export, then vote against this

amendment. But if you believe, as I do, that the strength of our country lies in our unwavering commitment to democracy at home and abroad, then join me in voting "yes" to strike the global gag rule.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in this motion to strike the Global Gag Rule language that is contrary to the principles of democracy that we claim to advocate and that simply sweeps the women around the world under the political table.

The family planning programs our country funds are doing critical work to provide reproductive health care for millions of women around the globe to help prevent unwanted pregnancies, and yes, help prevent abortions. These family planning programs are many times the only health care these women and their families have. They are also spreading the first seeds of democracy in countries that are struggling to care for their own people.

But what this bill says to these international family planning groups is that in order to be a part of our system you must forfeit your right to determine what you will do with your own private funds. You must not talk about certain things. You must not perform certain health care services. You must report to us what you do with your own money.

Mr. Chairman, this sounds to me shockingly similar to the undemocratic behavior we criticize in other countries. If we were to impose these mandates on U.S. groups they would be struck down as unconstitutional. Yet when it comes to abortion, some members of this House seem to think anything goes. Tell them they can't even talk about it. It is unconscionable. It is not our money we are now controlling. We do not fund abortions—we haven't for decades. We have now begun to restrict what groups do with their own money.

Who will suffer with we penalize the funding for these groups that provide certain health care services? Women and children. Some of the most impoverished women and children in the world.

This goes to our basis values. As a country that is prosperous, that has the means to provide health care so that fewer women will die, funding family planning is a statement that these women matter. That every child in this world matters.

I urge my colleagues not to go along with the undemocratic restriction on international family planning organizations. This vote comes down declaring your support for women's health, preventing abortion, and truly standing up for democratic values. Support this motion to strike.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 546, proceedings will resume immediately after this vote on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: Amendment No. 27 offered by the gentlewoman from Cali-

fornia (Ms. WATERS) and the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote on these two amendments.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 206, noes 221, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 396]

AYES—206

Abercrombie	Gejdenson	Morella
Ackerman	Gephardt	Nadler
Allen	Gibbons	Napolitano
Andrews	Gilchrest	Neal
Baca	Gilman	Obey
Baird	Gonzalez	Olver
Baldacci	Gordon	Ose
Baldwin	Green (TX)	Owens
Barrett (WI)	Greenwood	Pallone
Bass	Gutierrez	Pascarell
Becerra	Hastings (FL)	Pastor
Bentsen	Hill (IN)	Payne
Berkley	Hilliard	Pelosi
Berman	Hinchey	Pickett
Biggart	Hinojosa	Pomeroy
Bilbray	Hoeffel	Porter
Bishop	Holt	Price (NC)
Blagojevich	Hooley	Pryce (OH)
Blumenauer	Horn	Ramstad
Boehlert	Houghton	Rangel
Bonior	Hoyer	Reyes
Boswell	Inslee	Rivers
Boucher	Isakson	Rodriguez
Boyd	Jackson (IL)	Rothman
Brady (PA)	Jackson-Lee	Roukema
Brown (FL)	(TX)	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Jefferson	Rush
Campbell	Johnson (CT)	Sabo
Capps	Johnson, E. B.	Sanchez
Capuano	Jones (OH)	Sanders
Cardin	Kaptur	Sandlin
Carson	Kelly	Sawyer
Castle	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clayton	Kilpatrick	Scott
Clement	Kind (WI)	Serrano
Clyburn	Kleczka	Shays
Condit	Kolbe	Sherman
Conyers	Kuykendall	Sisisky
Coyne	Lampson	Slaughter
Cramer	Lantos	Snyder
Crowley	Larson	Spratt
Davis (FL)	Lazio	Stabenow
Davis (IL)	Leach	Stark
Davis (VA)	Lee	Strickland
DeFazio	Levin	Sweeney
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Tanner
Delahunt	Lofgren	Tauscher
DeLauro	Lowe	Thomas
Deutsch	Luther	Thompson (CA)
Dicks	Maloney (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Dingell	Maloney (NY)	Thurman
Dixon	Markey	Tierney
Doggett	Matsui	Towns
Dooley	McCarthy (MO)	Turner
Edwards	McCarthy (NY)	Udall (CO)
Ehrlich	McDermott	Udall (NM)
Engel	McGovern	Velazquez
Eshoo	McKinney	Visclosky
Etheridge	Meehan	Walden
Evans	Meek (FL)	Waters
Farr	Meeke (NY)	Watt (NC)
Fattah	Menendez	Waxman
Filner	Millender-	Weiner
Foley	McDonald	Wexler
Ford	Miller, George	Wise
Fowler	Minge	Woolsey
Frank (MA)	Mink	Wu
Franks (NJ)	Moakley	Wynn
Frelinghuysen	Moore	
Frost	Moran (VA)	

NOES—221

Aderholt	Bereuter	Burton
Archer	Berry	Buyer
Armey	Bilirakis	Callahan
Bachus	Bliley	Calvert
Baker	Blunt	Camp
Ballenger	Boehner	Canady
Barcia	Bonilla	Cannon
Barr	Bono	Chabot
Barrett (NE)	Borski	Chambliss
Bartlett	Brady (TX)	Coble
Barton	Bryant	Coburn
Bateman	Burr	Collins

Combest	Kanjorski	Roemer
Cook	Kasich	Rogan
Cooksey	Kildee	Rogers
Costello	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Cox	Kingston	Ros-Lehtinen
Crane	Klink	Royce
Cubin	Knollenberg	Ryan (WI)
Cunningham	Kucinich	Ryun (KS)
Danner	LaFalce	Salmon
Deal	LaHood	Sanford
DeLay	Largent	Saxton
DeMint	Latham	Scarborough
Diaz-Balart	LaTourette	Schaffer
Dickey	Lewis (CA)	Sensenbrenner
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Sessions
Doyle	Linder	Shadegg
Dreier	Lipinski	Shaw
Duncan	LoBiondo	Sherwood
Dunn	Lucas (KY)	Shimkus
Ehlers	Lucas (OK)	Shows
Emerson	Manzullo	Shuster
English	Martinez	Simpson
Everett	Mascara	Skeen
Ewing	McCollum	Skelton
Fletcher	McCrery	Smith (MI)
Fossella	McHugh	Smith (NJ)
Gallely	McInnis	Smith (TX)
Ganske	McIntyre	Souder
Gekas	McKeon	Spence
Gillmor	Metcalf	Stearns
Goode	Mica	Stenholm
Goodlatte	Miller (FL)	Stump
Goodling	Miller, Gary	Stupak
Goss	Mollohan	Sununu
Graham	Moran (KS)	Talent
Granger	Murtha	Tancredo
Green (WI)	Myrick	Tauzin
Gutknecht	Nethercutt	Taylor (MS)
Hall (OH)	Ney	Taylor (NC)
Hall (TX)	Northup	Terry
Hansen	Norwood	Thornberry
Hastert	Nussle	Thune
Hastings (WA)	Oberstar	Tiahrt
Hayes	Ortiz	Toomey
Hayworth	Oxley	Trafficant
Hefley	Packard	Upton
Herger	Paul	Vitter
Hill (MT)	Pease	Walsh
Hilleary	Peterson (MN)	Wamp
Hobson	Peterson (PA)	Watkins
Hoekstra	Petri	Watts (OK)
Holden	Phelps	Weldon (FL)
Hostettler	Pickering	Weldon (PA)
Hulshof	Pitts	Weller
Hunter	Pombo	Weygand
Hutchinson	Portman	Whitfield
Hyde	Quinn	Wicker
Istook	Radanovich	Wilson
Jenkins	Rahall	Wolf
John	Regula	Young (AK)
Johnson, Sam	Reynolds	Young (FL)
Jones (NC)	Riley	

NOT VOTING—8

Chenoweth-Hage	Forbes	Smith (WA)
Clay	McIntosh	Vento
Cummings	McNulty	

□ 1203

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GREEN of Texas changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 546, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on each amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 27 offered by Ms. WATERS: Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$82,500,000)".

Page 3, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$7,000,000)".

Page 30, line 8, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$155,600,000)".

Page 33, line 6, after the first dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$5,250,000)".

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$200,000,000)".

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 211, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 397]

AYES—216

Abercrombie	Ganske	Minge
Ackerman	Gejdenson	Mink
Aderholt	Gephardt	Moakley
Allen	Gilchrest	Mollohan
Andrews	Gonzalez	Moore
Baca	Gordon	Moran (VA)
Bachus	Green (TX)	Morella
Baird	Gutierrez	Murtha
Baldacci	Hall (OH)	Nadler
Baldwin	Hastings (FL)	Napolitano
Barcia	Hilliard	Neal
Barrett (WI)	Hinchee	Nussle
Becerra	Hinojosa	Oberstar
Bentsen	Hoefel	Obey
Berkley	Holt	Olver
Berman	Hooley	Ortiz
Berry	Horn	Owens
Bishop	Hoyer	Pallone
Blagojevich	Inslee	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Boehler	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Bonior	(TX)	Pelosi
Borski	Jefferson	Peterson (MN)
Boswell	John	Phelps
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Brady (PA)	Jones (OH)	Porter
Brown (FL)	Kanjorski	Price (NC)
Brown (OH)	Kaptur	Rahall
Campbell	Kasich	Ramstad
Capps	Kelly	Rangel
Capuano	Kennedy	Reyes
Cardin	Kildee	Rivers
Carson	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez
Castle	Kind (WI)	Rothman
Clayton	Kleczka	Royal-Allard
Clement	Klink	Rush
Clyburn	LaFalce	Sabo
Conyers	Lampson	Sanchez
Costello	Lantos	Sanders
Coyne	Larson	Sandlin
Crowley	Latham	Sawyer
Cubin	LaTourette	Schaffer
Davis (FL)	Leach	Schakowsky
Davis (IL)	Lee	Scott
DeFazio	Levin	Sensenbrenner
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Delahunt	Lipinski	Shays
DeLauro	Lofgren	Sherman
Deutsch	Lowe	Sisisky
Dingell	Lucas (KY)	Skelton
Dixon	Luther	Slaughter
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Dooley	Markey	Stupak
Doyle	Mascara	Spratt
Edwards	Matsui	Stabenow
Ehlers	McCarthy (MO)	Stark
Engel	McCarthy (NY)	Stenholm
English	McDermott	Strickland
Eshoo	McGovern	Stupak
Etheridge	McKinney	Sununu
Evans	Meehan	Tanner
Farr	Meek (FL)	Tauscher
Fattah	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Filner	Menendez	Thompson (MS)
Ford	Millender	Thurman
Frank (MA)	McDonald	Tierney
Frost	Miller, George	Towns

Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky

Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand

Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—211

Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggett
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Biley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehrlich
Emerson
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode

NOT VOTING—8

Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Cummings
Forbes
McIntosh
McNulty
Smith (WA)
Vento

□ 1217

Messrs. LARGENT, COBURN and FLETCHER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BOSWELL, WU, OBEY, LATHAM and LEVIN changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LEE:

Page 6, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$42,000,000)".

Page 7, line 21, after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by \$42,000,000)".

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$42,000,000)".

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 267, noes 156, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 398]

AYES—267

Abercrombie	Duncan	Kelly
Ackerman	Dunn	Kennedy
Allen	Edwards	Kildee
Andrews	Ehlers	Kilpatrick
Baca	Ehrlich	Kind (WI)
Bachus	Emerson	Kingston
Baird	Engel	Kleczka
Baldacci	Eshoo	Klink
Baldwin	Etheridge	Kolbe
Barcia	Evans	Kucinich
Barrett (WI)	Farr	Kuykendall
Becerra	Fattah	LaFalce
Bentsen	Filner	Lampson
Berkley	Fletcher	Lantos
Berman	Foley	Largent
Berry	Ford	Larson
Bishop	Fossella	Leach
Blagojevich	Frank (MA)	Lee
Blumenauer	Frost	Levin
Boehler	Gallegly	Lewis (GA)
Bonior	Ganske	Lofgren
Bono	Gejdenson	Lowe
Borski	Gephardt	Luther
Boucher	Gilchrest	Maloney (CT)
Brady (PA)	Gonzalez	Maloney (NY)
Brown (FL)	Goodling	Markey
Brown (OH)	Gordon	Mascara
Capuano	Green (TX)	Matsui
Cardin	Greenwood	McCarthy (MO)
Carson	Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)
Castle	Gutknecht	McDermott
Clayton	Hall (OH)	McGovern
Clement	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	McKinney
Coburn	Hayes	Meehan
Condit	Hilleary	Meek (FL)
Conyers	Hilliard	Meeks (NY)
Costello	Hinchee	Menendez
Coyne	Hinojosa	Mica
Cramer	Hobson	Millender
Crowley	Hoefel	McDonald
Davis (FL)	Hoekstra	Miller, George
Davis (IL)	Holden	Minge
Davis (VA)	Holt	Mink
DeFazio	Hooley	Moakley
DeGette	Horn	Mollohan
Delahunt	Houghton	Moore
DeLauro	Hoyer	Moran (KS)
Deutsch	Hulshof	Moran (VA)
Dicks	Hyde	Morella
Dingell	Inslee	Murtha
Dixon	Jackson (IL)	Myrick
Doggett	Jackson-Lee	Nadler
Dooley	(TX)	Napolitano
Doyle	Jefferson	Neal
Dreier	Jenkins	Nethercutt
	John	Nussle
	Johnson (CT)	Oberstar
	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
	Jones (OH)	Olver
	Kanjorski	Ortiz
	Kaptur	Owens
	Kasich	Pallone

Pascarell	Rush	Tauscher
Pastor	Sabo	Taylor (MS)
Paul	Sanchez	Thompson (CA)
Payne	Sanders	Thompson (MS)
Pease	Sandlin	Thune
Pelosi	Sawyer	Thurman
Peterson (MN)	Schaffer	Tierney
Petri	Schakowsky	Towns
Phelps	Scott	Trafficant
Pickering	Sensenbrenner	Turner
Pomeroy	Shays	Udall (CO)
Porter	Sherman	Udall (NM)
Portman	Sherwood	Upton
Price (NC)	Shows	Visclosky
Pryce (OH)	Sisisky	Wamp
Rahall	Skelton	Waters
Ramstad	Slaughter	Watt (NC)
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Waxman
Reyes	Snyder	Weiner
Rivers	Spratt	Wexler
Rodriguez	Stabenow	Weygand
Roemer	Stark	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Stenholm	Wise
Ros-Lehtinen	Strickland	Woolsey
Rothman	Stupak	Wu
Royal-Allard	Sununu	Wynn
Royce	Tanner	

NOES—156

Aderholt	Gilman	Pitts
Archer	Goode	Pombo
Army	Goodlatte	Quinn
Baker	Goss	Radanovich
Ballenger	Graham	Regula
Barr	Granger	Reynolds
Barrett (NE)	Green (WI)	Riley
Bartlett	Hansen	Rogan
Barton	Hastings (WA)	Rogers
Bass	Hayworth	Roukema
Bateman	Hefley	Ryan (WI)
Bereuter	Herger	Ryun (KS)
Biggert	Hill (IN)	Salmon
Bilirakis	Hill (MT)	Sanford
Bliley	Hostettler	Saxton
Blunt	Hunter	Scarborough
Boehner	Hutchinson	Sessions
Bonilla	Isakson	Shadegg
Boswell	Istook	Shaw
Boyd	Johnson, Sam	Shimkus
Brady (TX)	Jones (NC)	Shuster
Burr	King (NY)	Simpson
Burton	Knollenberg	Skeen
Buyer	LaHood	Smith (MI)
Callahan	Latham	Smith (TX)
Calvert	LaTourette	Souder
Cannon	Lazio	Spence
Coble	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Collins	Lewis (KY)	Stump
Combest	Linder	Sweeney
Cook	Lipinski	Talent
Cooksey	LoBiondo	Tancredo
Cox	Lucas (KY)	Tauzin
Crane	Lucas (OK)	Taylor (NC)
Cubin	Manzullo	Terry
Cunningham	Martinez	Thomas
Danner	McCollum	Thornberry
Deal	McCrary	Tiahrt
DeLay	McInnis	Toomey
DeMint	McIntyre	Vitter
Diaz-Balart	McKeon	Walden
Dickey	Metcalf	Walsh
Doolittle	Miller (FL)	Watkins
English	Miller, Gary	Watts (OK)
Everett	Ney	Weldon (FL)
Ewing	Northup	Weldon (PA)
Fowler	Norwood	Weller
Franks (NJ)	Ose	Wicker
Frelinghuysen	Oxley	Wilson
Gekas	Packard	Wolf
Gibbons	Peterson (PA)	Young (AK)
Gillmor	Pickett	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Chambliss	Forbes	Smith (WA)
Chenoweth-Hage	McIntosh	Velazquez
Clay	McNulty	Vento
Cummings	Serrano	

□ 1225

Messrs. ROHRABACHER, FOSSELLA, HULSHOF and GALLEGLY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained by official business and was not present to vote on three amendments:

Rollcall vote No. 396, on the Greenwood-Lowe amendment to H.R. 4811, had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall vote No. 397, on the Waters amendment to H.R. 4811, had I been present I would have voted "yea."

Rollcall vote No. 398, on the Lee amendment to H.R. 4811, had I been present I would have voted "yea."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to this title of the bill?

If there are no further amendments to this title, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMERICAN CHURCHWOMEN IN EL SALVADOR

SEC. 588. (a) Information relevant to the December 2, 1980, murders of four American churchwomen in El Salvador shall be made public to the fullest extent possible.

(b) The Secretary of State and the Department of State are to be commended for fully releasing information regarding the murders.

(c) The President shall order all Federal agencies and departments that possess relevant information to make every effort to declassify and release to the victims' families relevant information as expeditiously as possible.

(d) In making determinations concerning the declassification and release of relevant information, the Federal agencies and departments shall presume in favor of releasing, rather than of withholding, such information.

HIPC TRUST FUND CONDITIONS

SEC. 589. Beginning in fiscal year 2002, funds shall be appropriated to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative only when the President of the World Bank and the Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund submit a certification to the Secretary of the Treasury that the Institutions they head will not include user fees or service charges through "community financing", "cost sharing", "cost recovery", or any other mechanism for primary education or primary healthcare, including prevention and treatment efforts for AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and infant, child, and maternal well-being in their Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers or any other HIPC-related debt relief or economic reform program or plan or any other International Monetary Fund or World Bank loan or reform program.

SEC. 590. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay for the performance of abortion or to lobby for or against abortion.

PROCUREMENT AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REFORM

SEC. 591. (a) Of the funds made available under the heading "International Financial Institutions" in this or any prior Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, or related programs, 10 percent of the United States portion or payment to any international financial institution shall be withheld by the Secretary of the Treasury, until the Secretary certifies that—

(1) the institution is implementing procedures for conducting semiannual audits by qualified independent auditors for all new lending;

(2) the institution has taken steps to establish an independent fraud and corruption investigative organization or office;

(3) the institution has implemented a program to assess a recipient country's procurement and financial management capabilities,

including an analysis of the risks of corruption prior to initiating new lending; and

(4) the institution is taking steps to fund and implement independent third-party procurement monitoring and other similar measures designed to improve transparency, anticorruption programs, procurement, and financial management controls in recipient countries.

(b) REPORT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall report on March 1, 2001, to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate on progress made to fulfill the objectives identified in subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITION.—The term "international financial institution" means the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Inter-American Investment Corporation, the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund, the Asian Development Bank, the Asian Development Fund, the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the International Monetary Fund.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) the designee of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI)?

Mrs. LOWEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) as the designee of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

I want to commend the members of the Committee on Appropriations and, in particular, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for recognizing the important role that women play in Southeast Europe in the former Soviet Union. I would also like to note several innovative steps that the Europe and Eurasia Bureau of AID has taken to ensure that gender issues are considered in our programming. By gender issues, we mean identifying and analyzing the problems and possibilities that may affect men and women differently and using that information to carry out programs which address the needs and opportunities of both women and men.

For example, at a policy level, gender issues are integrated throughout the new E&E strategic framework, the policy document which will shape AIDS work in the region for the next several years. This is a first step for a USAID regional bureau.

The language includes the following: gender is being integrated into the Europe and Eurasia programs to ensure that the United States is promoting equal access and opportunities, equal

rights and equal protection in its assistance programs.

At a program level, preliminary work on this new approach of considering the problems of both men and women has already produced promising results. In central Asia, a recent AID study examined health costs by gender and found that men and women used health facilities differently for general care and that the costs are significantly different. Men go to hospitals and women go to local clinics, since hospitals are much more expensive than clinics.

□ 1230

The study recommended that clinics create outreach programs specific to men. This will result in considerable savings in health funding.

In the Ukraine, creating more women entrepreneurs was an important way to combat the problem of high unemployment rates for women. But absent specific attention to women, business programs often tended to focus principally on men.

Consequently, in 1999, AID asked business development implementers to analyze the best methods for reaching women as well as men. The best methods for reaching women based on this analysis resulted in many more women entering the market economy. In one business training center, woman clients increased 23 percent between 1999 and 2000.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments. I have become very familiar with programs like Star Network, which is organized and run by a group called World Learning that is training women throughout the Balkans to become leaders in their communities, in their societies, and they enter the political arena as a result of this training.

All the points the gentleman has mentioned really illustrate how very critical these programs are. I want to thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield further, I thank her for her comments, and again I want to acknowledge her leadership and that of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) in making this a reality.

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 51 offered by Mr. NADLER:
Page 130, after line 16, insert the following new section:

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING SO-CALLED "HONOR CRIMES"

SEC. 592. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Thousands of women around the world are killed and maimed each year in the name of family "honor".

(2) The United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 56th Session, January 2000,

working with the Special Rapporteurs on violence against women and extrajudicial, summary, or arbitrary executions, received reports of so-called "honor killings" from numerous countries, including Bangladesh, Jordan, India, and Pakistan, and noted that such killings take many forms, such as flogging, forced suicide, stoning, beheading, acid throwing, and burning.

(3) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1999, "crimes of honor" in Bangladesh include acid-throwing and whipping of women accused of moral indiscretion.

(4) Authorities in Bangladesh estimate there will be up to 200 "honor killings" in that country this year.

(5) Thousands of Pakistani women and girls are stabbed, burned, or maimed every year by husbands, fathers, and brothers who accuse them of dishonoring their family by being unfaithful, seeking a divorce, or refusing an arranged marriage.

(6) Jordan, which had 20 reported "honor killings" in 1998, still has laws reducing the penalty for, or exempting perpetrators of "honor crimes", and the Jordanian Parliament has twice failed to repeal these laws.

(7) His Majesty King Abdullah of Jordan should be commended for the recent formation of Jordan's Royal Commission on Human Rights, chaired by Her Majesty Queen Rania, which will primarily address obstacles that prevent women and children from exercising their basic human rights, including the persistence of "honor crimes".

(8) Although India has made efforts to address the issue of "honor crimes", more than 5,000 "dowry deaths" occur every year in India, according to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), which reported in 1997 that a dozen women die each day in "kitchen fires" designed to be passed off as accidents because the woman's husband's family is dissatisfied over the size of the woman's dowry.

(9) Women accused of adultery in countries such as Afghanistan, the United Arab Emirates, Pakistan, and a host of other countries are subject to a maximum penalty of death by stoning.

(10) Even though "honor killings" may be outlawed, law enforcement and judicial systems often fail to properly investigate, arrest, and prosecute offenders and laws frequently permit reduction in sentences or exemptions from prosecution for those who "kill in the name of honor" typically resulting in a token punishment, impunity, and continued violence against women.

(11) The right to exist is the most fundamental of all rights and must be guaranteed to every individual without discrimination, and the perpetuation of "honor killings" and dowry deaths is a deliberate violation of women's human rights that should be universally condemned.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING SO-CALLED "HONOR CRIMES".—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States, through the United States Agency for International Development, should—

(A) work with foreign law enforcement and judicial agencies to enact legal system reforms to more effectively address the investigation and prosecution of so-called "honor crimes"; and

(B) make resources available to local organizations to provide refuge and rehabilitation for women who are victims of "honor crimes" and the children of such women;

(2) the Department of State, when preparing yearly Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, should include—

(A) information relating to the incidence of "honor violence" in foreign countries;

(B) the steps taken by foreign governments to address the problem of "honor violence"; and

(C) all relevant actions taken by the United States, whether through diplomacy or foreign assistance programs, to reduce the incidence of "honor violence" and to increase investigations and prosecutions of such crimes;

(3) the United States should communicate to the United Nations its concern over the high rate of honor-related violence toward women worldwide and request that the appropriate United Nations bodies, in consultation with relevant nongovernmental organizations, propose actions to be taken to encourage these countries to demonstrate strong efforts to end such violence; and

(4) the President and the Secretary of State should communicate directly with leaders of countries where "honor killings", dowry deaths, and related practices are endemic, in order to convey the Nation's most serious concerns over these gross violations of human rights and urge these leaders to investigate and prosecute all such acts as murder, with the appropriate penalties.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) reserves a point of order on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am rising to offer this amendment on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), and the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL). I thank them for cosponsoring this amendment with me.

This amendment addresses a unique and gruesome form of violence against woman known as honor crimes, in which a woman is maimed or murdered by a relative, usual male, under the perception that the family's honor has been offended.

What is most shocking is that these women are attacked by their own family Members: brothers, fathers, even sons. Most of us are taught to protect and care for members of our family, not to brutalize them.

While preserving one's family honor is obviously no excuse for attacking any person, it is even more shocking that many of these honor crimes are not the result of a so-called dishonorable act, but of a mere belief or perception that such an act may have occurred.

In countries like Bangladesh, for example, women are attacked with acid and whipped if they are merely suspected of a moral indiscretion. In an 11-month period in Pakistan, there were over 675 reported honor killings.

Women in Afghanistan suspected of adultery are threatened with death by stoning, as are women in Pakistan and the United Arab Emirates.

While I could continue with gruesome details and statistics on the subject, I think the point is made. There is nothing honorable about whipping one's wife because one suspects her of adultery. There is nothing honorable about throwing acid on a daughter because she marries without permission. This is simply a horrid remnant of ancient cultures which places no value on the lives of women, and that must be addressed.

Unfortunately, as much as I wish it would, this amendment will not end this ghastly form of violence against women. However, it is an opportunity for the Congress of the United States to go on record and state clearly and resoundingly that these crimes should stop, and it is an opportunity to call for the U.S. Government to use its considerable resources to reduce the incidence of these crimes.

It is my hope as well that this amendment will call national attention to this horrible form of violence against women, and begin to get the ball rolling on a multinational effort to end this practice. An individual honor crime is not just an attack on one woman, it is an attack on the entire gender, and a violation of the most basic of human rights, the right to exist as a person and the right to personal autonomy.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the honorable gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. Thousands of women are maimed or killed each year in nations across the developing world because they have committed what their relatives or neighbors perceive as a crime of honor.

I have met with some of these women who have had acid thrown in their faces, who clearly are maimed, because in someone's eyes they did wrong. Whether their supposed offense is adultery, the desire for a divorce, refusing an arranged marriage, or having the nerve to fetch a lower-than-expected dowry, the punishment is always swift, severe, and outrageous.

Throughout the world women face flogging, forced suicides, stoning, beheading, burning, and other violent punishments for their actions. Rarely does anyone from the community offer to help. Even local government officials turn a blind eye to this terrible practice.

This amendment highlights how very important it is to do more to stop

honor killings around the world. Shining a flashlight on this practice, putting the full moral weight of the United States behind a campaign to end it, is critical if we are going to ensure the fundamental human rights of women. We simply must do more to stop these cowardly attacks.

I urge Members to vote yes. For those in doubt, I just wish they could see the faces of these women who have been tortured, who have been maimed, who have had acid thrown in their faces, just because they committed a crime that the community thought was not right, but we understand that they have the right to live their lives in peace and in dignity.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment that condemns honor crimes against women.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this amendment that condemns so-called "honor crimes." In countries around the world, women are beaten and killed by male members of their families after being accused of being unfaithful or acting in ways that embarrass the family.

According to Amnesty International the brutal practice of "honor killings" in Pakistan results in several hundred women being killed each year for suspected affairs, for seeking divorce, and for being raped.

In Jordan in the 1990s, an average of 20 women were killed every year.

In India in 1998, 286 women were victims of "honor killings" in Punjab alone. In the first quarter of 1999, 132 "honor killings" were documented in Sindh.

Domestic laws do not protect women who fall victim to this crime. For example, under Article 340 of Jordan's Penal Code, men are exempt from punishment who kill female relatives found or suspected of committing adultery and reduces sentences against those who kill unmarried female relatives who have affairs.

I support the amendment's call to increase investment of U.S. foreign assistance programs designed to investigate and document "honor killings." I would also like to see our assistance support initiatives that conduct public education campaigns about women's equality, with an emphasis on educating law enforcement officers and judges and that provide rehabilitative services to threatened and abused women.

Mr. Chairman, as we continue to expand and deepen our influence around the globe, protection of women and girls from this kind of barbaric behavior must be at the top of our agenda.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I will not belabor the point, but I think it is a simple enough thing to ask that this House go on record urging the United States government, the Executive Branch, to use its resources to stop these killings, to

stop this remnant of a former barbarous age.

I hope that despite whatever technicalities there may be, that this in effect precatory amendment can be adopted.

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

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) insist on his point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill, and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: "An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. . . ."

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) wish to address the point of order?

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the reasoning behind the gentleman's point of order. I agree with him that we must be very wary about legislating on appropriations bills, which we do too often in this House.

However, I believe two things: one, that this is a situation that begs our immediate attention. This amendment is in the form of a nonbinding resolution calling on the United States government to begin to address this issue with world leaders and the United Nations. I would hope we could make this statement here today.

Two, I would also point out that I do not really believe this changes existing law. This simply urges the Executive Branch to do certain things. It is not binding. It does not change the law. The law is a binding rule, that is what the dictionary defines the law as. Therefore, it does not meet that definition. It does not change the law.

I would submit it is not, therefore, legislating on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) proposes to express a legislative sentiment of the Congress. As such, the amendment constitutes legislation on a general appropriation bill, in violation of clause 2, rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—MOZAMBIQUE, MADAGASCAR, AND SOUTHERN AFRICA REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For an additional amount for "International Disaster Assistance", \$160,000,000, for rehabilitation and reconstruction assistance for Mozambique, Madagascar, and southern Africa, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for nonproject assistance: *Provided further*, That prior to any obligation of funds appropriated under this heading, the Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall provide the Committees on Appropriations with a detailed report containing the amount of the proposed obligation and a description of the programs and projects, on a country-by-country basis, to be funded with such amount: *Provided further*, That up to \$12,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be charged to finance obligations for which appropriations available under chapter 1 and 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 were initially charged for assistance for rehabilitation and reconstruction for Mozambique, Madagascar, and southern Africa: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, up to \$5,000,000 may be used for administrative expenses, including auditing costs, of the Agency for International Development associated with the assistance furnished under this heading: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount provided shall be available only to the extent an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 46 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 132, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR COUNTRIES THAT USE CHILDREN AS SOLDIERS

SEC. 701. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to the government of a country that—

(1) conscripts children under the age of 18 into the military forces of the country; or

(2) provides for the direct participation of children under the age of 18 in armed conflict.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed to the amendment each will control 10 minutes.

Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) rise in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment,

and I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I think anyone of good conscience would have rather not come to the floor of the House to debate an issue such as this, the conscripting of our children, the world's children, to fight bloody and disastrous and devastating battles around the world.

This is an issue of worldwide need. It is an issue for Vietnam. It is an issue for South and Central America. It is an issue for the continent of Africa.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of this committee, has reserved a point of order. I had asked that on this particular instance we waive the point of order because of the enormous devastation.

I also realize that the funding or the drafting of the language of this particular amendment is particularly direct and strong and harsh, for it reads that it would eliminate all funding for those who conscript children.

Let me give the basis of this, as well as to say that my commitment to this is so strong that I am hoping that my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations and the conference committee and those representing this particular subcommittee will work with me as we move this bill toward conference, ultimately at some point to be able to design disincentives that might also do similarly the same job: to discourage, to stop, to cease, to end the taking of our babies and putting them into war.

Just last week I joined the President of the United States, a number of ambassadors, and Members of the United States Congress at the United Nations in signing an international protocol against the use of children in war, in prostitution, and pornography.

Why is that necessary? Might I lend to the RECORD one story or a number of stories. One boy tried to escape from the rebels but he was caught. "His hands were tied and then they made us," the other new captives, "kill him with a stick. I felt sick. I knew this boy from before. We were from the same village. I refused to kill him, and they told me they would shoot me. They pointed a gun at me, so I had to do it. The boy was asking me, 'Why are you doing this?' I said, 'I have no choice.' After we killed him, they made us smear his blood on our arms."

□ 1245

They said we had to do this so we would not fear death, and so we would not try to escape. I still dream about the boy from my village who I killed. I see him in my dreams, and he is talk-

ing to me and saying I killed him for nothing. And I am crying. Susan was age 16. She was abducted into the army, by the Lord's Resistance Army. This is what our children are going through in their respective horror and the evilness of taking children whose lives should be full of joy and happiness.

All we are doing is condemning them to a life of misery, if they are not killed themselves in battle. Their minds are so warped with the viciousness of what has happened. They are destroyed forever.

It is estimated this year that some 300,000 children under the age of 18 are engaged in armed military conflicts in more than 30 countries. Sadly, far too many of these wonderful children are forcibly conscripted through kidnapping or coercion, and the others join because of economic necessity to avenge the loss of a family member or for their own personal safety.

There are so many stories of children being abused in this way, and I do want to acknowledge the leadership of the Members of the Subcommittee of Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the other Members of the committee, now the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) who is controlling the time, realizing that these are issues that have been vigorously discussed.

Mr. Chairman, I do believe we must do something about it. The protocol that was signed last week extends much needed protection for children. I cannot imagine that parents here in America would not have their hearts broken and their hearts extended to those victimized children who are being forced into a vicious war. I believe it is time for us now to do the strongest of rejection of those who do so, which would be to address them where it hurts, and that is in the pocketbook.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that we have done many things on the floor that I have supported, debt relief, HIV protection; but how can we stand as our children are conscripted involuntarily or for the basis of economic necessity?

Mr. Chairman, I rise to extend my strong support for this amendment that, if approved, could enormously enhance the lives of our children being cruelly used as soldiers around the world.

In short, this amendment would prohibit funding in the bill for nations that conscript children under the age of 18 or use child soldiers in armed conflict.

This is a small step that should be taken that this nation has now see as a priority. It is important to place this within the bill since, as a nation, we are now on record as prohibiting the inhuman practice of using children as soldiers.

Last week, I joined President Clinton, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Richard

Holbrooke, and Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers for the signing of two landmark Protocols that address prostitution, the impact of pornography on children, and the global practice of child labor. This resolution applauds the decision by the U.S. government to support the Protocol that condemns the use of children as soldiers by government and nongovernment forces.

This week, this body passed H. Con. Res. 348, a resolution that condemns the use of children as soldiers. And there is a good reason why we did that. It is important to note, however, this amendment only seeks to stop governments, not all nongovernmental forces or rebels, who find ways to bring children into armed conflict. That limitation cannot be imposed on the nongovernmental forces at this time.

It is estimated that this year some 300,000 children under the age of 18 are engaged in armed military conflicts in more than 30 countries. Sadly, far too many of these wonderful children are forcibly conscripted through kidnapping or coercion and others joined because of economic necessity, to avenge the loss of a family member or for their own personal safety. There are so many stories of children being abused in this way.

Military commanders often separate children from their families in order to foster dependence on military units and leaders, leaving such children vulnerable to manipulation. That is clearly unacceptable. I believe it is very unfortunate that military forces actually force child soldiers to commit terrible acts of killings or torture against their enemies, including against other children.

Last August, the United Nations Security Council unanimously passed Resolution 1261, condemning the use of children in armed conflict. On May 25, the UN General Assembly unanimously adopted an Optional Protocol on the use of child soldiers. This is a sensible addition to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

As my colleagues are well aware, The Protocol extends much needed protection for children. My fellow Americans, this is one of the first international commitments made by this nation that protects our children. We can no longer deny that thousands of children are killed, brutalized, and sold into slavery. In Sierra Leone, half of the rebel forces are under 18 and some are even as young as 4 or 5 years of age.

The Protocol addresses such action by raising the international minimum age for conscription and direct participation in armed conflict to age 18, it encourages governments to raise the minimum legal age for voluntary recruits above the current standard of 15 years of age, and it commits governments to support the demobilization and rehabilitation of child soldiers.

That is a very strong step forward. It speaks to an international sense of justice that should, indeed must be honored by governments around the world. We should commend President Clinton, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations Richard Holbrooke, and U.S. Secretary Lawrence Summers for their leadership on this issue.

My amendment will simply make clear that nations will not receive assistance if they use children as soldiers. It is entirely consistent with our international obligations and will effectuate such intent in a clear and straightforward manner.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

[From the Human Rights Watch]
STOP THE USE OF CHILD SOLDIERS!
THE VOICES OF CHILD SOLDIERS

1. "One boy tried to escape [from the rebels], but he was caught . . . His hands were tied, and then they made us, the other new captives, kill him with a stick. I felt sick. I knew this boy from before. We were from the same village. I refused to kill him and they told me they would shoot me. They pointed a gun at me, so I had to do it. The boy was asking me, "Why are you doing this?" I said I had no choice. After we killed him, they made us smear his blood on our arms . . . they said we had to do this so we would not fear death and so we would not try to escape . . . I still dream about the boy from my village who I killed. I see him in my dreams, and he is talking to me and saying I killed him for nothing, and I am crying."—Susan, 16 abducted by the Lord's Resistance Army in Uganda.

2. "The army was a nightmare. We suffered greatly from the cruel treatment we received. We were constantly beaten, mostly for no reason at all, just to keep us in a state of terror. I still have a scar on my lip and sharp pains in my stomach from being brutally kicked by the older soldiers. The food was scarce, and they made us walk with heavy loads, much too heavy for our small and malnourished bodies. They forced me to learn how to fight the enemy, in a war that I didn't understand why was being fought."—Emilio, recruited by the Guatemalan army at age 14.

3. "They gave me pills that made me crazy. When the craziness got in my head, I beat people on their heads and hurt them until they bled. When the craziness got out of my head I felt guilty. If I remembered the person I went to them and apologized. If they did not accept my apology, I felt bad."—a 13-year old former child soldier from Liberia.

4. "I was in the front lines the whole time I was with the [opposition force]. I used to be assigned to plant mines in areas the enemy passed through. They used us for reconnaissance and other things like that because if you're a child the enemy doesn't notice you much; nor do the villagers."—former child soldier from Burma/Myanmar.

5. "They beat all the people there, old and young, they killed them all, nearly 10 people . . . like dogs they killed them . . . I didn't kill anyone, but I saw them killing . . . the children who were with them killed too . . . with weapons . . . they made us drink the blood of people, we took blood from the dead into a bowl and they made us drink . . . then when they killed the people they made us eat their liver, their heart, which they took out and sliced and fried . . . And they made us little one eat."—Peruvian woman, recruited by the Shining Path at age 11.

REFERENCES

1. Human Rights Watch interview, Gulu, Uganda, May 1997.
2. Testimony given at a Congressional briefing on child soldiers, sponsored by Human Rights Watch, Washington, DC, December 3, 1997.
3. Human Rights Watch interview, Liberia, April 1994.
4. Rachel Brett and Margaret McCallin, "Children: The Invisible Soldiers", (Radda Barnen, 1996), p. 127.
5. Center for Defense Information, "The Invisible Soldiers: Child Combatants," The Defense Monitor, July 1997.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have no speakers other than a closing statement by me, and I continue to reserve my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The gentleman reserves his point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for offering this very important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen the exploitation of children. We have seen the exploitation in labor. We have seen the exploitation in sexual abuse, and we have seen the exploitation of children as relates to conflicts. In Sierra Leone, children as young as 10 and 12 are given weapons by the dreaded RUF, a group of brutal rebels who have armed children, and other conflicts throughout Africa and Latin America.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen children on the front lines, the Lord's Resistance Movement, as it was mentioned, up in northern Uganda, uses children as the frontline fighters, so when the government troops attempt to get the Lord's Resistance Movement, a rebel group, the children are put in front and the children then are in harm's way, with the military of Uganda reluctant to fire on the children.

Mr. Chairman, this is really a tactic that is used by these terrible despots and clan leaders, and so I think that this makes a lot of sense. We should not have people under the age of 18 in combat. We believe that the exploitation is unbelievable, that in this modern day that we can no longer accept what is going on in the world. I believe that we should support this. I think that it is a right thing to do.

I would hope that the point of order would be waived at this point in time, because I believe that this amendment by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) which would prohibit funding in the bill for Nations that conscript children under the age of 18 or use children soldiers in armed conflict should pass.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a Member of the Committee on Appropriations and a fighter for world justice.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent a lot of time on this floor in the last day talking about how at a time of prosperity we should be reaching out to families, to children around the world, helping them get educated, providing health care, providing the very basics of life. And then when we hear the horrors of these children who, in addition to lacking education and health care, are

being recruited into the armed services to fight a war that they do not know anything about, the words of one child named Alil ringing in my ear, the army was a nightmare; we suffered greatly from our cruel treatment we received. We were constantly beaten mostly for no reason at all, just to keep us in a state of terror. They forced me to learn how to fight the enemy in a war that I did not understand why it was being fought.

Sadly there are stories like this in several nations all around the world, and I support the Jackson-Lee amendment, and I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on this issue.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who has been fighting throughout this debate that we may be inclusive and protective of our world neighbors and certainly protective of our children who are forced into fighting vicious wars.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for her leadership, not only in this country on behalf of children, but her leadership internationally on behalf of children. This is typical of the kind of work that the gentlewoman has been doing.

Mr. Chairman, it is estimated that this year some 300,000 children under the age of 18 are engaged in armed conflict in more than 30 countries. Children are forcibly conscripted through kidnapping or coercion and others join because of economic necessity to avenge a loss of a family member or for their own personal safety. This may be shocking, as this gentlewoman has said, but it is real.

In this country, we have gone a long way toward protecting children. We protect children in the workplace. We protect children and make sure if they do not have a family, that they get foster care. We have rules about how they can or cannot be punished. We do everything that we can to support them from free lunch programs, to free breakfast programs. Certainly we can stand up for children who are being used in wars who are getting killed and maimed unnecessarily. Vote aye on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) insist upon his point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, first I rise in opposition to the amendment, then I am going to insist on my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to make a point here.

Mr. Chairman, it is difficult being chairman of this committee and having to stand up here and indicate that I do not support the underlying causes that the gentlewoman's amendment addresses. Who in the House would be opposed to this?

The point is, we have a procedure in this body whereby the Committee on

International Relations is the authorizing committee of all of these areas of jurisdiction. And I would just like to send a message to the chairman of the committee, if he wants me to accept all of the authorization on this bill, well, then I will do it. If he expects me to stand up and object and give indication that I do not support the underlying causes, he will be disappointed.

I am still going to object, but to send a message to the Committee on International Relations, if they want these things, fine; if they do not, they better get over here and start objecting on their own.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and legislation in an appropriations bill and, therefore, violates clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part:

"An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be made in order if it changes existing law."

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman from Texas wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I rise to speak to the point of order, and I appreciate several points that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), has said. I will offer to work with the chairman as we move toward conference on this issue.

