

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

and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. And as the sponsor of this legislation, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, especially the gentleman from Florida (Mr. McCOLLUM), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, for all of their work on the bill and their efforts to move this legislation forward.

The rule waives all points of order against consideration and against certain provisions of the bill. The bill will be open for amendment at any point, and under this open rule any Member who seeks to improve upon the legislation may offer any germane amendment. However, priority recognition will be given to those Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Additionally, the rule offers an opportunity to change the bill through the customary motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Finally, to ensure timely and orderly consideration of the bill, the rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes and reduce voting time to 5 minutes as long as the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

As the sponsor of this legislation, I am pleased that the House will have the opportunity to fully debate this important issue surrounding the tragedy of child abuse under a fair and open process.

It is hard for most of us to fathom a rage so blinding that it could compel an adult to attack a helpless child, much less their own child. It may shock my colleagues to realize that every 3 minutes a child will be reported abused or neglected. And, sadly, that is just in my own State of Ohio. Nationwide, the crisis of child abuse is even more staggering. An estimated one million violent crimes involving child victims are reported to police annually. And on top of that, another 1.1 million cases of child abuse are substantiated by child protection agencies annually.

This is a national crisis, and as leaders, we have the responsibility to take a stand and fight back against the cruelty that robs children of their innocence and produces troubled and violent adults.

As a former prosecutor and judge, I have seen firsthand the manifestation of child abuse in the criminal behavior of adults. Breaking this cycle of violence in our society begins with child abuse prevention.

But the most compelling case for child abuse prevention is not found in these troubled adults but in the eyes of children who live in constant fear. Children should be focused on school, little league, piano lessons, not reeling from punches or cowering from the adults who should be embracing them.

The CAPE Act focuses on two critically important fronts: child abuse prevention and improved treatment of the victims of child abuse.

The bill has a host of bipartisan co-sponsors and has been endorsed by a wide variety of groups from every ideological background, including the National Child Abuse Coalition, Prevent Child Abuse America, National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, and the Family Research Council.

The CAPE Act would make three changes to current law: first, the bill expands a Department of Justice grant program that helps States provide equipment and personnel training for closed-circuit television and video taping of children's testimony in child abuse cases. Under the CAPE Act, these grants could be used to provide child protective workers and child welfare workers access to criminal conviction information and orders of protection based on claims of domestic or child abuse. Or the grants could be used to improve law enforcement access to custody orders, visitation orders, protective orders, or guardianship orders.

Second, the CAPE Act expands the use of the Byrne law enforcement grants to improve the enforcement of child abuse and neglect laws, and, more importantly, child abuse prevention.

Finally, the bill allows additional dollars from the Crime Victims Fund to be used for child abuse assistance programs, increasing the earmark from \$10 million to \$20 million. This increase reflects a growth in contributions to the fund since the set-aside for victims of child abuse was first established.

Mr. Speaker, all of these changes will funnel more resources to the State and local level, where the individuals who are on the front lines in the fight against child abuse are best equipped to help our children. And I know my colleagues will be pleased to know that the CAPE Act draws on existing resources instead of creating a new Federal program that requires more taxpayer financing.

The CAPE Act has bipartisan support and was favorably reported by the Committee on the Judiciary without controversy or amendment. So while we do not expect numerous amendments to be offered today, this issue is simply far too important to deny a full and fair debate. That is why the Committee on Rules has reported this open rule, which I hope my colleagues will support.

I look forward to today's debate, which I hope will not only be a prelude to the passage of legislation that gives hope to millions of children, but also an effort to raise awareness about the horrors of child abuse and the steps we can take to end it.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, the rule for H.R. 764 is an open rule, and I am pleased to support its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, every year, millions of children are the victims of child abuse or are witnesses to terrible violence. The repercussions of this violence is often felt for the rest of that child's life. Study after study suggests that children who are victims of child abuse or neglect are far more likely to run afoul of the law either as adolescents or adults. Statistics show that most people who are abusers were abused as children themselves.

Even as the crime in some areas is going down, experts tell us the number of crimes against children is going up. This bill is an important effort aimed at child abuse treatment and prevention. It was passed just a few days ago by a voice vote in the Committee on the Judiciary and is now here on the floor for consideration by the full House.

□ 1430

Several important amendments have been identified, and I look forward to the thoughtful debate concerning this most important issue.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in participating in today's debate and strengthening the voice of millions of children who live each day with terror and in pain.

Raising awareness is the first step toward ending the living nightmare of child abuse. The next step is providing the resources to eradicate this scourge on our society. Today, happily, we can do both.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this fair and open rule and the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act.

Mr. Speaker, 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 764.

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

There was no objection.

CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION AND ENFORCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS). Pursuant to House Resolution 321 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares