

Smith (NJ)	Terry	Waters	Brady (TX)	Goode	McCrery	Shaw	Sununu	Visclosky
Smith (TX)	Thomas	Watkins	Brown (FL)	Goodlatte	McDermott	Shays	Sweeney	Vitter
Smith (WA)	Thompson (CA)	Watt (NC)	Brown (OH)	Goodling	McGovern	Sherman	Talent	Walden
Snyder	Thompson (MS)	Watts (OK)	Bryant	Gordon	McHugh	Sherwood	Tancredo	Walsh
Souder	Thornberry	Waxman	Burr	Goss	McInnis	Shimkus	Tanner	Wamp
Spence	Thune	Weiner	Burton	Graham	McIntosh	Shows	Tauscher	Waters
Spratt	Thurman	Weldon (FL)	Buyer	Granger	McIntyre	Shuster	Tauzin	Watkins
Stabenow	Tiahrt	Weldon (PA)	Callahan	Green (TX)	McKeon	Simpson	Taylor (MS)	Watt (NC)
Stark	Tierney	Weller	Calvert	Green (WI)	McNulty	Sisisky	Taylor (NC)	Watts (OK)
Stearns	Toomey	Wexler	Camp	Greenwood	Meehan	Skeen	Terry	Waxman
Stenholm	Towns	Weygand	Campbell	Gutierrez	Meek (FL)	Skelton	Thomas	Weiner
Strickland	Trafficant	Whitfield	Canady	Gutknecht	Menendez	Slaughter	Thompson (CA)	Weldon (FL)
Stump	Turner	Wicker	Cannon	Hall (OH)	Mica	Smith (MI)	Thompson (MS)	Weldon (PA)
Stupak	Udall (CO)	Wilson	Capps	Hall (TX)	Millender-	Smith (NJ)	Thornberry	Weller
Sununu	Udall (NM)	Wise	Capuano	Hansen	McDonald	Smith (TX)	Thune	Wexler
Sweeney	Upton	Wolf	Cardin	Hastings (FL)	Miller (FL)	Smith (WA)	Thurman	Weygand
Talent	Velazquez	Woolsey	Carson	Hastings (WA)	Miller, Gary	Snyder	Tiahrt	Whitfield
Tancredo	Vento	Wu	Castle	Hayes	Miller, George	Souder	Tierney	Wicker
Tanner	Visclosky	Wynn	Chabot	Hayworth	Minge	Spence	Toomey	Wilson
Tauscher	Vitter	Young (AK)	Chambliss	Hefley	Mink	Spratt	Towns	Wise
Tauzin	Walden	Young (FL)	Chenoweth-Hage	Herger	Moakley	Stabenow	Trafficant	Wolf
Taylor (MS)	Walsh		Clay	Hill (IN)	Mollohan	Stark	Turner	Woolsey
Taylor (NC)	Wamp		Clayton	Hilliard	Moore	Stearns	Udall (CO)	Wu
			Clement	Hinchey	Moran (KS)	Stenholm	Udall (NM)	Wynn
			Clyburn	Hinojosa	Moran (VA)	Strickland	Upton	Young (AK)
			Coble	Hobson	Morella	Stump	Velazquez	Young (FL)
			Coburn	Hoefel	Murtha	Stupak	Vento	
			Collins	Hoekstra	Myrick			
			Combest	Holden	Nadler			
			Condit	Holt	Napolitano			
			Conyers	Hooley	Neal			
			Cook	Horn	Nethercutt			
			Cooksey	Hostettler	Ney			
			Costello	Houghton	Northup			
			Cox	Hoyer	Norwood			
			Coyne	Hulshof	Nussle			
			Cramer	Hunter	Oberstar			
			Crane	Hutchinson	Obey			
			Crowley	Hyde	Olver			
			Cubin	Inslee	Ortiz			
			Cummings	Isakson	Ose			
			Cunningham	Istook	Owens			
			Danner	Jackson (IL)	Oxley			
			Davis (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Packard			
			Davis (IL)	(TX)	Pallone			
			Davis (VA)	Jefferson	Pascrell			
			Deal	Jenkins	Pastor			
			DeFazio	John	Payne			
			DeGette	Johnson (CT)	Pease			
			Delahunt	Johnson, E. B.	Pelosi			
			DeLauro	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)			
			DeMint	Jones (NC)	Peterson (PA)			
			Deutsch	Jones (OH)	Petri			
			Diaz-Balart	Kanjorski	Phelps			
			Dickey	Kaptur	Pickering			
			Dicks	Kasich	Pickett			
			Dingell	Kelly	Pitts			
			Dixon	Kennedy	Pombo			
			Doggett	Kildee	Pomeroy			
			Dooley	Kilpatrick	Porter			
			Doolittle	Kind (WI)	Portman			
			Doyle	King (NY)	Price (NC)			
			Dreier	Kingston	Pryce (OH)			
			Duncan	Klecza	Quinn			
			Dunn	Klink	Radanovich			
			Edwards	Knollenberg	Rahall			
			Ehlers	Kolbe	Ramstad			
			Ehrlich	Kucinich	Regula			
			Emerson	Kuykendall	Reyes			
			Engel	LaFalce	Reynolds			
			English	Lampson	Riley			
			Eshoo	Lantos	Rivers			
			Etheridge	Largent	Rodriguez			
			Evans	Larson	Roemer			
			Everett	Latham	Rogan			
			Ewing	LaTourette	Rogers			
			Farr	Lazio	Rohrabacher			
			Fattah	Leach	Ros-Lehtinen			
			Filner	Lee	Rothman			
			Fletcher	Levin	Roukema			
			Foley	Lewis (CA)	Roybal-Allard			
			Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Rush			
			Ford	Lewis (KY)	Ryan (WI)			
			Fossella	Linder	Ryun (KS)			
			Fowler	Lipinski	Sabo			
			Frank (MA)	LoBiondo	Salmon			
			Franks (NJ)	Lofgren	Sanchez			
			Frelinghuysen	Lowey	Sanders			
			Frost	Lucas (KY)	Sandlin			
			Gallegly	Lucas (OK)	Sanford			
			Ganske	Luther	Sawyer			
			Gejdenson	Maloney (CT)	Saxton			
			Gekas	Maloney (NY)	Schaffer			
			Gephardt	Markey	Schakowsky			
			Gibbons	Martinez	Scott			
			Gilchrest	Matsui	Sensenbrenner			
			Gillmor	McCarthy (MO)	Serrano			
			Gilman	McCarthy (NY)	Sessions			
			Gonzalez	McCollum	Shadegg			

NOT VOTING—11

Berry	Jefferson	Meeks (NY)
Bilbray	LaHood	Metcalf
Blumenauer	Mascara	Scarborough
Hill (MT)	McKinney	

□ 1303

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall votes 474 and 475. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote No. 474, and "yes" on rollcall vote No. 475.

SENSE OF CONGRESS IN SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF HURRICANE FLOYD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 322.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 322, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, answered "present" 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

YEAS—417

Ackerman	Barrett (NE)	Bishop
Aderholt	Barrett (WI)	Blagojevich
Allen	Bartlett	Bliley
Andrews	Barton	Blunt
Archer	Bass	Boehert
Armey	Bateman	Boehner
Bachus	Becerra	Bonilla
Baird	Bentsen	Bonior
Baker	Berkley	Bono
Baldacci	Berman	Borski
Baldwin	Berry	Boswell
Ballenger	Biggert	Boucher
Barcia	Bilbray	Boyd
Barr	Bilirakis	Brady (PA)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie	Hilleary	Meeks (NY)
Bereuter	LaHood	Metcalf
Blumenauer	Manzullo	Rangel
DeLay	Mascara	Royce
Hill (MT)	McKinney	Scarborough

□ 1311

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1315

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2606, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 307 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 307

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived. The conference report shall be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 307 is the standard rule waiving points of

order for the conference report to accompany H.R. 2606, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. The rule waives points of order against the conference agreement and its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

I support this rule, and I support the underlying conference report as well. There are many important programs which are being funded in this conference report, and because there are no country earmarks, the President and the Secretary of State are afforded great flexibility to conduct foreign policy as they see fit in this area.

I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN). I think he has done an extraordinary job, as has the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). They have done a lot of hard work on this important conference report, and I urge both the adoption of the rule by our colleagues, as well as passage of the conference report.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2606, a bill that makes appropriations for foreign aid and export assistance in fiscal year 2000. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, foreign aid is part of the price we pay to be the political and the moral leader of this world, and, just as it is our duty as individuals to help others less fortunate than we are, it is our duty as a Nation to help those countries which are struggling. There are more direct benefits. Foreign aid creates jobs here in the United States, increases exports and opens markets overseas for American businesses.

A report several years ago by the Washington polling firm of Belden & Russonello concluded that Americans strongly support humanitarian assistance to developing countries, which is part of foreign aid. In one poll, the average American thinks that almost one-third of the Federal budget is spent on foreign aid. However, in reality, less than 1 percent of the Federal budget goes to foreign aid. The evidence suggests that the more people think about foreign aid, the more likely they are to support it.

There are good provisions in this conference report. It provides a \$65 million increase for the Child Survival and Disease Programs Funds. This includes a \$5 million increase for UNICEF, which is so important to helping children throughout the world.

The report also contains favorable language for microenterprise development, which has proven to be a cost effective way to help people become economically self-reliant.

Unfortunately, the overall funding levels for the bill are insufficient to support America's leadership role in the world, and the bill cuts the administration's request for foreign aid programs by about 13 percent. This has been consistent over the past 10 years. Our foreign aid, especially on development assistance, continues to go down. As a matter of fact, it has been cut 50 percent in the last 10 years.

The Peace Corps is cut by \$35 million below the administration's request, which will cause the reduction of 1,000 volunteers in the next 2 years. As a returned Peace Corps volunteer myself, I am disappointed in the funding level of this important people-to-people aid program which enjoys broad support among American citizens.

There are no funds to implement the Wye River agreement, which is a tremendous agreement between our President, Jordan, and Israel in the Middle East. The President is considering a veto of the bill largely on the grounds of inadequate funding.

But, despite my concerns about the bill, I am willing to support this rule, which is the standard rule for conference reports, and it will allow for further debate of the bill.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as with so many other of the appropriations bills this year, we are hearing opposition from our good friends on the other side of the aisle because of the fact that they wish that more money was being spent. There is no doubt that proposals to spend money in myriad ways will be heard, and will continue to be heard, some of which, I am sure, make a lot of sense.

We made a decision on this side of the aisle, and I think it is important to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), and the leadership, the Republican leadership, the Speaker, the majority leader, the whip, the conference chairmen, the entire leadership. They made a decision, on our side of the aisle we made a decision, that we will not in these appropriations bills tap, we will not get into the Social Security trust fund. And we are sticking to that decision. So we are going to see a lot of opposition based on the fact we are not spending enough money on these appropriations bills.

This is the foreign aid bill. It is a very important bill. But we believe we are doing a good job, and we are doing the job within the existing resources that we have, while not tapping into, not going into, the Social Security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time on the resolution bringing the conference report to the floor. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is ready, the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN),

to explain the details of this legislation in great depth.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who is an expert and our ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his leadership internationally and domestically on behalf of people in need, especially our children.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), very clearly has pointed out some of the good things that are in this bill, and as I rise to talk about the rule, I am really rising in opposition to the bill.

My colleague, our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), deserves credit for how he balanced the allocation that he had in the bill, and, again, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) pointed out some of the positive initiatives that are in the bill. But the bill does not measure up even in the slightest way to our leadership role in the world.

I think it really is a disservice to the debate on the foreign aid bill to say that if we honor our commitments throughout the world, that that money will be taken out of Social Security. The fact is when these allocations were made, the foreign aid allocation was given very little priority.

This bill is not only about cooperation between the United States and other countries. This bill is about our assistance for our own trade. We have financed in this bill the Ex-Im Bank, OPIC, as well as the Trade Development Administration, which assists in promoting U.S. exports abroad. So the allocation, as small as it is, is not even all about assistance overseas; it is about promoting U.S. products. In order for those products to be sold, we have to develop markets for them. So it is in our interest to cooperate with countries to help develop their economies.

It is necessary for us in our foreign policy, which is an essential part of what we do here in the Congress, to honor the pillars of our foreign policy, to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, to promote democratic freedoms so that the world is a more peaceful place as we deal with democracies rather than authoritarian regimes who might invade their neighbors or oppress their people, and, again, to promote our economy by promoting U.S. exports abroad.