Let me speak to the point of order as I discuss the opportunity, I hope, to be able to work with the gentleman, and that is that we are dealing with an appropriations bill that deals with foreign policy, and foreign policy that covers a variety of issues. In fact, there is a child-support provision in here that we obviously attempted to work with.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this amendment is within the confines of the appropriations bills. It talks about the international policy on the question of children. It is noted that we have many children that have been killed and brutalized and sold into slavery. In Sierra Leone alone, half of the rebel forces are under 18; some of them are 4-years-old and 5-years-old.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot imagine in the report language and in the legislation that we do not have within the context of the section that I have offered, where I have deleted and had this in compliance with the CBO, it is budget neutral, that this particular amendment, which is simply a limitation that indicates that no monies can be used if your country flagrantly and boldly uses babies to go into war that we would not have that.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) that we

can work through conference if the point of order is upheld, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that babies are not dying, not only because of disease and brutality but because they are forced to be warriors in war and killing others in a brutal and horrific fashion.

I think that is the worst act that we as adults can do to our children, and I would ask that the point of order not be upheld and that we be able to move forward on this. I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his sincere effort, and I hope that we will be able to work together, maybe if the gentleman would stand. I know that the gentleman's heart is there. We worked together.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on my point of order and explain the rationale behind my decision to do this. The previous speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), had a good underlying cause, but there are 15 or 20 underlying good causes coming up.

I sort of resent the fact that I am standing here as an appropriator taking the brunt of a position saying that I oppose what the gentlewoman wants me to do. I do not oppose. We have a strategy. We have a rule. We have rules of the House which prohibit this type of activity. And I am trying to protect the integrity of the process.

I applaud the gentlewoman for her efforts. I applaud her mission. I support the content of her amendment, but it is violative of the rules; and I am here to protect the integrity of the process and, therefore, insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair has sought advice from the Parliamentarian and is prepared to rule.

Does the gentlewoman have further advice for the Chair? Please state the advice.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Yes, I have advice.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of the chairman of the committee and refer the chairman to the underlying bill and its purpose and only say that I also look forward to working on this as it moves towards conference with the authorizing committee and to provide disincentives for this terrible act.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) proposes to change existing law in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 52, even though a limitation or exception therefrom might refrain from explicitly assigning new duties to officers of the government, if it implicitly requires them to make investigations, compile evidence, or make judgments and determinations not otherwise required of them by law, then it assumes the character of legislation and is subject to a point of order under clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

The proponent of the limitation assumes the burden of establishing that any duties imposed by the provision either are merely ministerial or otherwise required by law.

The proponent in this case has failed to meet the burden. Accordingly, the point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

□ 1300

Are there further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

PROHIBITION ON FUNDS FOR KOSOVO PROTECTION CORPS

SEC. 701. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be made available for the Kosovo Protection Corps.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a simple amendment. It would prohibit any funds in this bill from going to the Kosovo Protection Corps, an organization that has always been and continues to be a rogue force in Kosovo.

In September 1999, the Kosovo Liberation Army, KLA, was transformed into a 5,000 member demilitarized civilian organization known as the Kosovo Protection Corps, KPC. According to U.N. regulations on the establishment of the KPC, and this is a quote, "the Kosovo Corps shall not have any role in law enforcement or the maintenance of law and order."

However, according to an unreleased internal United Nations report, the Kosovo Protection Corps has been using violence, extortion, murder, and torture. Because this report has not been made public, lawmakers in the United States who actually set the United States budget for this mission in Kosovo must rely on the media to provide such crucial information.

According to press accounts, the report states that the KPC has been involved in "criminal activities, killings, torture, illegal policing, abuse of authority, intimidation, breaches of political neutrality and hate speech."

The Washington Post reported that the U.N. report states that several members of the KPC "allegedly tortured or killed local citizens and illegally detained others, illegally attempted to conduct law enforcement activities, illegally forced local businesses to pay taxes, and threatened U.N. police who attempted to intervene and stop wrongdoing."

An article in the British Guardian newspaper indicates that in Dragash, two members of the KPC and three others were arrested by U.N. police in connection with the killing of an ethnic Gorani. It goes on to say the U.N. report cited "three charges of ill-treatment and torture: in Pec, a man was beaten senseless in the KPC's headquarters, suffering head injuries and severe bruising from a rifle butt. . . . In Prizren, a man from the Torbesh minority . . . was kidnapped and beaten up by a KPC member and three other men. And in Prizren KFOR suspended alleged torturers from the KPC."

A GAO report on security in the Balkans indicates that the Kosovo Protection Corps may be adding to unrest and regional instability in the region. It states that KFOR and the U.N. have detained members from the KPC "for carrying unauthorized weapons and engaging in violence and intimidation against ethnic minorities."

So the goals of the U.N., as stated in U.N. Resolution 1244 are actually being impeded by the KPC. These goals include: deterring renewed hostilities, demilitarizing armed groups, ensuring public safety and order, and protecting and promoting human rights.

The U.N. itself cited the KPC for threatening U.N. personnel in efforts to intervene in wrongdoing. So, not only is the KPC responsible for human rights violations, but the KPC is making it harder for the U.N. to accomplish peace in Kosovo.

An Amnesty International report issued in February concluded that after 6 months of peacekeeping efforts in the region, "human rights abuses and crimes continue to be committed at an alarming rate, particularly against members of minority communities."

According to the Human Rights Watch World Report 2000, "Ethnic Albanian refugees returned to a devastated Kosovo almost immediately after the withdrawal of Serbian and Yugoslav forces, and soon began a series of revenge attacks against the region's minority populations. A wave of arson and looting of Serb and Roma homes quickly deteriorated into harassment and beating of individuals. Most serious was a spate of abductions and murders of Serbs."

Finally, International Crisis Group, an internationally renowned conflict prevention and conflict resolution group based in Washington, D.C. and Brussels, recently issued a report on the KPC. It states that "Even the UNMIK's own officials and some KFOR officers admit (though never in public) that the KPC is, and will probably remain, a military-style organization."

These are credible reports from many credible sources that reveal that the KPC is causing unrest and instability as it continues to engage in violent and brutal practices. These human rights abuses of extortion, murder, kidnapping, torture, and intimidation must not continue.

So why should American tax dollars support an organization which is actually worsening the situation of ethnic hatred and violence in war-torn Kosovo? There has been enough violence in the Balkans. Why sustain this volatile atmosphere by continuing to allow the KPC to run rampant in Kosovo?

Most of Europe already knows this. That is why almost all NATO countries do not fund the KPC.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio cannot request unanimous consent to extend his own time. It is permissible to ask unanimous consent that both the proponent and an opponent are given an equal amount of time.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that both myself and the opponent be given 1 extra minute.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) may proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated, most of Europe already knows about the KPC. According to a May 10, 2000 United Nations Status Report, the United States has pledged about \$5 million and Germany has pledged about \$1.5 million. So the United States foots the majority of the bill for an organization which has failed to benefit society in Kosovo.

I am asking for a yes vote on this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) has 30 seconds remaining.

Does the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) insist upon his point of order?

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska withdraws his point of order.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for 6 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment to this bill of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) would terminate

funding for the Kosovo Protection Corps, the KPC. I am strongly opposed to that amendment because it would have the opposite intended effect of the author's stated goals and, in fact, contribute to greater instability and to increased human rights abuses in Kosovo, thereby complicating the mission of our and other NATO peace-keeping troops.

Strongly supported by the United States, the KPC was formed by the U.N. Administration in Kosovo, the UNMIK. Under this crucial program, the Kosovo Liberation Army was demilitarized and its former members encouraged to become part of an emergency assistance and community service.

Reports of individual members of the KPC, or individuals posing as KPC members, committing human rights abuses are disturbing and must be continued to be fully investigated and monitored. Any KPC member found to have been associated with such activities will be immediately dismissed and subject to criminal prosecution.

I do agree with KFOR and U.N. officials that there must be a zero tolerance policy towards offenses committed by those few members of the KPC or any other individuals in Kosovo who commit criminal offenses or abuse their position in the KPC. That is why we support the approach of focusing the relatively small amount of United States assistance to Kosovo on judicial and police assistance in order to increase stability in this region that has been torn apart by a decade long conflict.

Denying United States funding for the KPC would not resolve the problems that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) believes exists in Kosovo and would more than likely increase those difficulties. It would have us throw the baby out with the bath water by undercutting a good program because a few bad individuals may have been involved. We do not stop paying for our police when we find a bad cop in that force.

Cutting off our assistance to the KPC would jeopardize the accomplishments of disarming former combatants and moving Kosovo along the path of peace and reconciliation and would undermine our ability to influence the development of the KPC. It would increase the risk to our troops currently positioned in Kosovo and would threaten to extend the time they need to be deployed there, something we do not want to see happen.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) for yielding to me, and I certainly strongly support his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is imperative that we oppose this amendment. I

believe that this amendment really would wreak havoc in the region. The State Department, the administration, all people who have dealt with this situation in Kosovo oppose this.

The Kosovo Protection Corps plays a critical role in Kosovo in many ways. After the Kosovo Liberation Army formerly gave up its weapons, the KPC was created as an organization which absorbed former KLA members into a demilitarized structure. The State Department has described the KPC as the most important element of a broad program to provide employment for KLA veterans.

The KPC also carries out critical civilian works projects. NATO Secretary-General Lord Robertson has praised the KPC for its work throughout Kosovo, which has included repairing roads, bridges, and other reconstruction projects.

Let me read his quote. He says, "I will continue to support the KPC, to demand from the international community the resources that will allow it to do this valuable civil job to support General Ceku in the role he has of being an influential spokesman for peace and reconciliation." This is the NATO Secretary-General Lord Robertson.

The Kucinich amendment is based on a supposed unreleased internal United Nations report of February 29, 2000, which allegedly makes a variety of accusations against the KPC. When my staff requested a copy of this report, none was available because it was never released. We believe that it is difficult to respond anyway to this report, not only because Members cannot review it for themselves, but because the first KPC members were inaugurated only 1 month before the report was supposedly written.

On April 22 of this year, 114 KPC officers and personnel joined 230 local workers and youth groups in cleaning up disease-infested garbage mounds throughout Pristina, the capital. In another instance, the KPC intervened on February 4 when French and NATO peacekeepers were not able to disperse an angry crowd. According to Reuters, "The situation finally calmed down with the arrival of the KPC."

Let me read one other quote, and this is a quote from General Klaus Reinhardt, commander of Allied Forces in Kosovo, KFOR. He says, "It is my firm belief that the formation of the KPC is an essential step to restoring normalcy to this region."

So this is an irresponsible amendment. It should be resoundingly defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I request that the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) ask unanimous consent so that I could have a whole minute, which would be 45 seconds on each side.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each side be given an additional 45 seconds.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of our time to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York very much for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say there are no white hats in this operation, and there are neither on the Albanian side nor on the Serb side when one considers what happens in Kosovska Mitrovica. It is not easy to turn organizations which have grown up in war into democratic organization in the pursuit of multiethnic community. But if Kosovo is ever to be a multiethnic and a multireligious community, then we are going to have to work with these organizations.

I very much oppose that we adopt the amendment.

□ 1315

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The unreleased internal United Nations report on the Kosovo Protection Corps using violence, extortion, murder, and torture has been widely reported. I am asking all of my colleagues today to take a stand for the protection of human rights of all citizens in Kosovo. Vote "yes" on this amendment.

The KPC has become a brutal paramilitary organization, a fact that has been confirmed by the U.N. itself, the GAO, and many nongovernmental organizations. According to this internal U.N. report, the KPC has prevented the U.N. from establishing peace and maintaining order in Kosovo. The United States cannot continue to fund such activities.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Kucinich Amendment, which would seriously undermine our efforts to promote stability and reconstruction in Kosova.

This amendment seeks to cut off all funding for the Kosova Protection Corps, a civilian organization formed in September of last year to employ demobilized members of Kosova Liberation Army on needed efforts such as disaster response, search and rescue, humanitarian assistance to isolated areas, de-mining and rebuilding the country's infrastructure. The KPC, which operates under the authority of the UN, offers employments to these veterans to engage in constructive activities in support of the country and its people.

I understand and share the gentleman's concerns over allegations of acts of violence committed by purported members of this organization. These incidents should be investigated fully and those found guilty should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. But to completely cut off funding to an organization that, in the words of the KFOR commander, General Klaus Reinhardt, is "an essential step to restoring normalcy to this region", would undercut and negate everything that this country and our European allies have done to restore peace and stability to Kosova.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of former KLA members who joined the KPC were not professional soldiers—they were farmers, laborers or mechanics, individuals with skills that are desperately needed as Kosova re-builds. Yes, they took up arms in the face of naked aggression from Serb paramilitary and security forces. Faced with similar situations, I doubt many in this Chamber wouldn't do the same to protect their homes, their families and loved ones. The war is now over, and it is essential that we support programs such as this which, in a very real sense, beat swords into plowshares by transitioning these veterans to the cause of community service and nation building.

That cause would be undercut, Mr. Chairman, if we allow this amendment to prevail. Let's not destroy a worthwhile program and jeopardize the cause of peace because of the misdeeds of a few. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Kucinich Amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to oppose the Kucinich Amendment to cut funding for the Kosovo Protection Corps (KPC). The KPC has served as an important force for peace and stability in an unstable region. After the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) demilitarized, the KPC was formed in an effort to employ former KLA members in a capacity which could be beneficial to the region. Since its inception, the KPC has done important work in Kosovo, cleaning disease infested garbage dumps in Pristina, repairing roads and bridges and helping to rebuild over 1,000 homes.

While individual members of the KPC have been accused of carrying illegal weapons, and while I do believe these individuals should be dealt with, the KPC as a whole has played an important role in the quest for peace in Kosovo. On February 4th, in Mitrovica, KPC members intervened along with French and Italian NATO peacekeepers to disperse an angry crowd. The leadership of the KPC has repeatedly spoken out for tolerance and reconciliation amongst the different ethnic groups within the region.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be a grave mistake to deny funding to this important organization at this most tumultuous time in Kosovo's history. I urge my colleagues to vote against the Kucinich amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, it was a bleak picture early last year in the Balkans.

Slobodan Milosevic had begun a new campaign of terror against ethnic Albanians in Kosovo.

Men of all ages were tortured and killed.

Women were raped.

Yet another ethnic population was being "ethnically cleansed."

Refugees poured over the borders to Albania and Macedonia.

When I visited the refugees last May, they relayed experiences that few of us could even imagine are possible in the world today.

One Kosovar boy saw his father's eyes torn out. He told us, "you can't imagine what they have done."

A woman from the Prizren region said that Serb paramilitary forces entered her house, looking for her husband—a teacher in a local school. The forces took all of the family's jewelry and money. She escaped, but her husband and mother were burned alive inside the house. The woman said, "this happened to many people."

These are brutal episodes, but too many of us have become numb to them because in Milosevic's Yugoslavia last decade, we learned of violence like this nearly every day.

But I know that for many of us, and for many of our parents and grandparents, these stories bring back chilling memories of Europe during the Nazi reign of terror.

Last spring, we could have struck our head deep into the sand, and said that Kosovo was merely a European problem, but we didn't.

Together with NATO, we mounted a swift and successful campaign to put an end to this awful bloodshed and mayhem.

Although Kosovo has a long way to go after a generation of ethnic tension, years of neglect and months of war, things are getting better day after day.

Democracy, the rule of law and prosperity do not take root overnight. They must be nurtured. But with care, they will grow.

That's why we must reject this amendment.

It will do nothing more than uproot the careful work we have done so far in the Balkans.

The people of Kosovo are dedicated to democracy, and I know they draw their strength from the commitment we in the United States have made to them.

The army fighting for independence in Kosovo last year voluntarily disarmed.

According to the State Department, this demilitarization was the quickest in modern history.

And the new force—known as the Kosovo Protection Corps—which this amendment seeks to disband, has helped to rebuild homes, fight fires, repair the infrastructure and clean polluted rivers.

Yes, there have been incidents where individuals have engaged in abuses. And these must be dealt with severely.

In any country where chaos has ruled and war has ravaged civic institutions, there is bound to be confusion. Tensions which are ages old will not be diffused overnight.

We should not underestimate the problems.

But the answer is not to walk away from the problems.

The answer is to continue to work for peace.

And that's exactly what we should do in Kosovo.

Vote against this amendment.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I speak today in strong opposition to the Kucinich amendment which seeks to prohibit funds in the FY 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill from being used to fund the Kosova Protection Corps (KPC).

KPC plays a vital role in Kosova, filling the void that was left when the Kosova Liberation Army (KLA) surrendered its weapons.

The KPC was formed by the UN Administration in Kosova (UNMIK) as a civilian organization responsible for disaster response, search and rescue, humanitarian assistance, demining, and infrastructure rebuilding. Security in Kosova is not provided by the KPC, but a separately trained civilian police and international police force serving under the direction of UNMIK. The KPC functions under the political authority of UNMIK and the day-to-day operational direction of KFOR.

The KPC carries out important civilian work projects, such as building and repairing roads and bridges. In another instance, the KPC intervened on February 4 when French and Italian NATO peacekeepers were not able to

disperse an angry crowd and succeeded in restoring order to the situation.

The KPC has the support of the people in Kosova, the U.S. State Department and the United Nations.

Despite the allegations made in support of the Kucinich amendment, UN officials have investigated the allegations leveled against members of the KPC and found no evidence to support them.

International military and civilian leaders in the region have expressed their support and gratitude for the efforts of the KPC.

NATO Secretary-General, Lord Robertson, has praised the Kosova Protection Corps for its work throughout Kosova, which has included repairing roads, bridges, and other reconstruction and relief projects.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Kucinich amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

Mr. BEREUTER. 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 Mr. BEREUTER:

At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), add the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

PROHIBITION ON ASSUMPTION BY UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OF LIABILITY FOR NUCLEAR ACCIDENTS IN NORTH KOREA

SEC. 701. (a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which imposes liability on the United States Government, or otherwise require financial indemnity by the United States Government, for nuclear accidents that may occur at nuclear reactors in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any treaty subject to approval by the Senate pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) will control the time in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This Member rises out of concern that because of reported executive action that is currently being contemplated by the President, the American taxpayer may soon be required to assume billions of dollars of liability for potential North Korean nuclear accidents.

Under the Korean Energy Development Organization program, KEDO,

the United States Government committed to the construction of two light-water nuclear reactors in North Korea with major financing from Japan and South Korea. These reactors are designed to diffuse the nuclear development program of the Democrat People's Republic of Korea, the DPRK, that it had operated and, presumably, used to divert weapons grade nuclear material. The new reactors are to be owned and operated by North Korea.

Because North Korea is not known for its nuclear safety, some of the essential American construction firms have, quite understandably, refused to participate in the KEDO effort without insurance. Private insurance companies, sensing a lousy risk, want nothing to do with the KEDO program. As a result, the KEDO program could collapse under its own weight.

In an effort to keep the KEDO program moving forward, some in the executive branch have proposed that the United States provide insurance guaranties for the KEDO program. Mr. Chairman, this is an enormous legal liability that is being contemplated by Executive Order. While the United States continues to participate in the construction of two light-water nuclear reactors in the DPRK is not the issue, we have been participating in the KEDO program since 1995; and funds are included in this bill to continue that support. The question is whether the United States will assume financial liability for the project if accidents occur.

Mr. Chairman, make no mistake, this is potentially a staggering liability. It requires faith in the North Korea engineers, who may or may not have been trained and over whom we have little or no control. It requires faith that North Korea will devote the energy and resources to maintain those reactors. It requires that conflict does not break out on the Korean peninsula. And if North Korea's safety procedures prove inadequate and a Chernobyl-type disaster occurs, it could require tens of billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars. If there is a nuclear accident, there is no quicker way to eliminate the current budgetary surplus that many Members of this body have worked so hard to achieve.

Mr. Chairman, this Member would remind his colleagues that on May 18 of this year, in an amendment to the defense authorization bill, this body considered and voted overwhelmingly to limit the ability to provide such insurance guaranty. But the executive branch is ignoring or seeking to ignore that overwhelming vote. The amendment before this body today sends a very strong message that extending financial guaranties to rogue nations is a serious matter.

If Members of this body are concerned about nuclear proliferation, if my colleagues are concerned about fiscal responsibility, or even if Members are suspicious that North Korea may not be absolutely and irrevocably com-

mitted to cooperation on nuclear non-proliferation with the West, they must vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and rise in support of the Bereuter amendment and commend its sponsor.

This bill provides funding that the Clinton administration has requested to continue carrying out its policy of giving U.S. foreign assistance to North Korea pursuant to the agreed framework of 1994. The Bereuter amendment imposes a sensible condition on the funds that this bill appropriates for North Korea.

This amendment prohibits any money appropriated under this act from being used to assume any liability for the cost of nuclear accidents in North Korea. Incredibly, the administration reportedly is considering making U.S. taxpayers libel in the event that the North Koreans mismanage their nuclear reactors that the administration wants to build there and could trigger a catastrophic nuclear accident. This, obviously, would be folly; and the gentleman from Nebraska is doing all of us a favor by trying to stop the administration from doing this.

The distinguished Chair of our House Republican Policy Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), has been very active in protecting the interests of the American taxpayer with regard to the possibility that current U.S. policy may create a Chernobyl-style disaster in North Korea. I am pleased to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) on the defense authorization bill that addresses these concerns, and I am pleased to support the Bereuter amendment to the bill as well.

This is a very timely and important amendment, and I urge our colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would say that, indeed, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) has been extremely active. He does have an amendment filed, and I will give him the opportunity to close in a minute.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, if I have ever seen a bad deal, it is this amendment. It is bad from a number of perspectives. It was not that long ago that we were in the well here wringing our hands about the dangers of a North Korean missile coming over and hitting part of the United States, and there was no limit to the funding we would spend to stop this threat from North Korea: \$60 billion for an untested Star Wars program. Rush the program through. We

have spent a third of a billion dollars in the last 9 months.

We all saw the last success of that program when the booster apparently did not get to the target where it was predetermined to hit the mark. So we have spent a third of a billion dollars in the last 9 months. There are people here who want to spend \$60 billion before they find out whether the system works or not to protect us from North Korean missiles. But let us make sure we do not even give the administration an opportunity to work out an agreement that stops the North Korean missile program.

A better title for this bill would be "an amendment to prevent an agreement." Because before we know what the administration wants to do, whether they are going to get a consortium of nations to simply buy an insurance program, whether the Japanese and the others in the region are going to pay the whole tab and we might have to facilitate some of the technical elements of it, Congress is going to rush down here, and we are going to tell President Clinton and his negotiators not to come to an agreement.

We are going to spend \$60 billion on Star Wars whether it works or not. That is a good expenditure, just like the third of a billion we have had for the failed tests. Let us just slow down a bit here. What the administration has achieved is for the first time in 50 years we are having a dialogue with the North Koreans. Now, this is not an easy job. This is about one of the most paranoid societies in the world. Orwell's view of the world could not figure this place out if he had the blueprint in advance.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have got them to stop their nuclear program. We have got them to stop their missile program. There is a lot more we have got to do. We have our allies working together with us in a coordinated program. We always complain about burden-sharing. Here others want to take the lead in the burden, and we have got an amendment on the floor to stop us from participating before we know what that portion of participation is.

I understand the desire not to have anything in North Korea that could give us a liability. But when Congress is ready to pass on a \$60 billion Star Wars program before the technology works, when we have spent a third of a billion dollars in the last 9 months, we should not come here and say we cannot spend a penny to implement, negotiate and come to an agreement that might shut down any future missile or nuclear programs that the North Koreans might undertake is bad policy.

Let us give the administration a chance. This is the toughest country in the world to negotiate with, and we have begun to make progress.

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and

I just want to say that regardless of whether we are doing the right thing in the amendment or not, I think the whole indemnification process is wrong for us to get involved in.

What we are saying is that General Electric, which is the only American company I know of that is even involved in providing some of the resources for the new facility, will not go in there without indemnification. So what we are saying, in effect, is that we are not going to allow the United States to indemnify General Electric from any class action suit that might take place even in North Korean courts.

American business people are already being subjected to this serious problem in South Vietnam now. So I have questions about the indemnification.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's questions, but the questions exist outside of any liability.

We have not yet given the administration opportunity to see what portion the Japanese are willing to take, and they are very interested in this. So to handcuff the administration before we have even a blueprint of what the final negotiations will present us for American responsibility, while we are ready to spend \$60 billion on Star Wars, is irresponsible.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), but I might just say to the gentleman from Connecticut that this has nothing to do with missiles.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for offering his amendment. It is similar to language that this House recently approved when I offered my amendment on the defense authorization bill. The House voted 334 to 85 to authorize this prohibition on the Clinton administration guaranteeing against the cost of nuclear accidents in Stalinist North Korea.

This amendment is imminently sensible, and it must be adopted.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I say that we should give negotiations a chance.

If we can spend \$60 billion on Star Wars, a third of a billion in the last 9 months, we ought to at least give an administration a chance to try to work this out which has shut down the North Korean missile program, which has shut down their nuclear program, and has made more progress on the North Korean peninsula in the last several years than all the 50 years before that.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 546, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 57 offered by Mr. PAYNE:
Page 132, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

ASSISTANCE FOR NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE OF SUDAN

SEC. 701. (a) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds appropriated under the heading "TITLE II—BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND" for non-sub-Saharan African countries, not more than \$15,000,000 shall be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide assistance to the National Democratic Alliance of Sudan to strengthen its ability to protect civilians from attacks, slave raids, and aerial bombardment by the Sudanese government forces and its militia allies.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "assistance" includes non-lethal, non-food aid such as blankets, medicine, fuel, mobile clinics, water drilling equipment, communications equipment to notify civilians of aerial bombardment, tents, and shoes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me say that the amendment that I have offered is an amendment that would allow assistance to the National Democratic Alliance, which is a group of people in the south of Sudan. It will provide them with nonlethal equipment, not counting food aid; but it would give assistance to the people in the south to support their fight against the National Islamic front, which is the government of the north, which has given the people in the south a very, very horrible time over the past 30 years.

□ 1330

In Sudan, close to 2 million people have died in war-related causes. Many have died from famine. Many have died from war-related killings.

Secondly, in Sudan, slavery is condoned by the al-Bahsir government; and we feel that this is one of the most tragic situations in the world. More people have died in Sudan than in Somalia, Rwanda, Kosovo all put together.

We think that this support would help to protect the defenseless citizens to provide them with nonlethal assistance such as medicine, vehicles, field hospitals, communication equipment, radio transmitters so that they can have a way to counter the National Islamic Front's propaganda.

The need is even more important now since the Government is using newly found oil revenues to buy arms to destroy the opposition. We cannot allow the extremists to win. We must help create a level playing field if there is going to be meaningful negotiations and a just settlement to the conflict. We must do more to bring about peace in Sudan.

We feel that there should be an end to this conflict, and we would like to see the IGAD process led by President Moi of Kenya, who has been working with the government of Khartoum and with the SPLA and with the National Democratic Alliance to try to come up with a solution to end this most horrific situation that is occurring in Sudan.

We have seen pictures of slaves that have been purchased from the slave owners. We have seen the beatings of people who have been held in bondage where they are raped or where their Achilles' tendons are cut so that they cannot escape, where they are treated even worse than the animals in the compound where they have to work in indentured servitude.

And so, we are saying that the world has too long sat by and has done too little and that we must step up an aggressive movement to assist these people.

As I indicated before, an estimated 2 million people have died. They have died of famine. They have died of war-related incidents. There are old Soviet planes that the government in Khartoum uses against the villages in the south, planes called the Antinovs. These planes bring bombs down to the area. And as the plane goes over and as they approach a village, the chickens are the first to hear the planes coming and the children who watch the chickens then start to run. Then the older people know that the planes are coming and it is time to move out.

The last bombing, they destroyed a primitive hospital in one of the towns. They have bombed a school that the administrators there have attempted to conduct educational facilities going on. And so this is really something that is the only humane thing to do. We must say that enough is enough. I ask that this amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) wish to make his point of order?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order, and I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the long-time interest of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

PAYNE) in the humanitarian disaster in the Sudan. I am not necessarily against the language, but this is simply the wrong measure. This is an appropriations bill.

I will be pleased to work with the gentleman, who has been an outstanding advocate on behalf of democracy in Sudan, on these issues in our committee and would be pleased to work with him to make certain that we get the appropriate vehicle for doing what he is seeking, his meritorious goals.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it violates clause 2 of rule XXI in that it constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) wish to be heard briefly on the point of order?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who I have had the privilege to work with, for his comments. I think his leadership on the Committee on International Relations has been exemplary.

I have had the privilege also to work closely with the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE); and I feel very strongly that we have to finally move. It is the only right thing to do.

The pariah government of Sudan, those persons who bombed our embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, came out of the Sudan. They are bombing their own people. Two million people have died.

But, Mr. Chairman, I would accept the suggestion of the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that we could work together. And I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations would also agree to work along with us. We do realize that this may be perceived as trying to legislate through appropriations, but I do appreciate his willingness to work with us.

I commend the gentleman for the relationship that we have and also commend the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who has seemingly started to appreciate some of these issues. And, hopefully, we can work together.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) explicitly supersedes other law. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if possible, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the chairman to discuss an area that I think in our foreign policy that we

overlooked, and that is the funding for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

This is a country that of all the countries in the Balkans has achieved what none of the others have. And, in fact, what we have is a multiethnic society that has democracy, a functioning parliament that we, through our foreign policy, have not kept our agreements with, and specifically, the agreement that we signed that, if we were there longer than 5 days, we would renegotiate our agreements for the utilization of that society during the war in Kosovo.

The toll on Macedonia has been tremendous. They had an influx of 350,000 refugees in a country of 2 million people. That would be like us taking 45 million people in.

The agreements that were made are not being kept with the Macedonian people. In this time of instability in the Balkans and the need for stabilization, it is, I believe, imperative that, number one, we go back and reemphasize our effort for support for that democracy; and, number two, we keep the agreement that the administration made.

I would like to enter into the RECORD the statements by Ambassador Holbrooke, the fact that the administration had asked for more money for Macedonia; and, in fact, their request was not for an increase in money for Macedonia and to make that a part of the RECORD.

The second area that I think that we need to talk about is the infrastructure damage that has been done by both the KFOR force and the European force to their roads and highways which is handicapping their ability to rebuild their democracy and their economics.

My question would be to the gentleman that if he would he take another look at this prior to going to conference to see if in fact we cannot live up to our obligations that were promised, number one, and number two, invest in a country that has chosen peace instead of conflict and is demonstrating that a multiethnic parliament and democracy can work in that area.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we will be happy to give consideration to that. I think the gentleman is fully aware of the fact that we have a limited amount of allocation to us.

The time will come when the gentleman will have the opportunity to vote on whether or not we are going to have an increased allocation. And if indeed that increased allocation comes, which I am sure the gentleman will then not object if we are going to fulfill his request, I certainly will consider that.

I appreciate the knowledge of the gentleman of that area of the world and especially Macedonia and would pledge to work with him.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to reinforce some of the points that my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), made but add that it was not just the road damage. They will have 580 to \$600 million estimated in trade damage and other costs. They have 50 to 60,000 refugees still there.

Macedonia was in a terrible situation. Because, unlike the other Orthodox neighbors, they sided with the United States and they let us use their roads and let us use their facilities and have paid a terrible price in trade. And having the refugees there and having our armed forces go through, they have tried to sustain their balanced government, but it is under direct challenge.

Because it has been a destabilizing force, now their borders are at risk. It was never a completely clear border between the different countries there, anyway. I know that my colleagues are under tremendous financial pressure. Anybody watching these debates understands that. We all have the sneaking suspicion that there will be more money later. I hope my colleagues will strongly consider adding additional funds to a country that stood with us.

Many of us did not favor that intervention. But when we went in, we needed to have the protection for American soldiers and the base with which to put them through. This country cooperated with us and paid a terrible price, and we need to do what we can to help them.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would also give the same message to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that when the time comes for an increased allocation whereby we can facilitate these things, we would appreciate very much the support of the gentleman.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. PAUL:

At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR ABORTION, FAMILY PLANNING, OR POPULATION CONTROL EFFORTS

SEC. 701. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for—

(1) population control educational programs or population policy educational programs;

(2) family planning services, including, but not limited to—

(A) the manufacture and distribution of contraceptives;

(B) printing, publication, or distribution of family planning literature; and

(C) family planning counseling;

(3) abortion and abortion-related procedures; or

(4) efforts to change any nation's laws regarding abortion, family planning, or population control.

(b) ADDITIONAL LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to

any organization which promotes or makes available—

(1) population control educational programs or population policy educational programs;

(2) family planning services, including, but not limited to—

(A) the manufacture and distribution of contraceptives;

(B) printing, publication, or distribution of family planning literature; and

(C) family planning counseling;

(3) abortion and abortion-related procedures; or

(4) efforts to change any nation's laws regarding abortion, family planning, or population control.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes all the funding for international population control, birth control, abortion, and family planning. This is not an authorized constitutional expenditure. It should not be spent in this manner.

More importantly, in a practical way, it addresses the problem of fungibility. Because so often we appropriate funds, whether it is funding for family planning with restrictions against abortion or whether we give economic aid or whether we give military aid. All funds are fungible.

So, in a very serious way, we subsidize and support abortion to any country that participates once we send them funds. This amendment addresses that by striking all these funds which are allocated for population control.

Population control and birth control in many of these nations is a serious personal affront to many of their social mores in these countries. Also, it is an affront to the American taxpayer because it requires that American taxpayers be forced through their taxing system to subsidize something they consider an egregious procedure. That is abortion. These funds go to paying for IUDs, Depo-Provera, Norplant, spermicides, condoms.

Just recently a study came out that showed that the spermicidal, the nonoxynol-9, is something that is paid for with these funds. Unfortunately, this spermicidal enhances the spread of AIDS. Talk about unintended consequences. Here we are, the other side, who likes this kind of spending, they do it with good intentions; and at the same time, it literally backfires and spreads AIDS inadvertently.

□ 1345

For this reason, I offer this amendment to strike all these funds because there is no other way to stop the use of these funds once the funds get there, no matter what the restrictions are.

The Mexico City language is something I support and I vote for, and the attempt is very sincere to try to stop

the abuse of the way these funds are used. But quite frankly the Mexico City language does not do a whole lot. If the President wants to suspend that language, he can and he takes a penalty of \$12 million, a 3 percent reduction in the amount of money that becomes available for these programs. It goes from \$385 million down to \$373 million and the President can do what he wants. So there is really no prohibition. We as American taxpayers do support these programs. You say, Oh, no, they don't. We put prohibitions. They're not allowed to use it for abortion.

That is not true. I mean, the language is true; but it does not accomplish that. What it accomplishes is that these funds go in for buying birth control pills and condoms, and the money that would have been spent on birth control pills and condoms go and is used to do the abortion. I believe in the fungibility argument in its entirety, not just in the family planning. As soon as you give funds in any way whatsoever to a country such as China that endorses abortion, I mean, we are participants, we are morally bound to say that we are a participant in those acts. Even though we say, I hope you don't do it and you shouldn't do it and we're not authorizing you to do it, we have to remember that funds are fungible and that they can be used in this manner.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York seek to control the time in opposition?

Mrs. LOWEY. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) continues to reserve his point of order.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to the Paul amendment which would eliminate all of our international family planning and population programs. The House rightly rejected this amendment last year by a vote of 145-272. I respectfully submit that we do so again with an even larger margin.

Our family planning and population programs work hand in hand towards one very worthy goal, advancing the health and well-being of children and families. Simply put, if you seek healthy children, you must have healthy mothers. There is a strong relationship between educating women on safe motherhood, voluntary family planning and child survival. Planning pregnancies is one of the most powerful and effective child survival tools in existence. Postponing early high-risk pregnancies, giving women's bodies a chance to recover from a previous pregnancy, and helping women to avoid unintended pregnancies and unsafe abortion can prevent at least one in four maternal deaths.

We hear again and again that women die from having children too young, having children too closely spaced together, and by having more children than their bodies can bear. Getting that message out across to women is an integral part of our population and family planning work because healthier mothers will be better able to care for their children.

Children born to mothers who wait 2 years between births have a much stronger chance of survival than those born to moms whose births fall less than 2 years apart. Giving women this information can save children's lives, can save women's lives. We have to do all we can to encourage and reinforce the messages of voluntary family planning, safe motherhood, child survival. This amendment would absolutely destroy our efforts to help both mother and child. It would destroy the efforts of the barber in this small village in India to be taught while he is cutting the hair of these men how to work with the men and women in teaching them, educating them. That is what family planning is about in the poorest parts of our world.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to the Paul amendment and associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who has been a leader on this international family planning issue as has the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and so many others in the House of Representatives. But as a member of our subcommittee, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has led the way.

This is a hard amendment for me to understand. Maybe we need a lesson in the birds and the bees in this Chamber. We really have to be thinking seriously about what the message is that will come out of this Congress if we vote to eliminate all funding for international family planning. The gentlewoman from New York explained obviously how necessary this is. We all want to reduce the number of abortions that take place. I myself personally consider abortion a failure, a failure of education, of prevention, of opportunity for women to be in control of their lives and control the timing and size of their families. But that is so fundamental.

If you want to reduce the number of abortions, as we all do, does it not make sense, Mr. Chairman, that we would, therefore, try to prevent conception and give people an informed way in which to do that.

So I understand and respect everyone's view on this subject. I understand it more easily in terms of the gag rule, which I do not support, but I understand that. But as a woman, the idea that we would even consider on the

floor of this House the notion that we should cut off funding for international family planning is incomprehensible to me for the following reasons:

One, it would not reduce the number of abortions, family planning. Two, we have the opportunity from the standpoint of population and the environment, we have a responsibility to be responsible. I think that I am going to have to yield back to the gentlewoman, but I do so bewildered by the maker of this motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has expired. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me see if I can explain as an obstetrician the fundamentals of the birds and the bees, about the fundamentals of law. Under the Constitution we are not permitted to do these things.

I agree with much of what has been said. I believe in birth control, and I believe it should be voluntary. But this is not voluntary on the part of the American taxpayer. They are the ones who suffer the consequence of the involuntary compulsion of the tax collector coming and compelling the American taxpayer to fund things that they find immoral and wrong. That is the lack of voluntary approach that you have.

Yes, there are a lot of good intentions. I think that is very good. But there are a lot of complications that come from these procedures. As I mentioned before, this nonoxynol, it is a spermicidal, and it increases the spread of AIDS. Good intentions, unintended consequences. The American taxpayers are subsidizing this.

What we are saying is that there is a better approach. There is a voluntary approach through donations, through our churches. But not through the compulsion of the IRS telling the American taxpayers that they are compelled to pay for an egregious act that they find personally abhorrent.

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

Does the gentleman from New York wish to make his point of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the amendment on the grounds that it violates clause 2 of rule XXI in that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to be heard briefly on the point of order?

Mr. PAUL. Yes. This is an amendment that I have brought up on several occasions. As the gentlewoman just mentioned, we have voted on it. She cited the votes that we have had on previous occasions. We have done this before. The one question that they have is whether or not these funds can be used for lobbying. Of course the Mexico City language, the funds are

permitted to be used for lobbying and prevention of lobbying for the change in the promotion and the propagandizing for abortion and birth control.

I would say this conforms with the Constitution, it conforms with this bill, it conforms with what we have done for the past several years, and it is strictly, narrowly defined as a prohibition of funds to be used to perform population control.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from New York makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas proposes to change existing law, in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI.

As recorded in Deschler's Precedents, volume 8, chapter 26, section 52, even though a limitation or exception therefrom might refrain from explicitly assigning new duties to officers of the government, if it implicitly requires them to make investigations, compile evidence, or make judgements and determinations not otherwise required of them by law, then it assumes the character of legislation and is subject to a point of order under clause 2(c) of rule XXI. Specifically, subsections (a)(4) and (b)(4) of the proposed section in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas require new determinations not required under existing law.

Therefore, the point of order against the amendment is sustained.

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 23 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new title:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. None of the funds appropriated in this Act shall be made available to the Palestine Authority.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman claims the time in opposition. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In 1994, the United States signed an agreement with Palestinian authorities to encourage American investment with the Palestinian Authority, and this would allow the use of OPIC funds.

In 1995, Vice President AL GORE asked a company in my district to be, in fact, the first investor in Gaza. The

Buchheit Company got OPIC insurance and made a multi-million dollar investment in Gaza, the first, encouraged by Vice President AL GORE.

The company entered into contracts with the Palestinian Authority and hired and trained workers in Gaza. There were irrevocable written instructions to block wire transfers and dollars.

In January of 1996, the American company got a \$1.1 million loan from OPIC to expand the business in Gaza. They wired the funds from D.C. to Gaza. The money was stolen, never put into accounts. The State Department said, "It is a private commercial matter. Take it to court." They took it to court in Cleveland. They won. They were awarded triple damages. But now it is being appealed. So last year we got language in the bill saying, Let's work this out.

In October of 1999, OPIC wrote two letters asking the Palestinian Authority questions concerning the situation. I want the chairman and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to hear this. The Palestinian Authority admitted wrongdoing. They admitted to making fraudulent checks to a fictitious company that were cashed in 1996 and 1997. Then they seized the equipment of the company and still hold it.

Under the 1994 agreement, any disputes have to either be amicably settled or taken care of through arbitration or legal means and they said, We're not going to do anything about it.

When the company got the OPIC loans, they had to put liens on their property. So when everything was defaulted on, the company paid the loans out of their own pocket. The Palestinian Authority still has their equipment. They have told us to go to hell.

My amendment comes right to the point to prohibit any funding for the Palestinian Authority.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and ask how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have only one speaker and I understand it is my right to close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Wisconsin has the right to close.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here is where we are. We had another amendment that would be listed as out of order because it would prohibit any funds going to the Palestinian Authority until they resolve not only this case but several other American companies that have been ripped off.

If we are going to leverage American dollars, make investments with private companies, then have those companies go overseas and be ripped off, then who do we represent?

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the distinguished chairman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, but to tell the gentleman that we should protect American companies as you are doing for your constituents in Ohio.

As the gentleman knows, I have addressed this matter with the director of OPIC and told him that if indeed moneys were expropriated by the Palestinian Authority, well, then they should discontinue the delay in making a decision.

But the gentleman is right. As he well knows, the Palestinian Authority is going to be here in just a few months because they are out meeting at Camp David now, making concessions, saying that we are going to give them all of these billions of dollars if they will sign this peace agreement. I would just like to echo what the gentleman is saying.

□ 1400

If we indeed are going to start giving money to the PLO, then they are going to have to abide by standards of cooperation with the rest of the world.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, is the chairman supporting my amendment?

Mr. CALLAHAN. The chairman is supporting the gentleman's cause, and, if indeed there was not an objection, I probably would vote for the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I did not bring the one that is subject to a point of order.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I understand that.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I am asking for the gentleman's vote. That is the only protection this Congress has.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I just told the gentleman that if the amendment were to come to the floor, I probably would vote for it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I expect that it will.

Mr. Chairman, let me close by saying this: Rip them off. Go ahead. Rip off American companies and let monarchs and dictators say "Go to hell. Go to court." Not in my district. I want an "aye" vote on my amendment.

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

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I ask the Chair to let me know when I have consumed two minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if we can eliminate the bloviating, let me simply say that I oppose this amendment for two reasons: Number one, it is my understanding, we do not have the facts in this case. We do not have the facts in this case, and we should not take an action which could interfere drastically in the peace talks now going on at Camp David on the basis of a 5-minute explanation from one Member of Congress who has an ax to grind on the subject. The gentleman may be right; he may be wrong. All I know is that my understanding is that at this

very moment the company to which the gentleman refers may be under investigation by the U.S. Government itself for the way it does business.