All of those goals are served very well, in addition to the broader issue of our national security, by our investments in this bill. These are investments that will pay off for us. We would not have to be so involved in sending our young people off and putting them in harm's way abroad if we were more successful in promoting the

pillars of our foreign policy through funding this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that I hope that our colleagues will not say that the Social Security trust fund is at risk because we want to honor our commitments abroad.

Let me just show you this chart, Mr. Speaker. In it you see this big yellow pie. That is the national budget. This sliver here, this little blue, less than 1 percent of the national budget, less than 1 percent, 0.68 percent of the national budget, is spent on international cooperation.

We are a great country. I come from a city where our patron saint is St. Francis. The song of St. Francis is the anthem of our community, and that is praying to the Lord to make us a channel of God's peace. Where there is darkness, may we bring light; where there is hatred, may we bring love; where there is despair, may we bring hope.

We cannot solve all of the problems of the world, but we can bring hope to people, and that is what we try to do in this bill. This is a small price for us to pay to prevent putting our young men in harm's way and to honor the commitment of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have been fond of quoting President Kennedy on this bill, because everybody in the world who was alive at the time and those who study history know of his clarion call to the American people, the citizens of America, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." But the very next line in that inaugural address, which I heard myself as a student here so many years ago, the very next line says, "To the citizens of the world, I say ask not what America can do for you, but what we can do working together for the freedom of mankind."

That is what this bill strives to do. We cannot have that freedom, promote democratic values, stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and build our economy by promoting our exports on the cheap.

So I would hope that our colleagues would oppose the bill when it comes up. I have no objection to the rule. I urge our colleagues to vote no. Let us come back with a good bill we can have consensus on, that is worthy of a country as great as ours.

□ 1330

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule, and congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Miami, Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for his superb handling of this issue and the very important input that he has had in structuring this and working closely with the distinguished

Cardinal Callahan in helping to move this measure forward.

There is, obviously, some controversy around it. But frankly, it is a measure which falls right in line with our commitment to fund our national priorities, and to do so under the very tight spending constraints with which we are forced to live.

At the same time we are doing that, the conference report utilizes our scarce resources to ensure our successful and very important leadership abroad. A previous speaker mentioned the fact that we are committed to recognizing the importance of global trade. That is something that is underscored here.

Another issue that is very important is for us to, obviously, address the spread of communicable diseases in the developing world, and especially among children. Legislation we are going to be dealing with later today also focuses on children. This conference report itself provides \$715 million for child survival and disease programs that are highly effective in fighting diseases out there, such as tuberculosis, malaria, and yellow fever.

We can all agree that the drug abuse issue is no longer simply a domestic concern, it is a global concern. The bill of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) addresses that by providing \$285 million to fight international drug traffickers. We recognize in doing so that wiping out that scourge of drugs must be a top priority for all nations throughout the world.

The conference report also is very, very key to dealing with that continued challenge we face in the Middle East. This report maintains our commitment to Israel and Egypt, as laid out in the Camp David accords. Nearly half of the funding is devoted to peace in the Middle East, so this vital region will continue down the path towards democracy and prosperity and stability.

So I urge my colleagues to join in support of this rule and the very important conference report.

The easy issue which is often demagogued around here is to oppose foreign assistance. It is something that frankly I have done in years past. I have done it because in many instances we were spending much more than we should. But the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and other members of his subcommittee and the conference itself have dealt with these spending constraints which have been imposed on us appropriately, and they have established priorities. The priority for us is to maintain our Nation's leadership position in the world.

We all recognize that the United States of America is the world's only complete superpower militarily, economically, and geopolitically. Responsibility goes with that, so providing this assistance is really a very, very small part of that.

It is important to note that much of this assistance benefits the United

States of America directly in dollars that are expended here. So I urge support of the rule, support of the conference report, and look forward to what probably will be a reasonably close vote, but I think we will be successful.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), a member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding time to me, and I thank my colleagues.

I do want to add my appreciation to the cooperative efforts of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for their knowledgeable leadership.

Right out of the box, I want to thank them for the \$180 million increase in support of fighting worldwide AIDS, and in particular, the emphasis on Africa. I want to note the work of my colleague, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK). She and myself and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) went on an AIDS mission to Africa. We know this is not enough, but we are very grateful for the step that has been made.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I have no concern with the rule, but unfortunately, I cannot support this final legislation. Let me say that I think the chart that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) had is very telling. It shows the sliver or the mere amount of monies we expend as a country for foreign aid. It does not, however, show that when we poll Americans, they frankly think it is higher, and would accept higher, because they understand the responsibilities that come with world leadership.

So here are my concerns in this bill. First of all, we made a commitment in supporting and encouraging the Israelis and Palestinians to get together on the peace accord, in the Wye accord, to significantly work and fund that accord. The bill provides no funding, to my knowledge, to support the Wye accord. This funding is essential to support the renewed dedication of the Israelis and Palestinians to implement the Wye agreement and achieve an historic permanent status agreement over the next year. We must ensure that the framework of peace is stabilized by the resources. So I would hope that we would reach that point.

I am also concerned about the cuts to development assistance and economic support fund, the multilateral development banks and debt reduction. The \$87 million cut from debt relief programs for poor countries will damage the ability of the United States to contribute to the HIPC trust fund, which already is in jeopardy or may not be the best.

Last week or 2 weeks ago, with a number of my colleagues, I joined the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and others to challenge the IMF

for their hypocritical structure of debt relief for undeveloped nations. If we want to give them a fish, as opposed to giving them the opportunity to rebuild themselves, then we will continue to have poverty. Undeveloped nations want us to teach them how to fish, rather than give them a fish. All this so-called debt reduction and helping them with their debt relief keeps them needing fish, as opposed to relieving them of the burdens by providing more infrastructure and support that would help bring down their debt.

The Heavily-Indebted Poor Countries initiative is supported by a wide range of religious and charitable groups, and was recently agreed to by the G-7 in Cologne, and mentioned by our president. We must help bring down the debt of these developing nations so that they can take the lead on social issues in their countries like HIV-AIDS, like education, like health care, like housing.

I supported vigorously the African Growth and Opportunity Act, which provides an opportunity for trade to be used as a tool to economic advancements, but cannot have the intended effect unless the debt burden of these countries is adequately addressed.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act is a trade bill. I support it. The African Growth and Opportunity Act will change how America does business with Africa. African countries want an equal trading relationship, but we at the same time must deal with the enormous amount of debt they must service.