Secondly, for us to eliminate all funding for the Palestinian Authority would be incredibly against the interests of the United States Government. The last time I talked to Prime Minister Rabin before he was assassinated, he said to me, "For God's sake, do not let anyone interfere with the ability of the United States Government to deal with the Palestinian Authority, because if you cannot deal with them, then the only party left on the Arab side you can deal with in the Middle East is Hamas, and they are terrorists, and then there will be no hope at all for an agreement for peace in the Middle East."

Mr. Rabin gave his life looking for that peace, so did Mr. Sadat, and I do not think that that should be disregarded because one Member of Congress has come to believe that one company, which may be under investigation by our own Government, that their interests ought to take precedence over the United States' national interests.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I consumed?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman said he had but one speaker remaining, or I could have reserved my time.

Mr. OBEY. Since I said that, the distinguished minority whip has asked to speak, and so has the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Then the gentleman should have notified me.

Mr. OBEY. I cannot see ahead of time.

Mr. TRAFICANT. The gentleman has also made allegations of an investigation of a company.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this is my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All Members will suspend.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, further parliamentary inquiry. Being that the gentleman said he had only one speaker, and I closed, is it in order to at least let me have a minute to respond to these types of statements, or shall we keep to the fact that the gentleman claimed he had but one and forced me to utilize my time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask all Members to suspend.

Under the rules and precedents of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin defending the committee position has the right to close debate. Other state-

ments which may be made in the course of the debate cannot be enforced, of course, by the Chair.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut, because I have another Member who also has informed me he wishes to comment on the amendment.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio has one company with a problem in the Palestinian entity. I have a list here that we just in moments put together of 42 countries where American businesses have disputes. If we are going to end our foreign policy every time there is a corporate dispute, we ought to just pack up and go home.

We have had five wars in the last 50 years in this part of the world. We have had women and children killed, including Americans, in terrorist activities and accidental bombings and attacks. We are at Camp David today trying to end this conflict that has gone on for a century. I admire the gentleman for caring about his constituent, but our responsibility here for this unique opportunity for peace cannot be squandered for one economic debate.

Reject the amendment. Support the effort at Camp David.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I want to also associate myself with the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

I rise in strong support of the Middle East process and in strong opposition to the Traficant amendment. Right now, as the gentleman from Connecticut has said, the leaders of Israel and the Palestinian Authority are meeting in Camp David seeking to forge an agreement to end a generation of conflict. That leaves us with a very clear choice today: Do we support that process, or do we seek to disrupt or possibly derail a just and lasting peace in the Middle East?

Now is not the time to be cutting or conditioning aid to the Palestinian Authority, or to Israel. It is in our own interest to support this peace process and to help build the foundations of peace and progress for the Middle East.

I strongly urge my colleagues to resoundingly defeat this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say to the gentleman from Ohio, after the peace talks are over we will have plenty of time to assess the conduct of both the Palestinian Authority and the conduct of the company in question, and if at that time it is clear that the U.S. Government is satisfied with the business practices of that company, and if the U.S. Government concludes that it

is in the interests of the U.S. taxpayer to proceed, then I will be happy to entertain such a proposal. But until that point, I believe that it would be irresponsible of us to proceed with this amendment at this time. So I would urge a no vote on the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 546, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

SEC. 701. Of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act in title II under the heading "BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE", not more than \$35,000,000 may be made available to the Government of India.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Alabama rise?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will control the time in opposition.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, for the past probably 10 or 12 years, maybe even longer, I have been coming to the floor talking about the atrocities that have been taking place at the hands of the Indian government in places like Kashmir, Punjab, Nagaland, and other places in India, and today this amendment is merely to update my colleagues and anybody else who is paying attention as to where we stand on this issue.

When only a few hundred people were killed in Haiti, we sent 20,000 troops

into Haiti at taxpayer expense, and the problems there have not been resolved. In the Sudan, over 2 million people have been killed, and the United States has not really done too much.

In Kashmir, there are half a million Indian troops that have been there for years and years and years imposing marshal law, gang raping women, taking men out of their homes in the middle of the night never to be seen again, except maybe turning up in the streams around Kashmir with their hands and feet bound, having been tortured and drowned.

Amnesty International concludes the policies of the Indian government in Kashmir to be an official policy of sanctioning extrajudicial killings. Another half million troops are in Punjab, right next to Kashmir.

If U.S. action and attention was justified in places like Kosovo and Bosnia around the world, then we at least ought to be paying attention to what is going on in the area of human rights violations in places like Kashmir and Punjab and Nagaland and other places in India.

India does not allow Amnesty International or other human rights groups to go into these areas. Even Cuba, the last communist bastion in our hemisphere, allows Amnesty International in. India has killed over 200,000 Christians in Nagaland since 1947, 250,000 Sikhs in Punjab have been killed since 1984, more than 60,000 Muslims in Kashmir have been killed since 1988, and thousands of Dalits, or what they call the untouchables, the blacks in India, have been killed. We do not know how many of them.

According to our own State Department, India paid over 41,000, 41,000, cash bounties to the police for killing innocent Sikhs from 1991 to 1993. They actually paid bounties to kill some of those people.

In Punjab, Sikhs are picked up in the middle of the night, only to be found floating dead in the canals with their hands and feet bound. As I mentioned before, the same thing happened in Kashmir. Some Sikhs are only so fortunate, and others are just never found.

Recently, India's Central Bureau of Investigation, the CBI, told the Supreme Court that it had confirmed 2,000 cases of unidentified bodies that were cremated by the military. Their families did not know what happened to them. They were all piled up and cremated.

It does not get any better in Kashmir. Women, because of their Muslim beliefs, are taken out of their homes in the middle of the night and gang raped, while their husbands are forced to stay inside.

The State Department says on page 3 of its report released this year, "The National Human Rights Commission does not have the power to investigate the military's actions in that area."

They went on to say, "The Indian government rejected the Commission's recommendations to bring the army

and paramilitary forces under closer scrutiny by allowing the Commission to investigate complaints of their excesses." So the military has so much power, the Human Rights Commission in India cannot even look into these things.

Human Rights Watch, an international organization, says, "Despite government claims that normalcy has returned to Kashmir, Indian troops in the State continue to carry out summary executions, disappearances, rape and torture." That is from this year's Human Rights Report, the 1999 Human Rights Report, issued last July.

"Methods of torture include severe beatings with truncheons, rolling a heavy log on the legs, hanging the detainee upside down, and using electric shocks on various parts of their body." Just imagine what it would be like if you had to go through that.

"Security forces are making Dalit women," the untouchables, "eat human defecation, parading them naked, and gang raping them."

Amnesty International says, "Torture, including rape and ill-treatment, continued to be endemic throughout the country." That is in their annual report.

"Disappearances continue to be reported during the year, predominantly in Jammu and Kashmir." Amnesty International again, the recent report.

"Hundreds of extrajudicial executions were reported in many States." Again, in the same report.

In July of 1998, police picked up Kashmiri Singh. Police said they were investigating a theft. They then tortured him for 15 days. They rolled logs over his legs until he could not walk. They submerged him in a tub of water and slashed his thighs with razor blades and stuffed hot peppers into the wounds.

Muslim persecution. March 1996, Mr. Jalil Andrabi, chairman of the Kashmir Commission of Jurists and a human rights advocate, was abducted and slain 2 weeks before he was to travel to Geneva to testify before the U.N. Human Rights Commission.

□ 1415

Christian persecution. Since Christmas day of 1998, there has been a wave of attacks against Christians all over the country. Churches have been burned, Christian schools and prayer halls have been attacked, nuns have been raped and priests have been killed. Our State Department agrees, there has been a sharp increase in attacks against Christians and Christian organizations. This past weekend, just this past weekend, two churches were bombed in India. Last month, a women's prayer meeting was bombed by militant Hindus. Last month, four Christian missionaries who were distributing Bibles were beaten, one so severely that he may lose both his arms and his legs.

Right now, we are talking about giving India more money. We are talking

about today in this appropriation bill giving them more money and yet India has increased their military budget this year by 28 percent. They are spending hundreds of millions of dollars on conventional and nuclear weapons, and we are subsidizing, indirectly, that proliferation of weaponry. This year, the President has requested \$46.6 million for developmental assistance to India through AID. That is an increase of almost \$18 million from last year's request. I cannot recall the President asking for this large of a request for India ever.

I understand that the Glenn amendment, which passed the U.S. Senate, is currently imposing sanctions on India for some of these violations. So why should we be increasing aid to a country that we are currently sanctioning for human rights abuses and other travesties? It makes absolutely no sense to me.

We are talking about 25 percent cut with this amendment. I think it is justifiable, it sends a strong message, one that will be heard around the world, but especially in India.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana for agreeing to withdraw his amendment, which I understand he is going to do momentarily.

The objective, or my objective in handling this bill is to wind up with a final document that does not have offensive language in there to my views or the views I think of the majority Members of Congress. The very fact that the gentleman has agreed to withdraw it gives me my victory, and I can see no sense in standing here all day long and delaying the possibility of whether or not Members are going to be able to get out of here in a timely fashion to catch their arranged flights to go home for the weekend. So I have accomplished my mission, and that is that the offensive language to me, with respect to India, is going to be withdrawn and the amendment is going to be withdrawn.

But out of deference to those who want to speak in response to the gentleman's remarks, I am going to yield 7 of my 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), with the forewarning, Mr. Chairman, that she is not going to come forward with a unanimous consent request to extend this debate and preclude the possibility of Members getting out of here in a timely fashion this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and I ask unanimous consent that she be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) controls 7 minutes which she may yield to others.

There was no objection.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment. I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN).

(Mr. ACKERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. I only regret that we do not have as much time to put the light of truth to so many of the things that he said, because we have not been given equal time in this debate.

That being said, the House has rejected the gentleman's amendment on repeated occasions, and I do hope and expect it will do so again today. I think it should be clear to all by now that punishing India by cutting our assistance is not a policy that this U.S. Congress will adopt.

The Burton amendment is the wrong amendment at the wrong time. In the wake of the President's successful visit to India, the U.S. and India have a new opportunity to build a broad-based relationship. Instead of applauding India for establishing a joint working group with the U.S. to fight against terrorism, the amendment would punish India by cutting crucial assistance.

The gentleman makes a great many allegations about human rights abuses in India, but conveniently ignores the fact that the people of India are the major victims of terrorism perpetrated by groups supported and trained in Pakistan and associated with Osama bin-Ladin. In fact, after the Kargil incursion and the hijacking of an Indian Airlines plane to Afghanistan, the Pakistani-backed terrorists have stepped up their attacks on innocent civilians and security forces in Kashmir.

To characterize India's struggle against terrorism as a violation of human rights is not only unjust, but also provides aid and comfort to the terrorists who have claimed thousands of innocent victims in India. That there are things that go wrong in any civilized society, including India, are true, and some of the things the gentleman points out are true, but these are not done by the government of India.

Mr. Chairman, churches are bombed and burned here. People are killed every day here. Women are raped every day of the year here. These things are terrible, but it does not mean that our government is responsible. The best way for us to help India continue to improve its human rights record is to engage in positive and constructive dialogue, one great democracy to another, not with punitive sanctions and cuts.

The momentum that we have gained in relations by the President's visit needs to be strengthened and sustained. For Congress to act now to stigmatize India for alleged human rights abuses would send the wrong signal to the 1 billion democratic people in India. I urge all of our colleagues to reject this amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON). This is the time that we should be working together on environmental, education, and health issues.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise, as I have many times, in opposition to the Burton amendment, and for our continued support for the world's largest democracy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my strong opposition to this ill-conceived amendment.

This legislation has many problems, but one of the bright spots is a continued commitment to our Indian allies.

Unfortunately, this amendment will unfairly cut the critically-needed economic assistance funding for India included in this legislation.

As an important ally and a nation committed to strong democratic government, India has worked hard to ensure that the human rights of all its citizens are protected.

The Indian government has aggressively responded to assaults against religious minorities and has repeatedly expressed its commitment to ensuring tolerance. Recently, in response to attacks on Christians, Prime Minister Vajpayee reiterated his nation's desire to be inclusive of all faiths and to ensure equal justice under law for all Indians. We should support these efforts.

India is also one of our key trading partners and the Indian government has worked hard to create a friendly environment for U.S. firms.

As a result, U.S. investment in India has skyrocketed in the last ten years. Direct U.S. investment in India has increased from \$500 million in 1991 to more than \$15 billion today.

India has demonstrated a commitment to continue this growth and I strongly believe that we must support their efforts.

As a key ally and a fellow democracy, India deserves our support.

However, Congressman BURTON's amendment, rather than rewarding India, seeks to punish the people of India by withholding crucial humanitarian assistance.

India is a strong and vibrant democracy. It is the world's largest democracy. And, the U.S. is India's largest trading partner and largest investor.

The momentum gained in U.S.-India relations in recent years needs to be sustained and strengthened.

A vote for the Burton amendment would send the wrong signal to the people of India from the U.S. Congress at this very critical time.

I urge a "no" vote on the Burton amendment and yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, the arguments against the punitive anti-India amendment are stronger this year than they have ever been. In March, President Clinton completed the first visit to India by an American President in more than 20 years. The President's trip accompanied by a bipartisan congressional delegation produced a range of agreements on trade and investments, security partnerships and cooperation on energy and the environment. In September, India's democratically elected prime minister will be visiting the U.S. to further build upon this progress, especially in the area of economic relations.

India is the world's largest democracy. It is a country that has made tremendous progress in free market economic reforms over the past decade. But more to the point, since the gentleman from Indiana has been critical of India's human rights records, India's Human Rights Commission has been praised by our State Department and many international agencies for its independence and effectiveness. Indeed, India has become a model for the rest of Asia and the rest of the developing world in terms of democratization, economic reform and human rights.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, cutting aid to India only serves to hamper America's efforts to reduce poverty, eradicate disease and promote broad-based economic growth in the world's second most populous Nation. This amendment never made any sense, and it certainly makes less sense now.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it is in America's national interests to support and sustain India's development. The Commerce Department identifies India as one of the 10 Big Emerging Markets. With a growing high-tech industry, combined with the support and confidence of American investment, India has positioned itself to be one of the great success stories of the 21st century.

India has made tremendous progress in addressing human rights issues. The State Department has praised India for its substantial progress in the area of human rights. It is a strong, vibrant democracy that features an independent judiciary, diverse political parties and a free press, which vigorously assists in the investigation of human rights abuses.

This amendment threatens the relationship between the United States and the Republic of India. We should not be punishing countries like India, an example of freedom and democracy in Asia, while rewarding authoritarian governments like China which supports forced labor, which opposes freedom of the press, which opposes freedom of religion.

Mr. Chairman, the Burton amendment is a step in the wrong direction for American foreign policy. We should oppose it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, because I believe that we want peace in India and Pakistan, and my visit with the President in those countries, I ask that we oppose this amendment so that peace can be had in those nations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, it never ceases to amaze me that we come out here on this Burton amendment again. It is going to lose. But I implore my colleagues to look seriously and objectively at India. The proponents of this amendment say that India suppresses and violently intimidates its religious minorities. To use a Hindi word, that is bakwaas; that is absolute nonsense. The Indians know they have a problem, but they are the most secular country in the world. They appointed a Supreme Court inquiry, only the second time in their history, to look at the death of an American missionary. They also have a separate Human Rights Commission that operates in this country.

In contrast, consider our own treatment of Arab Americans in this country. When they are portrayed as terrorists, we turn a blind eye. India recognizes their problem and deals with them. I believe that India has problems, but it is a nation that is dealing with them. Rather than debate these kinds of amendments, we ought to find ways to work cooperatively with India to support their development.

Vote against the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here we are discussing the Burton amendment yet again. It never passes, and as far as I can tell, is brought up just to be inflammatory.

I implore my colleagues to look at the nation of India objectively. Since Independence, India has been a thriving democracy where suffrage is universal and voting rates are higher than the United States.

Unlike most former colonial nations, India has never suffered under a military dictator. The United States Military has more influence and participation in our government than the Indian Military has in theirs. India is a stable democracy, arguably the strongest and most stable in all of Asia.

Proponents of this amendment say that India suppresses and violently intimidates its religious minorities. That is bakwaas—pure nonsense. India is one of the most secular states in the world. India recognizes and guarantees religious freedoms and has the commitment to the rule of law to enforce those guarantees.

There have been isolated incidents—anomalies really—that have made the worldwide news, however, India has publicly, officially,

and resoundingly responded. India appointed a Supreme Court inquiry, for only the second time in this country's history, to investigate an instance of a Christian missionary's death. Also, India has a separate Human Rights Commission that is active and highly independent.

What is our response in this country when American-Muslims are depicted vilely as terrorists? We blindly turn away. India admits these problems and addresses them in the courts as well as and in the open and totally free press.

India has its problems, but it is a nation dealing with those problems. Rather than debate amendments that divide the US and India, we ought to work with India help come to grips with their problems and be a partner in the development of technology, trade and culture. The US and India have much in common and the potential to be great partners, we must not cut India off.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to my good friend from Indiana's amendment. While I commend my colleague's sincere concern about human rights and his tireless work on behalf of the oppressed, I have to disagree with him about his assessment regarding India. India has a fiercely democratic system that protects and promotes religious freedom and an independent judicial system.

We must not forget that the tensions between the people of India and Pakistan are to a very large degree fueled by communist China. Beijing's mischief making in Burma, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and occupied Tibet, nations that surround India, is a dangerous attempt to keep democratic India off balance. China has sold over \$2 billion in arms to the drug dealing Burmese junta. It has given or sold nuclear and conventional weapons to Pakistan. China occupies Tibet on India's northern border and Beijing is Sri Lanka's major supplier of arms.

India faces a difficult challenge in fighting extremists. The same vicious terrorists who attack innocent Indians are also responsible for the deaths of many innocent Americans. And our requests to the Pakistani government to pressure their Taliban clients to turn over the Saudi terrorist Osama bin Ladin to American law officers has fallen on deaf ears.

I regrettably, oppose my good friend's amendment. We need to work closer with democratic India to promote our similar concerns throughout the region. However, this is a wrong amendment targeted at the wrong country.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to vote against the resolution.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for her excellent work on this and so many other issues.

We have had an interesting year. President Clinton has led a delegation to India and we have begun to undo the damage of the Cold War where these two great democracies, the United States and India, did not have the best of relations. The Burton amendment is inappropriate almost any time; it is particularly inappropriate at this moment. We need to build a closer relationship with this largest free country in the world.

It is easy for us to run our democracy with the great wealth we have. India runs a democracy in excess of 1 billion people with some of the poorest people on this planet. We ought to be working to make a closer relationship between India and the United States, these two great leading democracies, and not drive a wedge between them. I urge rejection of this amendment and the concept that somehow India should be a whipping boy. India should be admired for its great successes in building a democracy in one of the largest and one of the poorest countries with some incredible economic development.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from California for her work in these last several days and all of her work here.

□ 1430

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the proposition of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) that we not provide a 50 percent increase in aid to India. The fact is, we should be asking ourselves why, in a country that has a vibrant and growing economy, a country that is now moving forward on its own, is the United States continuing to give more and more foreign aid to a country like India.

Beyond that question, yes, let us concede that India is a democracy. We are proud that India has made some progress and stands in that region as a democratically-elected government. In Pakistan, I am afraid they have gone in the opposite direction.

But that does not mean that we should have a reflexive, a reflexive response to give India money, or just ignore the transgressions that the Indian government commits upon its own people. We should be encouraging this democracy to live up to the principles of human rights and freedom that they are violating, and not just try to cover it up.

The fact is that it is clear that there are severe violations of the rights of Christians, of Sikhs, of Muslims, that have been blessed by the Indian government, if not at the highest level, at the local level.

We must also recognize the continuing violence and terrorism on the subcontinent. Most of it flows from one fact, and that fact is that India has refused to allow a democratic election in

Kashmir in order to solve a problem that a long time ago happened in 1948.

The United Nations has mandated that they have an election and permit the people of Kashmir and Jammu to control their own destiny. Then this terrorism that we have heard about would disappear. What we have now instead is terrorism on the part of government itself, trying to terrorize the people of Kashmir and other dissidents in India into submission.

Terrorism is nothing more than an attack on unarmed people. We see that in Kashmir, unarmed people are being attacked by soldiers who are trying to push them into submission because they know in a free election the Kashmiris would vote not to be part of India.

Let us not give India aid anymore. If we do, let us mandate democratic change and human rights.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I think in this debate we also need to think of India in strategic terms, not taking the action that the gentleman has proposed, which I think would be harmful to the relationship with India.

In strengthening our ties with India, we have the great advantage of common values of democracy and rule of law. With that, we can push for the further reforms we want to see in India. But I think we should all remember that it is going to take engagement to push for those reforms.

I think a decade of reforms by several governments has moved India from socialism and spurred economic growth. There is a new generation of Indians who have taken advantage of this liberalization of their economic climate, and frankly, I think that we see reforms coming to the fore in India. I think these reforms on the human rights front and in terms of trade can frankly succeed there because they have the rule of law as an underpinning.

I think there is an effective bridge with the Indo-American community. I think for those reasons this would be counterproductive. I think that increasing U.S.-India cooperation is about maintaining a regional security balance. I would urge withdrawal of the amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Once again, the object of this piece of legislation is to get a document that does not have language that is either offensive to my philosophy or even to the will of the House.

The gentleman from Indiana in the essence of time has agreed to withdraw his amendment. That is the purpose. The language will not be in there.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I will end by saying that a few years ago, this amendment did pass. Since then the other side, the Indian lobby, has been very effective. I congratulate them on their effectiveness.

The problem still exists, though. I hope one day we will not even have to talk about it because they will have solved that problem.

Ms. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman. Once again Mr. BURTON seeks to treat our friends in India in an unfair and unjust manner. The House should reject this ageless exercise by our colleague. This, like all the others over the years, is an ill-advised amendment.

This Burton Amendment, which would prohibit development assistance to India, is a step in the wrong direction.

The Government of India has consistently been moving at a rapid pace to strengthen its ties with the United States and the World. The economic and diplomatic relationship between the United States, the world's oldest democracy, and India, the world's largest democracy, can only be hurt by successful passage of this Burton amendment. We can not and must not ignore the important progress and mutual benefit we have achieved in recent years.

The Government of India has been on a constant pace of change, for the last decade. Recent elections have featured world record voter turnout, essentially free of violence.

Mr. BURTON, as usual, claims that human rights violations are taking place in India. That claim is not supported by the facts. As Members of Congress, we must be very careful not to view the Government of India as being callous to these alleged human rights violations.

India has made great strides in their battle to bring its various and diverse interests together. Indeed, recent reports by the U.S. State Department declare that India continues to make notable and important progress with its human rights problems. It would be false and misdirected to say that India is not our friend.

U.S. business in India has grown at an astonishing rate of more than 50% a year over the past ten years, with the United States becoming India's largest trading partner and largest investor.

India has more than a half century of democratic self rule, and we must not break the ties that we have so diligently strived to assemble. We must strengthen those ties. That is why we must defeat this latest Burton amendment.

We must also note that Indian Americans have become an important and active part of the fabric of this Nation. Organized around the country, they too use their influence to press for continued improvement in their native land.

Reject this latest Burton Amendment! There is much too much at stake!

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. BURTON. This debate seems to be an unfortunate rite of summer here in the House. Every year we debate a Foreign Operation Appropriations bill and every year the gentleman from Indiana tries to cut funding for India, one of our most important allies. As in previous years, this attack should be rejected.

The amendment in question would eliminate programs aimed at improving India's development. As my colleagues know, U.S. aid to India is primarily used for food, family planning

programs, child survival programs and infrastructure development. We should be doing all that we can to support India's government in stimulating economic development and opportunity for the Indian people, not standing in the way of these productive efforts.

Unfortunately, U.S. policy-makers have long neglected this important region, one that is home to one-fifth of the world population. That's why I applaud the efforts of President Clinton who visited India earlier this year and who has visited the Indian Prime Minister to the United States later this year.

There has been good news about India's economic performance in recent years; fiscal reforms, market opening and the privatization of state-owned companies has led to reduced inflation and tariffs as well as a reduced budget deficit. The economy's current 6 percent rate of expansion puts it among the fastest-growing in the world, as the Economist reported earlier last month. India's economic growth underlies its enhanced significance politically as a power that will play a decisive role for many years to come.

The U.S. is India's largest trading partner and largest investor. India continues to reduce and eliminate barriers to trade, and U.S. investment has grown from \$500 million per year in 1991 to over \$15 billion in 1999.

Passage of the Burton amendment, however, would be a blow to the flourishing bilateral partnership between the United States and India and a setback to Indian political and human rights reform.

As in previous years, the Burton amendment is wrong. It was rejected in a bipartisan manner. I urge all of my colleagues to again defeat this amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 32 offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new title:

TITLE VII—LIMITATION PROVISIONS

SEC. □□. No funds in this bill may be used in contravention of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits funds in the foreign operations appropriations bill from being used in

violation of existing laws against the importation of goods made by forced labor; specifically, the Tariff Act of 1930. It is not a new law, but since this act was passed the U.S. Government has turned a blind eye to the repeated violations of the import of goods made by forced labor overseas.

Forced labor violates the rights of workers and undermines pro-democratic forces by providing financial resources and international support to the totalitarian dictators under whom they languish. The labor system, for instance, in the People's Republic of China, known as Lao Gai or reform through labor, imprisons 8 million Chinese in slave camps and mental institutions.

The Lao Gai prison systems continues Mao Zedong's politics of despotism. In these work camps prisoners are subjected to beatings, to torture, and to near starvation.

The United States imports \$70 billion of goods from China, often goods made in these Lao Gai prisons.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in the essence of time and with respect to those schedules that have been prearranged, I will be happy to accept the gentleman's amendment if we can discontinue debate on the subject.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I accept that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

I would say to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), I have serious concerns about the operation of our Nation's assistance programs with respect to Ukraine and Russia.

The gentleman and his subcommittee have been most helpful, but I believe there are some remaining items that need attention, particularly in the arena of agriculture, where U.S. policy towards Russia and Ukraine have lacked primacy, have generally supported the old order rather than reform, and have been unrealistic in meeting the basic needs of villagers and small holders who are raising the majority of food in both nations.

First, most people know that agriculture depends upon seasons. There is a time to plant, a time to nourish, and a time to harvest. No one of us can change this natural cycle.

However, it is my experience that the Agency for International Development has not been sufficiently sensitive to these natural deadlines when considering applications for program assistance in agriculture. Approvals are delayed past planting dates. Termination dates are set earlier than harvest dates. It is as if the project is being set up to fail because these natural deadlines are being ignored.

Can the chairman assure me that as we move towards conference on this bill, that we can work to be sure that AID focuses more attention on agricultural reform in Ukraine and Russia, that it improves the speed of its application review process, and that the duration of these projects comports with the seasonal deadline?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentlewoman's concern and will be pleased to work with her to be sure that AID makes the improvement in its contracting process that she has suggested.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the chairman.

Secondly, anyone who knows Ukraine knows that its economic future will be highly dependent upon a reformed agricultural sector. To fail to recognize this fact in any development program is to ignore this country's natural strength.

While I know that the gentleman is not in a position to commit to a specific amount, I know that recent aid for agricultural development has been declining globally, both in terms of dollars and as a relative portion of the AID package.

Can the chairman give me any assurances that we can work to increase the proportion of assistance to agricultural reform efforts in any aid package that is provided?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, again, I understand the gentlewoman's concern. Our committee report supports her approach.

Ms. KAPTUR. I again thank the chairman.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the Russian food aid, the Agency for International Development has not placed a high enough priority on agricultural and food systems development there.

Would the chairman agree with me that any food aid provided to Russia should be leveraged for greater impact, that any resources generated by this aid should be directed toward substantial economic growth and a reformed agricultural sector, and that agricultural projects should focus on the private sector, especially small-scale producers, small hold farmers, and women in order to maximize impact in fostering reform and allowing aid to reach the greatest number of people?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I agree with the gentlewoman, we should always use our assistance programs in the most effective manner possible.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for his understanding, his assistance,

his cooperation, his leadership, and his dispatch.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. As he knows, I have an amendment pending relative to the Panama Canal.

Given the gentleman's concerns with regard to the impact of the amendment and the timeliness of its consideration, there are approximately 30 Members who have expressed interest in the issues raised by this amendment in that with the abandonment of the United States' military presence in that theater, many of us are concerned about the threat of drugs coming through Panama into our Nation, as well as the inability of us to appropriately respond in the case of international defense needs.

For that reason, I was hoping to condition an appropriation in this act, to predicate it upon the good faith negotiations between the Government of Panama and the Government of the United States to allow the reinitiation of military presence, either at Howard Air Force Base or whatever appropriate location may be determined.

In light of the chairman's concerns about the consequences of this amendment, I will not offer the amendment, but wish to seek the chairman's agreement and assistance as this bill moves forward to seek whatever manner or remedy may be available to us to initiate discussions for the reestablishment of some military presence within the country.

I thank the chairman for his courtesies in yielding to me.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and we will be happy to work with the gentleman to achieve his goals, because we share them.

VACATING REQUEST FOR RECORDED VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT
Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, with regard to my heretofore discussed amendment No. 23, I ask unanimous consent that the request for a recorded vote be vacated.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for a brief colloquy with the chairman relative to that issue, and ask the chairman, if he would, to see what would be possible to offer some remedy within reasonable means that might meet the effects of Congress.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I certainly will work with the gentleman

from Ohio to try to find some legislative solution to the problems that exist with the Palestinian Authority and the gentleman's company from Ohio, because I happen to believe that the gentleman's company from Ohio has a substantial claim that should be paid by the Palestinian Authority, if indeed there is a way to do it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not want in any way the form of that discussion to have any overtones on the importance of what is happening in the talks between Israel and the Palestinian Authority. I will defer to the good judgment of the chairman.

I thank the chairman for his consideration.

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 24 offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new title:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. No funds in this bill may be used in contravention of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.; popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment simply prohibits money in the bill that would be used to fund any action that would contravene the Buy American Act.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

□ 1445

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) for yielding. We accept his amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member of the committee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment and support the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I urge an aye vote; and, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. KAPTUR

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 48 offered by Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MS. KAPTUR

Page 132, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE

SEC. 701. The amount otherwise provided by this Act for assistance to the Government of Ukraine under the heading "ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION", is hereby reduced by an amount equal to the amount of any claim outstanding on the date of the enactment of this Act by the United States Government, a United States business enterprise, or a United States private and voluntary organization against the Government of Ukraine or any Ukrainian business enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, July 12, 2000, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes on her amendment.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment basically is a limitation amendment, limiting assistance to Ukraine reducing it by an amount equal to the amount of any claim outstanding on the date of enactment of this act, whether that to be a U.S. business enterprise, a U.S. private and voluntary organization against the government of Ukraine, or any Ukrainian business enterprise.

It is my intention, as I discuss this, to draw attention to the lack of resolution on claims by Land O'Lakes and Pioneer and other such claims.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I was of the impression that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and I, in the essence of time, I sought recognition to strike the last word to give her the ability to, I thought, express her views on this subject, which as the gentlewoman full well knows, is going to be ruled out of order, and in the essence of time I would ask the gentlewoman to keep her comments brief so we can get out of Dodge.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I do intend to keep them brief, but we entered into a colloquy and I appreciate the gentleman's forbearance on that, but this was in the form of an amendment.

I wanted to use the opportunity to speak about the lack of repayment by Ukraine of various debts that are owed

to companies in our country and also to speak about U.S. policy toward Russia and Ukraine, particularly as it relates to a sector critical to long-term stability in those nations, agriculture and sustainable food production.

Mr. Chairman, sadly and incredibly, U.S. policy toward Russia and Ukraine have ignored agriculture and those nations governments are not inclined to pursue a path toward reform without prodding. U.S. policies have not only failed to elevate agriculture's importance as a key economic and social transformation mechanism; but our actions have generally supported the old order, rather than the new, and have been seriously deficient in meeting the basic needs of villagers and small holders who are raising the majority of food in both nations.

It is my intent to be very brief; however, I want to state for the record that students of history will attest, the economic and social systems of the former Soviet state were premised on the production of collective farms and the distribution of their earnings to social welfare concerns within those countries, everything from schools to hospitals. Thus, agriculture was more than a sidebar activity in the former Soviet Union. It was the spine of the economy.

When the Soviet system collapsed, the West made a very serious, and I might add continuing mistake, in its efforts to help those nations reform and transform. It has largely ignored agriculture. How myopic. Any serious effort to transform the economies of those nations must be rooted in the countryside.

Mr. Chairman, not only have the fundamentals of agricultural reform been largely absent from U.S. policy initiatives toward Russia and Ukraine, some of the steps we have taken have been absolutely wrong-headed. In Russia, for example, the direct food aid provided through AID and USAID has largely supported the very parastatal entities that still control production.

A year ago, when the U.S. Government, without a vote of this Congress, sent over \$1 billion of food aid to Russia, there was no agreement that the proceeds of the sale of those commodities would be used for reform in the rural countryside. In fact, the proceeds are being deposited in the Russian pension fund, an account over which we have no control, no voice, no oversight.

Similarly in Ukraine, millions of dollars have been directed to what one can politely call the establishment, but not to people desperately trying to eke out a living. Take the issue of U.S. tractor sales to Ukraine. The sales were conducted through the government of Ukraine. Those tractors, which each cost \$100,000 more than they would have cost in the free enterprise system, could only be afforded by the old collectives, not the humble entrepreneurs and women villagers in babushkas struggling to restore Ukraine as the breadbasket of that region.

Whether the West likes to admit it or not, the vast majority of food being produced in those countries is now occurring on the small holder plots, largely tilled by older women. Nothing from our billions of dollars have ever reached these deserving people.

Somebody somewhere better pay attention to what is happening in Russian and Ukraine. The West's media is captivated by the goings on in Moscow and Kiev and the political intrigue surrounding who the next prime minister or president will be.

I will tell my colleagues, put on your mud boots and walk into the countryside where the pain gets deeper. Who is paying attention to the fact that 70 percent to 80 percent of the diet of ordinary citizens in Russia and Ukraine is bread and potatoes?

It is my intention, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to put my statement in the RECORD. I am going to submit everything that has gone wrong in terms of aide assistance to Russia and Ukraine since independence was granted there.

I want to use this opportunity to speak about U.S. policy toward Russia and Ukraine, particularly as relates to a sector critical to long term stability in those nations—agriculture and sustainable food production. Sadly, incredibly, U.S. policy toward Russia and Ukraine have ignored agriculture. And, those nations' governments are not inclined to pursue a reform path without prodding.

U.S. policies have not only failed to elevate agriculture's importance as a key to economic and social transformation. But our actions have generally supported the old order rather than the new, and have been seriously deficient in meeting the basic needs of villagers and small holders who are raising the majority of food in both nations.

As students of history will attest, the economic and social systems of the former Soviet state were premised on the production of collective farms and the distribution of their earnings to social welfare concerns within the state—everything from schools to hospitals. Thus, agriculture was more than a sidebar issue in the former Soviet Union. It was spine of the economy. When the Soviet system collapsed, the west made a very serious—and I might add continuing—mistake in its efforts to help those nations reform and transform. It has largely ignored agriculture. How myopic. Any serious effort to transform the economies of these nations must be rooted in the countryside.

Not only have the fundamentals of agricultural reform been largely absent from U.S. policy initiatives toward Russia and Ukraine, some of the steps we have taken have been absolutely wrong headed. In Russia, for example, the direct food aid provided through AID and USDA has largely supported the very parastatal entities that still control production. A year ago, when the U.S. government, without a vote of the Congress, sent over \$1 billion in food aid to Russia, there was no agreement that the proceeds of the sale of those commodities would be used for reform in the rural countryside. In fact, the proceeds are being deposited in the Russian Pension fund—an account over which we have no control, no voice, no oversight.

Similarly, in Ukraine, millions of dollars have been directed to what one can politely call the establishment, but not to people desperately trying to eke out a living. Take the issue of U.S. tractor sales to Ukraine. The sales were conducted through the government of Ukraine. Those tractors, which each cost \$100,000 more than they would have cost in a free enterprise system, could only be afforded by the old collectives, not the humble entrepreneurs and women villagers in babushkas struggling to restore Ukraine as the breadbasket of that region.

Whether the West likes to admit it or not, the vast majority of food being produced in those countries is now occurring on the small holder plots, largely tilled by older women. Nothing from our billions of dollars have even reached these deserving people.

Somebody somewhere better pay attention to what is happening in Russia and Ukraine. The West's media is captivated by the goings on in Moscow and Kiev, and the political intrigue surrounding who the next prime minister or president might be. But I will tell you, put on your mud boots, and walk into the countryside where the pain gets deeper. Who's paying attention to the fact that 70 to 80 percent of the diet of ordinary citizens of Russia and Ukraine is bread and potatoes. Caloric intake is going down. If the price of bread rises, political unrest is not far behind.

Time and again, the people of those nations go waiting and wanting, while assistance from the West misses the mark—

In Russia, the Russian Rural Credit Fund that could help real Russian farmers develop private operations goes waiting and wanting for cash, while U.S. assistance flows into government coffers;

In Ukraine, in 1995, the U.S. government gave \$3.6 million in commodities through Land O'Lakes to help Ukraine. The proceeds were to be used to help Ukrainian agriculture. But it didn't happen. For all these years, the U.S. government has tried to settle this matter, the latest offer being \$1 million for settlement. Promises of payment were made last fall. Then last December, I personally asked newly reelected President Kuchma to intervene in this matter. Last winter, when I traveled to Ukraine, I left a similar request with the Prime Minister's office. Promises were made again when I held a meeting this year between USDA Secretary Dan Glickman and the Ukrainian Ambassador. But these promises have not resulted in performance. Instead, we have seen letter after letter, phone call after phone call, argument after argument about whether or not the right documents have been exchanged or the correct contact number has been referenced.

Meanwhile, in Ukraine, the grandmas in babushkas who till the fields, and literally feed that nation, don't even have good shovels or seed. They get no real help either from the West or from the government of Ukraine. What kind of wrong headedness is this? Frankly, we'd be better off to send them seed packets and small rototillers with enough fuel to make it through the planting season. It would be more practical and hit a home run where it matters.

Our own Agency of International Development ignores the fact that agriculture depends upon seasons. There is a time to plant, a time to nourish, and a time to harvest. No one of us can change this natural timetable. So why

would USAID ignore these natural deadlines when Americans attempting to make a difference in agriculture in the field face approval delays past planting dates? Or contract termination dates set earlier than harvest dates? It appears as if even the meager projects addressing rural reform are purposefully set to fail because natural deadlines are ignored.

Let me focus on the amendment relating to Ukraine. It basically is a limitation amendment—limiting assistance to Ukraine, reducing it by an amount equal to the amount of any claim outstanding on the date of the enactment of this Act—whether that be a U.S. business enterprise, a U.S. private and voluntary organization against the government of Ukraine or any Ukrainian business enterprise.

It is offered as a way of getting the attention of the government of Ukraine to the serious outstanding issues that block full cooperation between us, not just in agriculture but as partners in a market economy.

It is my intention to withdraw this amendment this year, in hopes that final resolution can be reached on such matters as Land O'Lakes and Pioneer Seed. But, I reserve my rights to attach this amendment to subsequent legislation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) seek to control the time in opposition?

Mr. GILMAN. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the gentlewoman from Ohio to withdraw her amendment?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. It is my intention, Mr. Chairman, to withdraw this amendment this year, in hopes that final resolution can be reached on such matters as Land O'Lakes and Pioneer Seed; but I reserve my rights to attach this amendment to subsequent legislation, including perhaps legislation emanating from the gentleman's commitment at the appropriate point.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for bringing up this subject. I think what has happened in the latter decade of the 20th century, with respect to our assistance programs, internationally and American, to the former Soviet Union, certainly including Russia and the Ukraine, has really been a tremendous blow.

It has, I think, been counterproductive for causing them to move to a market-oriented economy. It has been counterproductive for democracy. In fact, it has contributed further to the corruption that has pervaded so many of the former Republics of the

Soviet Union, including, unfortunately, Ukraine.

We have, as the gentleman knows, and I am sure the gentlewoman is involved directly, so many positive contexts with the people of Ukraine, but to see so much of our resources diverted. Recently, it was suggested by a reputable source, an independent source in this country, that as much as \$1 billion to \$1.5 billion in assistance, international, including American, is diverted each month to private bank accounts, at least exported from that country at a time when those countries really need to have capital, their own and to attract foreign capital.

We have this huge outflow through Cyprus and other points, and it is a robbery of the assets and the potential and the future for the Ukrainian people and for the Russian people and for some of the smaller republics of the former Soviet Union.

I think we really have to be more insistent; we need to be more careful in having auditing of exactly where these international funds have gone. It seems to me in the past we have had too many decisions made on supporting various leaders of the former Soviet Union, certainly in the case of Yeltsin, when, in fact, we should have been building institutions from the bottom up, and working with those governors and local officials where, in fact, we have something approaching honest government and accounting for the resources presented to them by the international community.

Mr. Chairman, the IMF resources have been misused. In fact, the leadership direction to the IMF has come unfortunately from this country and from this administration. So I regret greatly that we have lost this opportunity in so many of the taxpayers' funds and funds from the world's community have been diverted to improper means.

The gentlewoman raises questions about those Caterpillar tractors. I have heard the same story how they ended up in garages of the local officials there in a very corrupt process. American companies many times are left holding the bills, as well as our taxpayers. So I appreciate the gentlewoman bringing this up.

We need to have reform. We need to be more insistent to make sure that the funds we do provide are properly spent and accounted for; and I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for the remarks. First of all, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for chairing the Ukrainian caucus, for keeping the Ukrainian problem before us in the Congress. I happen to have a large Ukrainian American constituency in my own area. I am very much concerned about the future of Ukraine and its democratic reforms. A great deal has to be

done, and we thank the gentlewoman for her making certain that the Congress addresses these issues.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for taking time out of his busy schedule to be here on such a critical issue.

I wanted to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, for allowing us just this moment. If so many billions of dollars were not involved, I would not press to spend a few extra moments here this afternoon.

I wanted to thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for allowing us this time.

We have had absolutely no other opportunity to bring this to international attention than this moment. We think it is the right time, and we look forward to working with the authorizing and appropriations committees in the future to keep our assistance on a short lease and to recover assets that are due to our company and our people and to move our aid in the direction of reform in both of those very strategic nations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentlewoman withdraw her amendment?

Ms. KAPTUR. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and I want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for her leadership.

We have had this issue for our committee over and over again, and I know that we are all behind the gentlewoman on this and thank her for her leadership.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, finally, we have arrived at the end of the bill, and in just a few seconds we are going to rise. I understand that there was a ceremony in the Rotunda and that has now ended and Members are now free to come back to the Chamber and we can now rise.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to tell the Members of the House that we have now a good bill, I know, in the minds of many. Especially in the minority it is

even a better bill, because they made their points about HIPC. I, too, made my points, because within the bill, I had put in some of the provisions. I talk about the restrictions on new loans to these countries.

I think all and all we have a good bill at this point, and I hope that we will get bipartisan support to send this message on over to the Senate where we can get on with this process of the passage of the year 2001 appropriation bill for foreign operations.

Mr. Chairman, I would once again like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her many courtesies; and I think, however, our balance sheet is a little slanted on my side, because I extended her more courtesies than she extended to me. Nevertheless, that is to be expected and not in the chauvinistic world. But in the Southern world, this is traditional, that Southern men especially are extremely courteous to our other staff colleagues.

I am happy to have had this opportunity during the last 6 years to work with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), to the members of our subcommittee.

I am happy that we have a bill now that I feel that can be supported in a bipartisan way. Even though I thought it was perfect before, I am optimistic that now the Senate will agree with me with the modifications that have been made that it is now a perfect bill, and there will be no reason for a conference; but, nevertheless, we will have to see about what happens there.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and while on occasion we may not have always agreed, we certainly have recognized his outstanding leadership in bringing the foreign operations bill to the floor.