I have in that provision, the African Growth and Opportunity Act, a sense of Congress for corporations to develop an AIDS fund to compliment what we are doing in the Federal Government. But I can tell the Members that if we do not have debt relief, we are going to see these countries go down, down, down into a hole of no return.

I would ask that we send this bill back and have it fixed, though I support the family planning efforts, and get us a real foreign operations bill. I thank Members for their work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern regarding the Foreign Operations Appropriations Conference Report. This legislation simply does not provide enough funding to carry out an effective foreign policy. It cuts American assistance to those who most urgently need it throughout the world and ignores some of our most pressing foreign policy priorities.

Since the mid-1980's the resources devoted to our foreign assistance programs have steadily declined. Some of these decreases have been prudent reductions as we examined our international and multilateral commitments. However, these massive cuts in funding currently are threatening America's ability to maintain a leadership role in a rapidly changing world.

The Wye accord between Israel and the Palestinians was a significant diplomatic effort on behalf of our country. The credibility of our country should not be put in a compromising position by this Congress. The bill provides no funding to support the Wye accord.

This funding is essential to support the renewed dedication of the Israelis and Palestinians to implement Wye and achieve a historic permanent status agreement over the next year. This is not the time for the United States to renege on its commitments in support of a historic opportunity for peace in the Middle East.

Implementation of the Wye agreement resumed immediately, with the first round of prisoner released, followed by the next stage of Israeli redeployments in the West Bank, and the assumption of permanent status negotiations. The Israelis and Palestinians have committed to achieve a framework agreement on the most difficult permanent status issues by February 2000 and a final permanent status agreement by later that year. I strongly oppose the lack of funding for the Wye agreement in this measure or any efforts that would impede progress in Middle East peace.

I am concerned about the cuts to Development Assistance and Economic Support Fund, the Multilateral Development Banks and debt reduction. The \$87 million cut from Debt Relief programs for poor countries will damage the ability of the United States to contribute to the HIPC Trust Fund, which is an essential component of current debt reduction programs as well as of the Cologne debt initiative. This massive reduction equates to a 72% cut from the Debt Relief programs. The developing nations of the world have developed strategies and plans to alleviate some of the debt burden of poorer countries. The expanded Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) initiative is supported by a wide range of religious and charitable organizations, and was agreed to by the G-7 in Cologne. It is critical that the United States demonstrate its leadership by providing the necessary funding support for the first year of this initiative, which enjoys bipartisan and international support.

The debt issue is one that cannot be ignored as the United States establishes a more mature trade relationship with Sub Saharan Africa. The African Growth and Opportunity Act provides an opportunity for trade to be used as a tool to economic advancement but cannot have the intended effect unless the debt burden in these countries is adequately addressed. African Growth and Opportunity will change how America does business with Africa. It seeks to enhance US-Africa policy to increased trade, investment, self-help and serious engagement. It seeks to move away from the paternalism which in the past characterized American dealing with Africa by encouraging strategies to improve economic performance and requiring high level interactions between the U.S. and African governments on trade and investment issues. The debt burden must be addressed.

Payments on unsustainable debt have left many poorer countries facing the tough decisions of making debt payments or delaying necessary social, health, education or other programs designed to improve quality of living. Humanity is less than ninety nine days short of the year 2000. Yet, poorer countries are still faced with 80 percent illiteracy rates, lack of food security, diseases affecting their children that are nonexistent in developed countries, and other malaise that should be eliminated.

Debt reduction must be fully funded. The Congress must not ignore the historic opportunity presented by the Cologne debt reduction initiative to reduce the unmanageable

debt burdens of the poorest countries, the majority of which are in Africa. By not funding this initiative, which is supported by a wide range of faith based and other private sector organizations, the Congress will ensure not only that the U.S. does not contribute its fair share, but also that the worldwide initiative does not succeed.

I must oppose the \$212 million or 31% cut from democratization and economic recovery programs in Latin America, Africa and Asia. This reduction in the Economic Support Fund would significantly constrain the United States' ability to respond to a host of threats and new crises around the world.

These cuts would force the reduction of programs intended to increase political stability and democratization in Africa; support democracy efforts in Guatemala, Peru and Ecuador, and bolster democratic and economic reform in Asia, as well as sustain implementation of the Belfast Good Friday Accord. Cuts to these accounts will not permit the United States to provide sufficient funds for numerous priorities in Africa. I am concerned that as we applaud democracy, we are not willing to support it. I am concerned that during their critical transition periods, we may not be able to support emerging democracies like Nigeria.

At a time when natural disasters and man-made conflicts are causing unprecedented damage throughout the world, Congress has cut the International Disaster Assistance and Voluntary Peacekeeping requests by over 25 percent. This dramatic reduction in funding for Voluntary Peacekeeping operations would decrease funds available for the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe mission Bosnia and Croatia, significantly reduce assistance for the African Crisis Response Initiative and African regional peacekeeping operations, such as ECOMOG, and eliminate funding for Haiti.

Such a substantial reduction would raise international concern that the United States may not support its fair share of the international police force that will help to implement the Kosovo peace settlement, for which new resources will be needed. The conference initiative cuts funding for international peace by 41%. Adequate funding is critical for support of regional peacekeeping activities such as ECOMOG that has helped to maintain stability and avert the kind of humanitarian disasters that require much greater expenditure of resources.

The severe cuts in the conference bill to provide assistance to the NIS will make it impossible to implement the Enhanced Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI). The primary objective of the ETRI is to reduce the threat of weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of rogue states. The bill effectively provides no resources to continue ETRI and reduces U.S. ability to prevent and terminate international security threats in Russia and the NIS.

I thank my colleagues for increased funding to combat HIV/AIDS. Of 5.8 million adults and children newly infected with HIV during 1998, 4 million live in sub-Saharan Africa. AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa is a growing disaster. UNAIDS has declared HIV/AIDS in Africa an "epidemic out of control".

Each and everyday, more than 16,000 additional people become HIV positive, and most live in sub-Saharan Africa where in South Africa alone, 1500 people become HIV+ each

day. Among children under 15, the proportion is 9 out of 10. To date 82% of all AIDS deaths have been in the region and at least 95% of all AIDS orphans have been in Africa. It is estimated that by the year 2010 AIDS will orphan more than 40 million children, with 95% in sub-Saharan Africa.

Additional funds to combat HIV/AIDS are always welcome and I urge my colleagues to acknowledge this threat to mankind by addressing the international crisis.

I thank my colleagues for funding the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), a vital program, which provides valuable voluntary family planning and other services in over 160 countries.

I oppose the use of U.S. funds to lobby for or against abortion. U.S. funds should not be used in such a political debate. Governments should address those issues independently of U.S. appropriated monies.

In closing, I must urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 2606. Low funding levels translate to bad policy choices. At such funding levels, there will be no choice other than to keep considering supplemental appropriation request and budget amendments.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the subcommittee on the Committee on Appropriations who has done superb work on this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill is always a difficult bill. It requires some difficult negotiations. But for the past 5 years, with my handling of this bill, we have worked in a very bipartisan manner to satisfy or to attempt to satisfy the needs of both sides of the aisle.

I think this year is certainly no different, because not one Member on the other side at any point in this debate has ever come to me and said, "Sonny, I think there is something wrong in your bill." They did not say, "You left out Colombia, because we put Colombia's needs in there. They did not say, "You left out Africa," because we responded to those who were interested in Africa. We did not leave out Israel, we did not leave out Jordan, we did not leave out many of the foreign countries that so many of the Members are interested in, because we worked in a bipartisan spirit to draft a bill.

So the only problem we have here is this insatiable desire on the part of the President to give away American taxpayer money. They talk about revenue enhancement programs. I think the President calls it offsetting receipts. In Alabama we call it taxes, but the President says he wants some offsetting receipts, so let me suggest one. Maybe we could charge every foreign dignitary that comes into the White House \$1 million, because every foreign dignitary who walks into the White House comes out with a commitment from anywhere from \$1 million to \$50

million. Maybe we ought to consider that.

Maybe we ought to limit the ability of the President and the Vice President and the First Lady to travel. Number one, his trip to Africa cost the taxpayers \$47 million because he took so many people with him. But that is not our problem. Our problems are the commitments that he makes.

Every time the President meets with a foreign dignitary, they have a toast, which is appropriate. But every time they make a toast, the President of the United States says, here is my commitment to you. I am going to give you some more money. Then they run over here and say, this is an obligation of the United States. How can we possibly not fulfill our obligations?

Mr. Speaker, this does not mean it is an obligation of the United States when the President of the United States raises his glass of wine to some foreign leader and says, I am going to send you \$50 million. We do not have the money.

The gentlewoman from California and I have worked so very well together. She told me not to mention social security. I am not going to say, even though it is a reality, if we give the President \$2 billion more that he is asking for, it is going to impact social security.

I apologize to the gentlewoman from California for saying that, and I will not say it anymore until the bill comes up. But let me tell the Members, in this bill no one, no one in this debate, no one in the Committee on Rules, no one on the floor of the House, no one by telephone call has called me and said, "Sonny, you did not treat Lebanon right, you did not treat Armenia right, you did not treat Georgia right, you did not treat Africa right," because we worked in a bipartisan fashion to make absolutely certain that we did have a bipartisan bill.

So we have a bipartisan bill, and it is \$2 billion less than the President requested at this point. He just came last week and asked for another \$100 million for another of his pet projects. In addition to that, he wants \$2 billion more to give to Israel and to Jordan and to the Palestinian authority because of the Wye agreement.

He is going to need some additional money, he says, for Kosovo, even though we responded to the wishes of this House on Kosovo by saying, we are not going to participate in reconstruction in Kosovo unless the European community puts up 85 percent of the money.

We have done everything they asked. We have responded to all of our subcommittee members, our full committee members, and to every Member in this House who has come to me and said, we think you ought to do something. We have done every responsible thing we can do except satisfy this insatiable appetite for money that President Clinton has that he wants to hand out as he makes his travels, as I would

do if I were in his position, during this last year and a half of his presidency. He wants to travel around the world. He wants more money to hand out.

We do not have more money. The only way to get more money is through new taxes, through possibly jeopardizing social security or breaking the budget caps. I urge Members to bring this bill up, vote for this rule, and let us indeed debate this. If it fails and the President wants to veto it, let him veto it.

I talked to the President the other night. I promise the Members, I think I had him convinced that I was right, that this is as much as he is going to get. The President said, "Well, Sonny, maybe you are right. Maybe you are right. But," he says, "I need to talk with my people." I said, "I will tell you what, Mr. President, I will let you go at this point if you will invite me in the same room when you talk to your people, to let me tell them what I have just told you about the merits of this bill. And the President said, "Well, maybe you are right. I will do that."

But unfortunately, at 9 o'clock that night, Sandy Berger called back and said they did not think it was wise for me to get into the same room with Madeleine Albright, with Sandy Berger, and Bill Clinton, because they knew that logically, and I say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), they knew that logically I was correct, and that if indeed I were able to get them all in the room, no one could convince the President otherwise of the merits of this bill at this particular time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate very much the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

I rise on the rule, and I am speaking in opposition to the outrageous underlying bill, although there are many positive initiatives, like increasing funding for security at our embassies abroad.

□ 1345

There is zero funding for the important Wye agreement, the Middle East peace agreement. I must say that I applaud the conferees for their bipartisan agreement to restore funding for the United Nations Family Planning Assistance and for the bipartisan agreement to strip out any antichoice riders. These are two important policy initiatives that are precedent setting that will be part of the underlying bill that returns to this House.

Mr. Speaker, next week, our world reaches 6 billion in population and the decisions that we make on UNFPA and on other policy decisions will determine whether this number quickly doubles or whether we move more slowly.

Funding UNFPA will save lives, maternal health, child health, and I applaud the conferees for their bipartisan support of putting UNFPA in and taking Mexico City out.

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Maloney) for yielding to me. She raised the issue about the Wye agreement, and I am pleased to note we have just received a letter from AIPAC dated October 5, and it was sent to the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN).

It reads, "Chairman CALLAHAN, we are writing to express our support for the conference report on H.R. 2606, the fiscal year 2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill which contains funding for Israel's regular aid package, including provisions for early disbursement, offshore procurement and refugee settlement. The Middle East peace process is moving forward. Both Israel and the Palestinians are committed to resolving issues between them within a year. It is important that Congress support Israel as this process moves ahead. And we therefore also hope and urge that Congress find a way to fund assistance to the Wye River signatories before the end of this year."