This may be the last occasion in which he does it as chairman of the Foreign Ops Committee, and we have valued his hard work throughout the years. We want to thank his staff who have been doing such outstanding work and also the ranking minority Members, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for their outstanding work in foreign operations.

□ 1500

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate the gentleman from Alabama for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I must say, while I had not intended to comment at all, it is difficult to let the time pass by without expressing my deep appreciation for the work that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has done with this subcommittee over the years. We had, to say the least, some rough times during this particular appropriations year. The leadership that the gentleman has shown has had a huge impact in our relations around the world, and I appreciate his being patient with me as I try to provide input. I would like to express my appreciation as well to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her work and leadership on this very tough area.

Mr. Chairman, there is little doubt that very few of our constituents across the country are very excited about spending their taxpayer dollars on a thing called foreign assistance. The gentleman from Alabama has been able to provide a backdrop that involves questions, for example, that relate to the child welfare or development fund that have cast a different kind of shadow.

Indeed, the public is responding very positively to the positive role that we can play in strengthening democracy around the world as well as helping especially poor people and poor children around the world.

For the leadership and work that the gentleman from Alabama has done, I want him to know I very much appreciate his effort.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. Chairman, I might just convey to the audience that might be watching this that this is not an obituary. I am not going to die, and I am not going to go away. I am going to be back again next year because I have no opposition; and, as a result, I am going to be the chairman of another committee. I think whatever committee I get, it is going to be a committee whereby I will have some chips to pass around this House, and maybe it will not be as difficult as this has been.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as this is the close of this bill, I rise to commend once again the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his distinguished leadership of our subcommittee.

As my colleagues can tell, we do not always agree. In fact, a good deal of the time we do not agree. But we always have good communication because that is really what is important for us to develop a bill.

Now, it is interesting to me that the gentleman from Alabama said at the start of this that he had developed a perfect bill. He saw no room for improvement, and it was a perfect bill. Now today, this afternoon, he is saying now we have a perfect bill, a more perfect bill. So we are getting there. Now we are going to get the most perfect bill as we go along in the process.

I say that, despite the tremendous regard that I have for the gentleman, and he knows that, I still am in opposition to the bill and would encourage a no vote on the part of my colleagues.

While we have made some progress in two very important areas, part of the funding that we need for debt relief and some additional funding for global aid, and those were significant, we certainly did not go the full distance on the debt relief, and there are many other deficiencies in funding in the bill.

So, as we take a step down this path, I want to urge my colleagues to support the President, to sustain a veto by voting no on the bill.

But back to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN). Perhaps the gentleman from Alabama will be a chairman, perhaps he will be a ranking member, that is a whole new world that is open to him, and he will know then what it is like. Again, hopefully he will receive the same treatment as ranking member that I have received from him.

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

Ms. PELOSI. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, no doubt the gentlewoman will be the House Whip, so then there will be no question that neither one of us will be here in any position of authority.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's optimism in that regard.

But I do want to say that our staffs, and we have acknowledged and recognized them at the beginning of the bill, have worked in a bipartisan fashion.

I would not be taking this time except for my great esteem that I have for the gentleman from Alabama. People should know what a gentleman he is, how open he is to our views, even though he does not always accept them, and that he sincerely represents the point of view that he brings to the table without guile. So we share that sincerity.

We come from completely different districts, mine are more globally oriented, although, from all I can see, in Mobile and looking South, I think the gentleman is going to have a hard time sustaining the idea that we should have a small international relations budget.

As my colleagues know, this is about humanitarian assistance. It is about export finance, and it is about our national security. So those are all very important initiatives and worthy of support.

But in any case, again, back to the gentleman from Alabama, he is great. He has done a great job over the last 6 years. It has been a pleasure to work with him. I think our staffs have worked very well together. Perhaps I will have more to say if we ever bring a conference report to the floor.

I want to also say a word about the distinguished gentleman from Florida

(Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member. I think our committee is very excellently served by them and particularly on this subcommittee where they both have so much experience.

With that again, I commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and urge a no vote on his bill.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, often on this floor, good people can have strong disagreements about substance, and we certainly do in this bill today. Let me stipulate that I think the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the subcommittee chair, is a very good person, as is the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking minority member. We have very strongly differing views of how adequately this bill meets our responsibilities.

I think the distinguished gentleman from Alabama has done a terrific job as subcommittee chairman the last 6 years given the fact his hands have been tied most of the time by budget resolutions. I do hope that he gets the best possible ranking minority slot on whatever subcommittee he wishes in the next Congress.

But having said that, let me explain my concerns about this bill. Despite the increase in funding for debt relief, this bill still falls over \$200 million, almost \$250 million short of the administration request for debt relief. When one includes the supplemental, the International Development Organization is almost \$300 million short of the administration request.

We still have substantial shortages in the African Development Fund, the Asian Development Fund, the African Development Bank, which is only about half funded at half the level the administration is requesting. There are a number of other shortfalls as well.

I think we need to understand that, despite everything that this bill does so far, it still does not lay a glove on the major problem which confronts the international community in terms of public health. In 1999 alone, 480,000 children under 15 died from AIDS. Approximately 430,000 of those deaths occurred in sub-Saharan Africa. Around the world, as was noted on this floor several times last night, 1,700 children under 15 years old are, in effect, newly infected with HIV every single day. There will be some 44 million children in the 34 most affected countries who will be orphaned by that disease within the next 10 to 15 years.

I think the world has no idea the human carnage that is in store. When I look at this bill, even with the adoption of the two amendments that were adopted on the floor, this still falls far short of what is required for a Presidential signature. The administration is still opposed to the bill, and I certainly do not intend to vote for the bill, and I would urge Members to oppose it as well.

I would also ask that, when we vote on this bill, that we remember that we have obligations to our constituents, to our taxpayers, and to the fellow human beings with whom we share this planet.

In my view, this bill does not meet our obligation on all three fronts. America does not understand how much it is vulnerable to a health epidemic because of the shortfall of funds that we are providing in crucial international and domestic health funds. I hope that we do not find out over the next 20 years just how vulnerable we are. But I believe that the Labor-Health appropriations bill, which we passed earlier, and this bill both fall very far short of defending our taxpayers and our citizens from that problem.

I think this bill generally, especially with respect to the International Development Association, is needlessly unresponsive to the needs of the poorest countries in the world. For that reason, I would urge a no vote on this bill and, at the proper time, will have a motion to recommit with instructions.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), as has so many other of my colleagues, for the tremendous job that he has done shepherding this bill through the process, getting us through the subcommittee and the full committee, and getting to first base here in the House. We will move on, then, to the other body. We will round second, then we will round third, and we will come home with a bill that is probably not as perfect as the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) said that it was, but it is a bill that has to be passed.

I also want to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the role that they have played, and I thank all of the Members who took part in this great debate all day yesterday and most of today.

We have talked about a lot of issues. Some of them even were about appropriations, believe it or not. Most of them were authorizing issues. But, nevertheless, this was a good vehicle. We had good debate. For the most part, the Members were very respectful of each other and that is great.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) will play a major role in the balance of this Congress and in the next Congress and as many Congresses as he chooses to be here, because he is an obvious leader, and he is recognized as such. His ability to move this bill, which is one of the most difficult bills to pass, is proof positive of what I have said.

I want to compliment all of our colleagues in the House, Mr. Chairman, because this, believe it or not, is the 11th appropriations bill. This is only

July. This is the 11th appropriations bill that will go through the House not including the supplemental, which we have already passed and conferred earlier. So I am proud of this House of Representatives.

The differences are obvious. That is why there is 435 of us to express these differences. But this House has done a good job in meeting its constitutional responsibility to move appropriations bills.

With that, Mr. Chairman, again, I want to compliment the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for an outstanding job, and I guarantee him that he is going to be chairman of something very, very important. In response to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), we are hoping that he continues to be the ranking minority member for a long time, emphasis on "minority."

Mr. Chairman, I ask the Members to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to recommit this bill and to get to final passage and send the bill on to the other body.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 298, noes 125, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 399]

AYES—298

Abercrombie	Burr	Doyle
Aderholt	Burton	Dreier
Andrews	Buyer	Duncan
Archer	Calvert	Dunn
Armey	Camp	Ehlers
Bachus	Campbell	Ehrlich
Baird	Canady	Emerson
Ballenger	Cannon	English
Barcia	Capps	Evans
Barr	Castle	Everett
Barrett (NE)	Chabot	Ewing
Barrett (WI)	Chambliss	Fletcher
Bartlett	Clement	Foley
Barton	Coble	Fossella
Bass	Coburn	Fowler
Bateman	Collins	Franks (NJ)
Bentsen	Combest	Frelinghuysen
Bereuter	Cook	Gallely
Berkley	Cooksey	Ganske
Berry	Costello	Gekas
Biggart	Cox	Gibbons
Bilbray	Crane	Gilchrest
Bilirakis	Cubin	Gillmor
Bishop	Cunningham	Gilman
Blagojevich	Danner	Goode
Bliley	Davis (FL)	Goodlatte
Blunt	Davis (VA)	Goodling
Boehrlert	Deal	Gordon
Boehner	DeFazio	Goss
Bonilla	DeLay	Graham
Bono	DeMint	Granger
Boswell	Diaz-Balart	Green (TX)
Boyd	Dickey	Green (WI)
Brady (TX)	Doggett	Greenwood
Bryant	Doolittle	Gutknecht

Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shays
Hansen	McKinney	Sherman
Hastings (WA)	Meehan	Sherwood
Hayes	Menendez	Shimkus
Hayworth	Metcalf	Shows
Hefley	Mica	Shuster
Heger	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Hill (MT)	Miller, Gary	Sisisky
Hilleary	Minge	Skeen
Hinchey	Moore	Skelton
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Slaughter
Hoefel	Myrick	Smyth (MI)
Hoekstra	Nadler	Smith (NJ)
Holden	Nethercutt	Smith (TX)
Holt	Ney	Souder
Hooley	Northup	Spence
Horn	Norwood	Spratt
Hostettler	Nussle	Stabenow
Houghton	Ortiz	Stark
Hulshof	Ose	Stearns
Hunter	Oxley	Stenholm
Hutchinson	Packard	Strickland
Hyde	Pascrell	Stump
Isakson	Paul	Stupak
Istook	Pease	Sununu
Jenkins	Peterson (PA)	Sweeney
John	Petri	Talent
Johnson (CT)	Phelps	Tancredo
Johnson, Sam	Pickering	Tanner
Jones (NC)	Pickett	Tauzin
Kasich	Pitts	Taylor (MS)
Kelly	Pombo	Taylor (NC)
Kind (WI)	Porter	Terry
King (NY)	Portman	Thomas
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Klecza	Quinn	Thornberry
Klink	Radanovich	Thune
Knollenberg	Ramstad	Tiahrt
Kolbe	Regula	Tierney
Kucinich	Reyes	Toomey
Kuykendall	Reynolds	Traficant
LaHood	Riley	Turner
Lampson	Rivers	Udall (NM)
Largent	Rogan	Upton
Latham	Rogers	Velazquez
LaTourette	Rohrabacher	Vitter
Lazio	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
Leach	Rothman	Walsh
Levin	Roukema	Wamp
Lewis (KY)	Royce	Watkins
Linder	Ryan (WI)	Watts (OK)
Lipinski	Ryun (KS)	Weldon (FL)
LoBiondo	Salmon	Weldon (PA)
Lucas (KY)	Sanders	Weller
Lucas (OK)	Sanford	Weygand
Luther	Saxton	Whitfield
Manzullo	Scarborough	Wicker
Martinez	Schaffer	Wilson
Mascara	Schakowsky	Wolf
McCarthy (MO)	Scott	Woolsey
McCollum	Sensenbrenner	Wu
McCrary	Serrano	Wynn
McHugh	Sessions	Young (AK)
McInnis	Shadegg	
McIntyre	Shaw	

NOES—125

Ackerman	Dingell	Kennedy
Allen	Dixon	Kildee
Baca	Dooley	Killpatrick
Baker	Edwards	LaFalce
Baldacci	Engel	Lantos
Baldwin	Eshoo	Larson
Becerra	Etheridge	Lee
Berman	Farr	Lewis (CA)
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lewis (GA)
Bonior	Filner	Lofgren
Borski	Ford	Lowe
Brady (PA)	Frank (MA)	Maloney (CT)
Brown (FL)	Frost	Maloney (NY)
Brown (OH)	Gejdenson	Matsui
Callahan	Gephardt	McCarthy (NY)
Capuano	Gonzalez	McDermott
Cardin	Gutierrez	McGovern
Carson	Hall (OH)	Meek (FL)
Clayton	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)
Clyburn	Hill (IN)	Millender-
Condit	Hilliard	McDonald
Conyers	Hinojosa	Miller, George
Coyne	Hoyer	Mink
Cramer	Inlee	Moakley
Crowley	Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)
Cummings	Jackson-Lee	Morella
Davis (IL)	(TX)	Murtha
DeGette	Jefferson	Napolitano
Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Neal
DeLauro	Jones (OH)	Oberstar
Deutsch	Kanjorski	Obey
Dicks	Kaptur	Olver

Owens	Roemer	Towns
Pallone	Roybal-Allard	Udall (CO)
Pastor	Rush	Visclosky
Payne	Sabo	Waters
Pelosi	Sanchez	Watt (NC)
Peterson (MN)	Sandlin	Waxman
Pomeroy	Sawyer	Weiner
Price (NC)	Snyder	Wexler
Rahall	Tauscher	Young (FL)
Rangel	Thompson (MS)	
Rodriguez	Thurman	

NOT VOTING—11

Boucher	Markey	Smith (WA)
Chenoweth-Hage	McIntosh	Vento
Clay	McNulty	Wise
Forbes	Mollohan	

□ 1535

Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. KAPTUR, and Messrs. PALLONE, TOWNS, LEWIS of California, and JEFFERSON changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. PHELPS, THOMPSON of California, SKEEN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Messrs. KUCINICH, BERRY, MORAN of Virginia, NADLER, HINCHEY and MEEHAN changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the “Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2001”.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this bill. This bill is more than 10 percent below the President’s request overall, and it severely underfunds programs that are critical to our national security and continuing global leadership.

The bill does include some very necessary funding. The \$2.82 billion in aid to Israel included in this year’s bill is even more important today, as it demonstrates our enduring support for Israeli and Palestinian efforts to seek an end to their bitter conflict—efforts that are even now under way at Camp David. I strongly support the peace process, and my lack of support for this bill does not reflect anything to the contrary. I believe that U.S. aid to Israel is critically important to push this process forward and to ensure that Israel remains strong in the face of regional military threats. But as much as I value the prospect of peace, I cannot support a bill that falls short of our commitments in so many crucial areas.

I heard one of my colleagues say on the floor yesterday that he didn’t understand why the debate focused so much on the needs of people all around the world, and not about the needs of people in this country. After all, he said, we were elected by citizens of this country to represent them—not to represent the citizens of Mozambique or India or Kosovo.

First of all, to those who think—as many Americans do—that we spend too much on foreign aid, bear this in mind: Foreign assistance makes up only .6 percent of all federal expenditures in the fiscal 2001 budget. That is only .11 percent of the total U.S. economy, a level tied for the lowest percentage on record.

It’s true that the funds in this bill are intended to help those in need around the world. I think this is good. In fact, public opinion shows that there has been no decline in support for international engagement in the wake of the Cold War. Just the opposite—the

public strongly supports foreign aid, supports a stronger United Nations, and supports contributing our fair share to peacekeeping missions. I say we have an unprecedented opportunity—and indeed, a responsibility, as the richest country in the world—to provide global leadership through the spread of democracy and the promise of economic growth.

But foreign assistance isn’t just about helping our global neighbors—it is also about guaranteeing our own security. Development assistance helps level the playing field by reducing economic instability, poverty, and disease—all of which contributes to a healthier and safer planet. In our increasingly interconnected world, we cannot afford to pretend that adverse events in other countries and regions have no bearing on the United States. They do. Devoting adequate resources to foreign assistance is a proactive investment that will pay off in preventing more expensive crises in the future.

I say to my colleagues who question the importance of foreign aid, this bill doesn’t reflect the best of what America can and should offer to the rest of the world, and in fact, doesn’t even reflect some priorities Congress has already set.

Last year Congress authorized and fully funded bilateral debt cancellation, and authorized the IMF to revalue part of its gold reserves to write off its debts. Last year Congress also pledged to work toward a new process for debt relief and lending at the World Bank and IMF that includes greater transparency, participation, and poverty reduction. This year we were supposed to finish the job by canceling more bilateral debt and funding a contribution to help write off additional multilateral debt—which is necessary to leverage contributions from other countries. Fulfilling our commitment to last year’s debt relief agreement would provide incentive to poor indebted countries to take the steps necessary to qualify for debt relief programs. Instead, today we were going to vote on a bill that provided just \$82 million for debt relief for some of the poorest countries in the world—only 16 percent of the total amount the President requested for debt relief.

I recognize the bill has been improved slightly.

The House did approve an amendment to boost funds for debt relief that will help to keep us on track with our commitment to easing the plight of so many nations. I am hopeful that these funds will remain intact as the bill moves forward. This is good, but we should have done more.

In addition, there was some improvement regarding funding for AIDS. Before it was amended today, the bill would have cut the request for funding to fight the global AIDS pandemic by almost 20 percent. This would have been a devastating cut at a time when the spread of HIV/AIDS poses a serious threat to nations around the world, especially those in Sub-Saharan Africa. By 2010, at least 44 million children will have lost one or both parents in the 34 countries most severely affected by HIV/AIDS. Coming less than a week after the global AIDS conference in South Africa, this shortcoming in the bill appeared all the most glaring.

The passage today of an amendment to boost funding for HIV/AIDS programs is good news, and I am hopeful that these funds will remain intact as the bill moves forward. But again, we should have done more.

For example, the bill cuts by 30 percent the request for funding for international family planning programs, and contains the "global gag rule," despite valiant efforts to strike the language on the part of my colleagues Ms. LOWEY and Mr. GREENWOOD and many others. The "gag rule" provision prohibits private organizations in foreign countries to which we provide aid from participating in the political process of their own country using their own funds. This policy restricts the free speech of international non-governmental organizations. Furthermore, it undermines our own foreign policy objective of democracy promotion by placing restrictions on these organizations that would be unconstitutional in the United States. International family planning programs save the lives of women and children worldwide, reduce the incidence of abortion, and raise the social and economic well-being of women all over the globe.

The "global gag rule" is simply wrong, and—I believe—it is an embarrassment to us as a country.

I am also concerned about the bill's 40 percent cut in the Administration's request for contributions to multilateral development banks, which would result in substantial reductions in lending for health, clean water supplies, education programs, and infrastructure needed to reduce poverty in the world's poorest countries. Specifically, the bill cuts funding by 32 percent for the International Development Association, a main source of resources to battle AIDS, and additional cuts are made in funding for the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, and the Asian Development Fund.

Further, the bill doesn't provide sufficient funds to battle the global threat of tuberculosis, a disease that is endangering the health and lives of people all over the globe as deadly strains of multiple-drug resistant TB emerge. Tuberculosis kills two million people each year and is the greatest killer of people with HIV/AIDS worldwide, accounting for 40 percent of AIDS death in Asian and Africa. Especially as the HIV pandemic is exacerbating the rise of TB, I believe that the \$55 million provided in this bill for international TB control is insufficient.

Finally, I had hoped to vote to support an amendment for an additional \$15 million for the microcredit program, which provides small loans to the very poor for the start-up or expansion of small business ventures. These loans have helped to promote economic growth in some of the most poverty-stricken regions in the world. Unfortunately, this amendment was withdrawn, and I remain concerned that this bill doesn't provide sufficient funds of this important program.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed in the overall levels and in the priorities reflected in this legislation. We can and should do better, and because we haven't, I cannot support this bill.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Fiscal Year 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill. I deeply believe that foreign assistance is a cornerstone of American foreign policy and diplomacy and I have serious concerns that passing a bill this underfunded would be detrimental to America's strategic interests around the world.

At \$2 billion below the President's request, this bill is irresponsible. The dramatic cuts to debt relief, HIV/AIDS funding, and the restric-

tions on international family planning programs, would imperil millions of women and children. The cuts to microcredit lending, International Development Assistance, and the U.S. Agency for International Development, would bleed dry projects that are a proven success for uplifting the poorest families in the world. The consequences of abandoning these programs are severe. Diseases know no borders. Overpopulation is a burden on the infrastructure of the entire world. Ignoring these issues is a threat to our own health and environment, and our national security.

At the outset, all the funding requested to support the Middle East Peace Process was included in this bill. Aid for Israel and the Middle East has always been my highest foreign aid priority, but the fact that these funds had to be compromised for critical increases to provide funding for debt relief and HIV/AIDS demonstrates how cash strapped this bill truly is. I am confident that all of the Foreign Military Financing for Middle East countries will be restored in conference, but we must also focus on increasing our commitment to the stability of other regions as well.

Assistance to the politically fragile states in the Former Soviet Republics, the Central Asian Republics, and the Balkans is drastically below the Administration's request. The bill slashes the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative, which works to prevent the transfer of Russian nuclear technology to rogue states, for the second year in a row. Furthermore, the attack on debt relief translates into an assault on the Latin American and African countries that are struggling to implement drastic economic and democratic reforms.

There are some who believe that we can vote for this bill now and threaten to vote against it later if it does not improve. I believe we cannot settle for anything less than a better bill. This is only the beginning of the process and we should not have to settle for less before we go to conference with the Senate. The Republican leadership has crafted an untenable bill and I hope that my no vote on this point will strengthen the Administration's hand so it can get adequate funding for these important priorities, in addition to full funding for Israel and our Middle East priorities.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4811, the Fiscal Year 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act.