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has assured us that he will be working in the conference to try to obtain sufficient funding for the Wye River agreement. This is a very complicated measure, but it covers many of our concerns, and I want to commend the gentleman for working out a very difficult foreign operations measure, and it deserves the support of our entire House.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to reiterate something very important that the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) said. The gentleman pointed out that obviously there could always be more requests for more money. But he explained what was done within the resources available, not doing three things which we refuse to do. Raise taxes. We refuse to raise taxes. Bust the balanced budget. We refuse to bust the balanced budget. Or go into the Social Security Trust Fund. We refuse to go into the Social Security Trust Fund.

So not doing those three things, we are doing a good job of funding the Government's needs, including the very important programs that our friends on the other side of the aisle have pointed out.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is very important work that the subcommittee has brought forward in the context of this conference report. We need to get it passed.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have worked so hard on this bill. Unfortunately, although it is a difficult bill, there are many reasons to oppose it. We have had the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) indicate some of them.

Some will oppose it because of the Mexico City provisions. Some will oppose it because of various foreign aid proposals in here. I am going to oppose it because it took out the language which the House voted, in which it stopped money from going to keep the School of the Americas program.

In 1980, four U.S. churchwomen were brutally murdered in El Salvador. One of them was a good friend of mine, Sister Dorothy Kazel from Cleveland. In 1989, six Jesuit priests were massacred in El Salvador. Archbishop Oscar Romero and Bishop Juan Gerardi of Guatemala were assassinated. Almost 100 of the El Mozote community in El Salvador were massacred. In 1992, nine students and a professor were killed in Peru. In 1997, 30 peasants in the Colombian village of Mapiripan were massacred.

Mr. Speaker, these people were innocent civilians and missionaries working for peace and justice, and they were brutally killed by officers who received their training from the United States Government at the School of the Americas, and the rule of the House should have stayed. We should have eliminated those funds, and no one who cares about peace and justice should vote for the rule or the bill.

Furthermore, another reason to oppose this bill, American tax dollars have been used to blow up water systems, sewer systems, bridges, railroad trains, buses, tractors, hospitals, libraries, schools and homes, killing and maiming countless innocent women and children. In Yugoslavia, Serbia was wrong to wage war on the Kosovar Albanians. NATO was wrong to bomb Belgrade, and we are wrong to further punish Serbia by making them a terrorist nation which stops any opportunity for democratic opposition to grow to Milosevic. If we want to get rid of Milosevic and give the Serbian people an opportunity to grow a democracy, do not make it a terrorist nation.

This Congress has messed up the policy in Iraq by not forcing the administration to come to an accounting on that, and we are going to do the same thing in Serbia by letting this legislation pass which puts them as a terrorist nation. It is time that we stand up for what is right and for a future where we really can have peace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the fiscal year 2000 foreign operations bill, but I do want to indicate support in the way this legislation affects U.S. policy towards Armenia and India.

First, I want to express my appreciation to the conferees, particularly the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for their continued attention to Armenia, Nagorno Karabagh, and the entire South Caucasus region.

This year's legislation provides somewhat more assistance to Armenia than we provided in the last fiscal year, \$89.67 million or 12.2 percent of the total of \$735 million for the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union. The conference report also specified that 15 percent of the funds available for the South Caucasus region be used for confidence-building measures and other activities related to regional conflicts including efforts to achieve a peaceful resolution of the Nagorno Karabagh conflict.

The House version of the legislation contains several report language provisions that would contribute greatly to peace and stability in the South Caucasus region. The administration should follow through on the policy directives contained in the House report which are now incorporated in the conference report. The House report specifically directs the Agency for International Development to expedite delivery of \$20 million to the victims of the Nagorno Karabagh conflict. The people of Nagorno Karabagh suffered during their war of independence with Azerbaijan, and their need for help continues to be significant. They should not be discriminated against in terms of receiving humanitarian assistance simply on the basis of where they live.

The administration should also heed the House report language regarding the peace process for Nagorno Karabagh, stating that assistance to the governments of the region should be proportional to their willingness to cooperate with the Minsk Group. And finally, I want to applaud the conferees from both bodies who have maintained section 907 of the Freedom Support Act.

Turning to India, I want to thank the conferees and particularly the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. PELOSI), the ranking member, for not adopting a provision in the Senate version of the legislation singling out India as one of a handful of nations that would have to receive special congressional approval before the allocation of foreign aid. Section 521 of the Senate bill talked about special notification requirements for countries such as Colombia, Haiti, Liberia, Pakistan, and also included India in this list; but the House conference report does not, and I want to thank the conferees for making that change.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to at this moment actually praise the gentleman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), who came up and says he is going to oppose this bill. And I am praising him because at least he is going to oppose this bill for a concept and a reasonable concept that I think the American people could understand, and that is we are spending money on something that he has some concerns about. But at least the gentleman from Cleveland is standing up and saying that the bill is spending money that he does not want spent.

In a time to where we are struggling to try to make sure we do not continue the crime of raiding the Social Security Trust Fund, at a time that we are trying to finally address the national debt, at a time to where we are finally trying to bring some fiscal credibility and live within a budget, at least the gentleman is coming forward and saying, "I am opposing this bill because it is spending money."

But there are speaker after speaker after speaker who will oppose this rule and then justify it because we are not spending enough money all over the world. The gentleman from Ohio at least is consistent at saying let us protect Social Security and stop spending here. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of this committee, has come forward with a proposal that is moderate and reasonable. Let me say this to the gentleman and to the ranking member, thank you for taking the abortion issue out of this debate. It is something that a lot of us really hate every year.

But now to oppose this bill and oppose this rule because we are not spending enough American money overseas is absolutely absurd. And some of my colleagues may not think the American people understand it, but it is their money. Can we not have a foreign aid policy that does not require us to take from our grandparents' Social Security or take from our children's future to be able to be an international leader? Do we have to buy our way into our standard as the world's superpower?

Is this something that comes with a slip of paper and a little bill that says, Excuse me, American taxpayer, if you want to claim to be the greatest Nation in the world, you have to buy it year by year by sending your money out of Social Security or your money out of your children's savings account to another country that then God knows what happens to this money?

Everybody knows that. Some may not believe that the American people understand foreign aid. And I think they respect a reasonable aid for a reasonable amount of time. But I think the American people are saying enough is enough. The time has come that we

allow the world to grow up and start paying some of their bills and quit looking to Washington and quit looking to the United States to be the sugar daddy to pay for everything. We may be Uncle Sam, but we are not Mom and Dad to the world. But we are Mom and Dad to our children and our grandchildren, and we are the children of our parents who want our Social Security Trust Fund to be left alone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask those who stand up to oppose this bill, I ask them to stand up and point up, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) did, where they want the money taken out of this bill. But do not stand up and talk about how we need to spend more money overseas and then stand up tomorrow and talk about what are we going to do to protect the Social Security Trust Fund.

There is an obligation here that when we come to oppose something that we also provide the answers. If we are not spending enough money where my colleagues want to spend it in this bill, show us where we take it out of somewhere else to move it over. I ask that we all have the fiscal responsibility that goes along with the privilege of being a representative of the House of Representatives.

If Members want to spend the money, tell us where it is going to go, which committee it is going to come out of, whose trust fund it is going to come out of, and will the seniors or the children of America be asked to pay for a debt that we are incurring overseas because we do not have enough guts to tell the rest of the world enough is enough. We are going to take care of our own first.

□ 1400

Charity starts in America. Commitments start in America. Then and only then, after we have paid for our domestic commitments to our seniors and our children, will we be talking about making any new commitments to the rest of the world.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I really do not think that the Chamber needs to be lectured by the Republican majority about fiscal responsibility. They cannot even come up with a budget. We still have not passed a budget. Every budget they come up with raids the Social Security Trust Fund.

They came up with an irresponsible huge tax break for the wealthy, which would have destroyed the Social Security tax fund, which would have dipped into the Social Security tax fund. Then they get up on the floor and attempt to portray themselves as the party of fiscal responsibility. They have busted the budget caps.

They have just been devious about it and have gone around it by declaring the census an emergency when we all know that this country has had a cen-

sus for hundreds and hundreds of years. That was a way they could bust the budget caps and go around it. Perhaps by the same nonsense, we could declare foreign aid an emergency.

So let us not be lectured by the Republicans about fiscal responsibility because the tax break for the rich that the President was courageous enough to veto would have killed Social Security for us, for our children, and for our grandchildren for many, many years to come.

Now, I am a big supporter of foreign aid, and I am embarrassed by this bill. I am embarrassed by it because there is an isolationism bent in the Republican Party where, every year, we provide less and less monies for foreign aid.

Now, we can all get up and give a great speech about how we need the money for home and we need to build housing and build schools, and we need all that. But the United States is also the leader of the world. We used to say the leader of the free world when we had the Soviet. Now we say the leader of the world.

Unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle, the minute the Soviet Union collapsed, most of them saw no further need for the responsible foreign aid. The fact of the matter is, no one made us the leaders of the world. We chose to pick up and take the mantle.

With leadership comes responsibility, and we do not have enough money to fulfill our foreign aid obligations in this bill. I have gone around to foreign capitals and seen our embassies and seen our hard-working Americans do the best they can with what they have had, and I am embarrassed by it. Because there is not enough money to have embassies and to have fully staffed embassies and to have the types of programs that the United States as the leader of the free world needs.

This bill is \$1 billion less than last year. It is \$2 billion less than what the President asked for. It has no money for the Wye Accords. We talk about a fight with the Soviet Union. We won the Cold War. Now we are going to throw it all away.

Developmental funds for Africa are cut. All these emerging Nations, we say we want them to have democracy and free market economy; and then we do not put our money where our mouth is where a little bit of money would just go a long, long way.

Foreign aid, 75 to 80 percent of the foreign aid that we give comes back to the United States in terms of purchasing American goods and services. So it stimulates our economy, and it is good as well.

Now, this is such a terrible bill that the Republican leadership prepared for days and days and weeks and weeks have been putting this bill on and pulling it back. They do not have the votes to pass this bill. I say we should let them go back to the drawing boards, come up with a responsible bill that we can be proud of so America can lead again.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out just a few things. The essence really of the debate today is whether, as the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), the previous speaker, pointed out, more money which, except for one speaker on the other side of the aisle, insufficient amount of money is the reason for their opposition to the bill. That is a legitimate discrepancy. We refused to go into the Social Security Trust Fund.

Now, with regard to what the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) just stated, U.S. embassies and consulates, they are in another appropriations bill in the State Department; Commerce, State, Justice, that bill, not in this one.

Now, it is important to point out again, and I reiterate it, we made a decision, the leadership, and we are standing firm behind our leadership on this. We are not going to go into the Social Security Trust Fund. We are not going to do it. We made that decision. We are sticking to it. Obviously, it subjects us to pressure. We see argument after argument after argument that they want more and more and more money.

Many of the programs that they talk about are probably good programs. But we are going to stick to our commitment. We are not going to go into the Social Security Trust Fund. We are not going to do it.

This is a good work product. We want to bring it to the floor. This rule does so. We deserve to get into the details of the debate. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), our chairman, the prime author of this legislation is ready to provide the details and go into the details of this debate in depth.

But we need to pass this rule in order to get that debate. It is a procedural rule. It is a standard procedural rule, bringing forth the negotiation between the House and Senate known as the conference report that is finalized for foreign aid.

So we are ready to go, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not necessarily oppose the rule before us, but today I am forced to cast a very difficult vote against the conference report to the Fiscal Year 2000 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

It is unfortunate that strong supporters, like myself, of foreign assistance to countries such as Israel, Columbia, Armenia, India, and Egypt are being placed in a position where it is necessary to vote against assistance for those priority countries.

This legislation also has important contributions to UNFPA and other international programs, which I fully support and have urged my colleagues to support. In fact, I thank the conferees and the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for fulfilling the will of the authorizers and the intent of the House by including funding for UNFPA, which I offered as an amendment earlier this year. However, a no vote on this bill is a vote in favor of a strong U.S. foreign policy and a vibrant foreign assistance program.

Mr. Speaker, the numbers in this report are clear. They speak for themselves. This legislation is nearly \$2 billion below the President's request for foreign assistance. Almost every major account is underfunded.

The conference report does not include the \$87 million for debt relief initiatives for the poorest countries, and it cuts \$200 million from economic development and democracy-building programs in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, to name just two important initiatives which will be hampered by this report.

Additionally, this legislation has no money, not one single dollar, to fulfill our commitment to the Wye agreement to the Middle East Peace Process. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and APAC, and I am sorry to disagree with my Chairman, but as the gentleman has stated there is no Wye funding in this bill at this time, and it ought to be there.