There are many good things in this bill. For example, the aid to Israel included in the bill is an important step in maintaining Israel's security in a particularly unstable part of the world. It is paramount that we continue to stand by Israel, especially as historic peace talks between the Israelis and the Palestinians are simultaneously taking place just a few miles from this Capitol at Camp David.

Unfortunately, aid in the bill does not go far enough for other countries desperately in need, especially in the continents of Africa and Latin America. The bill contains only \$82 million of the \$472 million requested for debt relief. It will not even provide enough resources to enable two countries, Bolivia and Mozambique, who have met all necessary conditions to obtain debt relief, to procure it. If we are to have a stable world, we must help those countries that need it most. To do otherwise only invites conflict.

Of particular concern to me is the lack of adequate funding to fight the AIDS epidemic that is currently devastating the continent of

Africa, as well as other regions of the world. The bill only allocates \$202 million of the \$244 requested by the President to fight this horrible disease. We have turned out back on Africa for too long, and AIDS will not wait for us to find our consciences.

Finally, the bill includes a modified version of the anti-choice "Mexico City" policy, which prohibits funding of any private foreign non-governmental and multilateral organizations that perform abortions or lobby to change abortion laws in foreign countries.

For these reasons, and the fact that the bill is simply too underfunded, I oppose this bill.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, today I reluctantly voted against H.R. 4811, the Fiscal Year 2001 Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act.

I did so for a very specific reason: this proposal contains some direct aid to the government of Colombia. In February of last year, a member of my district's Menominee Indian Nation was brutally murdered in that country. This woman, Ingrid Washinawatok, was in Colombia as part of a peaceful educational effort when she was kidnapped and killed by the Marxist terrorists of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC).

Since Ms. Washinawatok's murder, Colombian President Andres Pastrana has said he is unwilling to extradite those responsible for her death to the United States to be tried under U.S. anti-terrorism laws. This refusal flies in the face of the cooperative relations our nations have enjoyed in the past and directly contradicts legislation I authored on the subject—legislation that passed the House last year by a unanimous vote. That measure called on the Colombian government to extradite Ms. Washinawatok's killers to the United States for trial as soon as possible.

I would also note that some months ago, I specifically asked U.S. Drug Czar Barry McCaffrey for help in this matter during a congressional hearing. He has not responded to the specific questions I posed to him.

In my opinion, if Colombia wishes to continue receiving significant U.S. aid, it must be willing to cooperate with us on key matters such as this. I hope that my vote against a foreign aid bill that otherwise has much in it to support will be seen as a modest message to Colombia. It is my further hope that withholding aid to the Colombians will push their government to reconsider the folly of their decision not to extradite the murdering terrorists who killed Ingrid Washinawatok.

I offer this statement today because this bill does contain several positive provisions that certainly deserve support. These positive measures include funding to help bring permanent peace and stability to the Middle East. In particular, this proposal would send needed aid to support those nations, like Israel, who share our democratic values and with whom we have forged loyal strategic friendship. This is funding I would have been pleased to support—unfortunately, the mitigating circumstances with regard to Colombia precluded me from doing so. While I could not vote to pass this bill in its current form, I hope my reasons and intentions are now more clear.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of this bill. While I will support this legislation, I am concerned that this bill shortchanges the United States' foreign policy initiatives. This bill makes large cuts in funding

for programs which most directly affect the poorest countries in the world—cuts which disproportionately affect African and Latin American countries. Further, the bill drastically cuts funding for international financial institutions that provide developmental loans to poor countries. This legislation also cuts funding designated for international HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment and codifies the “Mexico City” restrictions on international family planning funding.

I am pleased, however, that the House approved two amendments to address some of the funding problems and helps to make this bill better. I strongly supported the amendment offered by my colleague, Ms. Waters, to increase funding for the HIPC Trust Fund at a level equal to the President’s request. It is a critical victory that the Waters amendment was approved, because passage of the debt relief provisions in the underlying bill represent an unacceptable amount.

As approved by the House Appropriations Committee, H.R. 4811 provides \$82 million, or only 16 percent of the President’s request for debt relief for some of the poorest countries of the world. As a member of the House Banking Committee, I am disappointed that the Leadership did not make more of a commitment to debt relief, especially in light of the accomplishments of my colleague and Chairman of the Banking Committee, JIM LEACH. Last year, with his strong leadership, the Banking Committee approved H.R. 1095, legislation which took an important step in relieving some of the debt loads carried by the world’s most economically distressed nations. While some of the most important provisions of H.R. 1095 were realized last year, the FY2001 Administration request is desperately needed to expand the debt relief effort. If the Waters amendment had not been approved, the low level of funding including in this bill would have jeopardized the HIPC initiative because it may have led other bilateral donors to reduce their contributions. I am pleased with the passage of the Waters amendment, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that meaningful debt relief can be achieved by the world’s most impoverished nations.

I also strongly supported passage of the Lee amendment to increase funds for international efforts to address the global HIV/AIDS crisis. The recent 13th International AIDS Conference in South Africa highlighted the fact that the epidemic in the rest of the world is threatening to bring down entire nations. In many of the countries throughout the world it has crippled the entire infrastructures; education, economic, and national security. It is critical that we invest our resources in an effort to turn back the tide. Regrettably, the Foreign Operations funding bill would have cut the President’s request for funding the fight against the global AIDS crisis by almost 20 percent. This cut would have been devastating, especially so at a time when HIV/AIDS poses a serious threat to the stability of lesser developed nations around the world particularly in Africa. In sub-Saharan Africa, the percentage of adults who have been in-

fectured with HIV is 20 percent or higher. With today’s passage of the Lee amendment, I am hopeful that funds to fight the global AIDS pandemic can begin to make a difference and save thousands of lives throughout the world.

While I have strong reservations about the underlying bill, I am pleased with \$2.9 billion in U.S. aid provided to Israel. U.S. aid to Israel is one of America’s most cost-effective foreign policy investments. The economic and military aid that America provides Israel serves the interests of both countries by promoting peace, security, and trade. Aid to Israel is an essential and efficient means of strengthening the Middle East’s only democracy. Israel stands out as the only steadfast ally that supports U.S. foreign policy and military actions and votes with the U.S. and the U.N. more than any other country. Aid to Israel supports American diplomatic efforts in promoting a peaceful resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The continuity of U.S. aid sends a powerful signal to potential adversaries that a negotiated settlement with Israel is the only option since the U.S. commitment to Israel is unwavering.

For my state of Texas, exports to Israel are particularly important. Israel has become a world leader in high-technology, agriculture, medicine and education. Realizing the great potential for trade and cooperation with Israel in these and many other fields, several states, including Texas, have established joint exchange programs with Israel. Since 1984, when Texas became the first state to set up and promote bilateral trade and technological cooperation, more than 20 states have followed suit. These agreements have resulted in the opening up of trade offices in Israel, creating new jobs and opportunities for the people of Texas and Israel.

Virtually all U.S. aid to Israel—economic and military—helps Israel meet its security needs. As other countries in the region enlarge and modernize their arsenals, this assistance gives Israel the means to obtain expensive, advanced American weaponry that it needs to defend itself. U.S. aid reduces the risk of war in the Middle East by sustaining Israel’s qualitative military advantage over the combined military forces of its adversaries who have an overwhelming numerical advantage. By keeping Israel’s army second to none in the region, this direct aid deters aggressors from attacking Israel without an American military presence, which Israel has never sought.

The U.S. aid package contained in the FY2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill is especially critical to Israel this year. As Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak prepares to meet with President Clinton and Palestinian Authority Chairman Yasser Arafat at Camp David this week to discuss final status issues, U.S. support for Israel and her security needs becomes more critical than ever.

As the Camp David peace summit is ongoing, I think it is appropriate to applaud the courage of the Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak, who has withstood a very difficult term in office. In recent weeks, three of his coalition members have broken away or resigned because of his efforts to seek a lasting peace

agreement. Even at this time of internal political tension in Israel, it is clear that Prime Minister Barak traveled to Camp David with a profound sense of responsibility. He understands that he has a mandate from the voters, the citizens of Israel to do all that he can to establish peace, not for just for those who would benefit now, but for the children and for those not yet born. I am hopeful that Mr. Barak and PLO Chairman Arafat can find a way to address the critical issues with a respect for all sides that can result in a true, lasting peace for the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, I understand that foreign assistance, which represents less than 1 percent of the entire federal budget, is often politically unpopular. However, at a time when the United States, having won both the cold war and the economic war, reigns supreme as the sole economic and military superpower and the leader of the free world, it has become incumbent upon us to take a leadership role in pursuing peace and prosperity for the less fortunate in the world. Further, I believe it is in our own best interest to lead the other free and democratic nations of the world in combating poverty and disease—which ravages many parts of the less developed world—and poses a significant future threat to stability. With that in mind, I hope—as the appropriations process moves forward—that the defects in the underlying bill can be corrected.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, on July 13, 2000, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, H.R. 4811, came to the House floor for a vote. I reluctantly vote for this bill for the sole reason of moving the foreign affairs platform forward.

I believe H.R. 4811 is a bad bill for various reasons. It appropriates a total of \$13.3 billion for fiscal year 2001—\$1.9 billion or 12% below the Administration’s request and \$451 million less than the fiscal year 2000 funding level. This bill makes large cuts in funding for programs which most directly affect the poorest countries in the world—cuts that disproportionately affect African and Latin American countries—and contains only \$82 million of the \$472 million request for multilateral debt relief assistance. Further, the bill drastically cuts international financial institution funding that provides interest-free loans to poor countries. H.R. 4811 cuts \$42 million from international HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment, a cut I find deplorable.

Although this bill is badly flawed in many ways, I believe the best way to address those problems is to move it forward and express my concerns directly to the conferees. If the bill is reported out of conference with my concerns left unaddressed, I will support the President’s veto.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of both the Helsinki Commission and the House International Relations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Human Rights, I am particularly supportive of many portions of this Foreign Operations bill for Fiscal Year 2001. The section on “Assistance to Eastern Europe and the Baltic States” is one

of the items in which I have a strong interest. This assistance has made a difference in many countries.

Given the fact that the bill leaves FY 2001 assistance at FY 2000 levels, I want to state that, in southeastern Europe, our priority list should begin with a focus on the need for democratic change to Serbia. The people of Serbia deserve it; right now they are facing a major crackdown by the Milosevic regime on their basic rights and freedoms. Democratic change in Serbia is in the U.S. interest. Building democracy and prosperity throughout the region, including in Kosovo and Bosnia, would then be easier, making our assistance there more effective. Until Milosevic is stopped, we face the possibility of more conflict in the region, and the need for additional millions of dollars for humanitarian aid, reconstruction and possibly military intervention in both a peacemaking and a peacekeeping capacity.

In addition to helping initiate a long-needed democratic transition in Serbia, this assistance could bring support for Montenegro, Macedonia, and Croatia, now that the relatively new governments of these republics have learned the value of embracing multi-ethnic cooperation and tolerance, along with cooperation with the international community. Mr. Chairman, we should prioritize assistance to those who seek to make the right decisions.

I am pleased, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee report language states its support for the funding levels requested by the President for Montenegro, as well as the allocation of \$350,000 for an OSCE effort to facilitate contacts with democratic forces in Serbia and Montenegro. In the near future, the International Relations Committee should mark-up similar provisions as part of H.R. 1064, the Serbia and Montenegro Democracy Act of 2000, which I introduced in early March of last year. I thank the Committee for this report language.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, 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. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 546, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. OBEY. I certainly am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4811 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with an amendment to reduce the Asian Development Fund and increase the African Development Fund as follows:

On page 40, line 23 after the dollar amount insert: "decreased by \$5,000,000", and

On page 41, line 5 after the dollar amount insert: "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make clear that I do not intend to ask for a rollcall vote again in order to save time, but I do want Members to understand what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, shortly I will be asking Members to vote against final passage of this bill because, with all of the amendments that were adopted today, this bill still falls \$224 million short of what is needed on the debt relief front. It falls some \$270 million short of funding the administration's request on the International Development Association, or IDA. It funds only one-half the Asian Development Fund and only one-half the African Development Bank.

The Peace Corps is \$17 million short of the administration's request. The Global Environmental Facility, which has a request for \$176 million, is funded only at \$36 million. The InterAmerican Fund, which was requested at a \$20 million level, is funded in fact at only \$10 million. There are a variety of other problems, as well. And so, I urge Members to vote no until we can fix these problems in conference.

What this motion to recommit will do is to try to add to the points made in the debate last night on Africa. The fact is there will be over 40 million children who will be made orphans over the next few years in Africa because of AIDS.

Taking that into account, this recommitment motion would simply cut \$5 million from the Asian Development Fund and increase the African Development Fund by \$5 million correspondingly.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask my colleagues to vote against the recommitment motion. We have had two long days of debate. There has been some victories on the Republican side and some victories on the minority side. I

think, though, that we have a good vehicle that we can address even some of the concerns that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) mentioned, some of the deficiencies that are here and admittedly are here, but it is the best that we could do under the deck of cards that have been used to deal us this hand. This is the best we can do.

I think the distributions that we have made are fair and equitable. I pledge to those of us that are concerned about such things as the Peace Corps, and my colleagues know my strong support for them, that if additional allocations are made during this process, we are going to address the very concerns that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is concerned about.

But his motion to recommit transfers from the Asian Development Fund \$5 million and sends it to the African Development Fund, and I think that we should not do that at this time.

I urge a no vote on the recommitment and a favorable vote on final passage of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays 185, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 400]
YEAS—239

Aderholt	Chambliss	Gillmor
Archer	Coble	Gilman
Armey	Collins	Goodling
Bachus	Cooksey	Gordon
Baker	Cox	Goss
Ballenger	Cramer	Graham
Barcia	Crane	Granger
Barrett (NE)	Crowley	Green (TX)
Bartlett	Cubin	Greenwood
Barton	Davis (FL)	Gutknecht
Bass	Davis (VA)	Hastert
Bateman	Deal	Hastings (WA)
Bentsen	DeLay	Hayworth
Bereuter	DeMint	Hill (MT)
Berkley	Deutsch	Hilleary
Berman	Diaz-Balart	Hobson
Biggert	Dickey	Hoekstra
Bilbray	Doyle	Holden
Bilirakis	Dreier	Holt
Blagojevich	Dunn	Hooley
Bliley	Ehlers	Horn
Blunt	Ehrlich	Hostettler
Boehlert	Emerson	Houghton
Boehner	Engel	Hulshof
Bonilla	English	Hunter
Bono	Everett	Hutchinson
Boyd	Ewing	Hyde
Brady (TX)	Fletcher	Isakson
Bryant	Foley	Istook
Burr	Fossella	John
Burton	Fowler	Johnson (CT)
Buyer	Franks (NJ)	Johnson, Sam
Callahan	Frelinghuysen	Kaptur
Calvert	Frost	Kasich
Camp	Gallegly	Kelly
Canady	Ganske	King (NY)
Cannon	Gekas	Kingston
Castle	Gibbons	Klink
Chabot	Gilchrest	Knollenberg

Kolbe	Oxley	Smith (NJ)
Kuykendall	Packard	Smith (TX)
LaFalce	Pascrell	Souder
LaHood	Pease	Spence
Lampson	Peterson (PA)	Stabenow
Largent	Petri	Stupak
Latham	Pickering	Sununu
LaTourette	Pickett	Sweeney
Lazio	Pitts	Talent
Leach	Porter	Tancredo
Lewis (CA)	Portman	Tauzin
Linder	Pryce (OH)	Taylor (NC)
LoBiondo	Quinn	Terry
Lowey	Radanovich	Thomas
Lucas (KY)	Ramstad	Thornberry
Maloney (CT)	Regula	Thune
Maloney (NY)	Reynolds	Tiahrt
Manzullo	Riley	Toomey
Martinez	Rogan	Towns
Mascara	Rogers	Traficant
McCarthy (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
McCollum	Roukema	Upton
McCrery	Ryan (WI)	Vitter
McHugh	Ryun (KS)	Walden
McIntyre	Salmon	Walsh
McKeon	Saxton	Wamp
Metcalf	Scarborough	Watts (OK)
Mica	Schakowsky	Weiner
Miller (FL)	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Miller, Gary	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Moran (KS)	Shaw	Weller
Morella	Shays	Wexler
Myrick	Sherman	Weygand
Nadler	Sherwood	Whitfield
Nethercutt	Shimkus	Wicker
Ney	Shows	Wilson
Northup	Shuster	Wolf
Norwood	Simpson	Wu
Nussle	Sisisky	Young (AK)
Ose	Skeen	Young (FL)
Owens	Smith (MI)	

NAYS—185

Abercrombie	Filner	Meek (FL)
Ackerman	Ford	Meeks (NY)
Allen	Frank (MA)	Menendez
Andrews	Gejdenson	Millender-
Baca	Gephardt	McDonald
Baird	Gonzalez	Miller, George
Baldacci	Goode	Minge
Baldwin	Goodlatte	Mink
Barr	Green (WI)	Moakley
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Moore
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Moran (VA)
Berry	Hall (TX)	Murtha
Bishop	Hansen	Napolitano
Blumenauer	Hastings (FL)	Neal
Bonior	Hayes	Oberstar
Borski	Hefley	Obey
Boswell	Herger	Olver
Brady (PA)	Hill (IN)	Ortiz
Brown (FL)	Hilliard	Pallone
Brown (OH)	Hinchey	Pastor
Campbell	Hinojosa	Paul
Capps	Hoeffel	Payne
Capuano	Hoyer	Pelosi
Cardin	Inlee	Peterson (MN)
Carson	Jackson (IL)	Phelps
Clayton	Jackson-Lee	Pombo
Clement	(TX)	Pomeroy
Clyburn	Jefferson	Price (NC)
Coburn	Jenkins	Rahall
Combest	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Condit	Jones (NC)	Reyes
Conyers	Jones (OH)	Rivers
Cook	Kanjorski	Rodriguez
Costello	Kennedy	Roemer
Coyne	Kildee	Rohrabacher
Cummings	Kilpatrick	Rothman
Cunningham	Kind (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Danner	Kleccka	Royce
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Rush
DeFazio	Lantos	Sabo
DeGette	Larson	Sanchez
Delahunt	Lee	Sanders
DeLauro	Levin	Sandlin
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Sanford
Dingell	Lewis (KY)	Sawyer
Dixon	Lipinski	Schaffer
Doggett	Lofgren	Scott
Dooley	Lucas (OK)	Sensenbrenner
Doolittle	Luther	Serrano
Duncan	Matsui	Skelton
Edwards	McCarthy (MO)	Slaughter
Eshoo	McDermott	Snyder
Etheridge	McGovern	Spratt
Evans	McInnis	Stark
Farr	McKinney	Stearns
Fattah	Meehan	Stenholm

Strickland	Thurman	Watkins
Stump	Tierney	Watt (NC)
Tanner	Udall (CO)	Waxman
Tauscher	Udall (NM)	Woolsey
Taylor (MS)	Velazquez	Wynn
Thompson (CA)	Visclosky	
Thompson (MS)	Waters	

NOT VOTING—11

Boucher	Markey	Smith (WA)
Chenoweth-Hage	McIntosh	Vento
Clay	McNulty	Wise
Forbes	Mollohan	

□ 1559

Mr. SALMON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, I missed several votes today due to an illness. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on rollcall vote 396 (Mr. GREENWOOD's amendment to H.R. 4811); "nay" on rollcall vote 397 (Ms. WATERS' amendment to H.R. 4811); "nay" on rollcall 398 (Ms. LEE's amendment to H.R. 4811); "yea" on rollcall vote 399 (Mr. BE-REUTER's amendment to H.R. 4811); and "nay" on rollcall vote 400 (on Passage of H.R. 4811).

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire from the distinguished majority leader the schedule for the week and next week.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that the House has completed its legislative business for the week.

The House will next meet on Monday, July 17, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider a number of measures under suspension of the rules, a list of which will be distributed to Members' offices tomorrow. On Monday, no recorded votes are expected before 7 o'clock p.m.

On Tuesday, July 18, and the balance of the week, the House will consider the following measures, subject to rules: H.J. Res. 103, disapproving the extension of annual normal trade relations with respect to China; the Comprehensive Retirement Security and Pension Reform Act; and the Treasury, Postal Service and General Government Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2001.

Mr. Speaker, we also expect to consider conference reports next week, including DOD appropriations and the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act, should they become available.

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

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague. A couple of questions, if I may. Do we expect late nights next week?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, I should say it pleases me to tell the gentleman I do not expect late nights next week. I think we have been through a very difficult time. We have one appropriations bill that will be on the floor under the 5-minute rule, and, of course, it is very difficult to project how those bills will go, but I think with continued cooperation between the Members at large and the bill managers, we should be able to contain that to a well-managed proposition, and frankly, I have to say in all optimism, I do not expect that we are going to those tortured late nights next week.

Mr. BONIOR. Does the gentleman expect us to be in on Friday next?

Mr. ARMEY. At this time I think I have to reserve an expectation that we will be. We do have two or three very important bills we would like to complete next week. There will be questions of timing as we look for conference reports to return or perhaps the parliamentary processes as it relates to the Marriage Penalty Relief Act. So we will just have to reserve Friday of next week. Should that change as the week develops, I will announce it as soon as possible to the Members.

Mr. BONIOR. May I ask the distinguished gentleman from Texas what day he expects the pension IRA bill to come to the floor of the House?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for asking that. I would expect probably on Wednesday.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague. Finally, on the China MFN debate, the annual hour of debate, I suspect that is what we will have, is there a day that the gentleman has designated for that particular exercise?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the gentleman asking. I would think that on any day next week. I think with a bill that is that easily managed, we would just try on appropriate notice to move it when it best fits the rest of the scheduling requirements.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his courtesies and for offering us a summation of what we can expect next week. I wish him a good weekend.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would continue to yield, I have just decided we will move that China trade bill on Tuesday.

Mr. BONIOR. The China bill on Tuesday. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 17, 2000

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.