Mr. Speaker, the President has made his position crystal clear; increase funding for foreign assistance and include the Wye funding or he will veto the legislation. I know it. My colleagues know it. The Republican leadership knows it. Yet, here we are, with legislation that fails to fund U.S. foreign policy priorities and threatens stability in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is bad for America, it is bad for the Middle East peace process, and it is just plain bad policy. I urge my colleagues to live up to our commitments, support the President and vote against this antforeign aid bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in vigorous opposition to this rule and to this bill. I would like to alert the Members of this chamber of something they may not have heard; and that is, buried in this bill is yet another one of the insidious repeated antienvironmental riders that have so infected our appropriations process.

Because hidden in this bill is an amendment that would prevent the United States of America from engaging, engaging in a discussion with the developing world on how to get them to start help dealing with the problem of climate change.

There is no reason in this bill or any other bill to shackle our ability to dis-

cuss with other Nations of the world how we are going to move forward and how we are going to deal with climate change. This has been infecting other bills. We should stop it right here.

In the last few days, we have debated other antienvironmental riders. This is one dealing with perhaps the most insidious environmental problem that we have. Because, while 15 of the hottest years in human history have been in the last 15 years, while the temperature has risen so that we are having droughts in the Midwest and places of Antarctica breaking up and places in the Tundra changing. While we are doing this, the majority puts in another antienvironmental rider that tells us we should do nothing about this problem.

Well, the one thing I can be sure of about climate change is that we cannot lead in the position of the ostrich. We cannot lead the world in solving this problem by sticking our heads in the sand and allowing other places of anatomy to be out and exposed to the wind. We have got to start leading to a solution of climate change.

If we kill this rule today, and it might be a close vote, so I hope Members may consider this, if my colleagues want to stand up against an antienvironmental rider, cast a no vote on this rule. Let us show some leadership.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I assume that the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) was referring to the Kyoto Treaty, which has to be, pursuant to our constitutional system of advice and consent of the Senate, has to be given consent by the Senate. So that is an issue obviously that is of great importance and is a decision that the Senate will have to make.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers at this time with regard to the rule. It is a procedural rule. This is a procedural rule. We seek to bring the conference report to the floor. That is why we have to pass the rule first.

Once we pass the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the prime author of the conference report who has provided a tremendous amount of leadership, as well as hard work on this issue, is ready.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is ready to delve into the details. He has pointed out how any and all requests that were made of him by our distinguished friends on the other side of the aisle, he did his utmost to comply with. Yet, we are seeing now systematic opposition generally because our friends on the other side of the aisle want more money. But they want more money for everything.

So what we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to bring forth, get to the debate on this foreign aid conference report. But in order to get to the debate on the foreign aid conference report, we have to pass the procedural

rule to do so. That is what we would like to do.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that I do not have a problem with this rule. I do not think many people over here do either. I am not going to ask for a roll call on the rule. I think the rule is in good shape. It is the proper order for a conference committee to have a rule like this.

I will oppose the bill when the bill comes up for a vote. The reason why I oppose the bill is that I do not really have a problem with what the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has done and his staff. I think they spent money they were given. They made the proper choices as to the allocation and some of the earmarks, especially relative to child survival funds and basic education.

The problem that I have had in the last 10 years with the foreign budget or the foreign appropriation budget is, and I testified before the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is that there are so many areas of this foreign aid budget that are lacking.

We have cut the development assistance fund by 50 percent in the last 10 years. If there is one thing that the American people have said, when we invest money overseas, invest it in a way in which people can start to take care of themselves and be self-sufficient. But the very thing that they want we have cut by 50 percent.

We have cut Peace Corps this year. We have cut a lot of programs relative to humanitarian aid of which we could be a leader, and we have been the leader for years. There are so many things to do in this world and our own country that we have the ability to do it.

One does not have to be a rocket scientist to figure out how to feed people, how to give medicines to people, how to immunize people. We have eradicated smallpox in the world. With just a little bit more money, we could start to eradicate polio and TB and those kinds of diseases that are easy. This is not a hard thing to do.

We know logistically how to get food to people. We know how to immunize people. We know how to feed people. At the same time, we should not be giving it from government to government. We should be giving it through our NGOs, the nonprofit organizations, the CARES, and the World Visions, and the Catholic Relief Services, and the Oxfams, and all of the great NGOs in the world, because we get good value for our dollar.

□ 1415

Another thing. This is a practical thing that produces jobs. For every dollar we invest overseas, we get \$2.37 back. We do not lose money on this deal; we gain, and yet year after year it gets more and more frustrating that we

continue to cut back on these funds that are so invaluable to our own workers and that would help the world so much.

We do have a responsibility. It is interesting that when we ask Americans how much they think of the Federal budget we spend on foreign aid, every poll will show that the American people believe that we spend somewhere between 18 and 22 percent of our total budget on foreign aid. And the fact is that is wrong. We spend less than 1 percent of our total budget on foreign aid, and it is going down.

The area that I care so much about, humanitarian aid, is less than one-half of 1 percent. Maybe someday we should separate political and diplomatic aid from humanitarian aid and really fund it and solve some of these problems like polio and TB. We know how to lick this. We know how to feed people, and yet we do not do it.

I know the leadership has taken a position on this of no more money for these programs. But they are wrong, and we disagree with them, and that is why so many of us are going to vote against the bill. So I say the rule is okay, vote for the rule, but when this bill or this conference report comes up, vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We heard multiple speakers on the other side of the aisle with regard to the issue, and all but two said that their opposition to this foreign aid bill was because there was not enough money. I just want to be clear that even though we on this side of the aisle are standing firm behind our leadership in not raising taxes, in not busting the balanced budget, in not going into the Social Security Trust Fund, despite that, on this bill for foreign aid we have \$12.617, that is almost \$13 billion. That is almost \$13,000 million for foreign aid.

I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his extraordinary job. I think this has been a very good example of the underlying difference that separates the two sides of the aisle. With only two exceptions, every single speaker on the other side of the aisle got up and opposed this legislation because there is not enough money in it. And so there is a fundamental difference, but a very good job has been done by our side, our leadership, the chairman of the subcommittee, and so I support not only this rule but the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is important, we need to get it passed, and that is why at this point I support the rule and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 764, CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 321 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 321

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 764) to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 4 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 321 is an open rule providing for the consideration of the Child Abuse Protection and Enforcement Act, also known as the CAPE Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided