

# SECURING OUR CHILDRENS' FUTURE

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, imagine an America where all children receive a world class education and an opportunity to achieve their dreams in a safe school in every community. Imagine an America where the best and brightest teach America's children and every child can read by the third grade. Imagine an America where 95 percent of students graduate from high school and every high school graduate has access to a college education.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to this vision for our children and making these dreams a reality.

Children are America's top priority. Republicans are open to innovation and new solutions to old problems. Republicans have made a solid commitment to education, but the Clinton-Gore administration and Democrats in Congress want the Federal Government to decide what local schools can and cannot do. This is what separates the two parties on education policy.

Wake up America. Every child, regardless of family income, deserves a quality education. We need to increase the role of parents in the day-to-day education of their children and decrease the role of Washington. Republicans are committed to securing America's future for our children and grandchildren.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCNULTY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 332, nays 51, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 544]

YEAS—332

Abercrombie	Ballenger	Berry
Ackerman	Barcia	Biggert
Allen	Barr	Bilirakis
Andrews	Barrett (NE)	Bishop
Archer	Barrett (WI)	Blagojevich
Armey	Bartlett	Bliley
Baca	Barton	Blumenauer
Bachus	Bass	Blunt
Baird	Bentsen	Boehlert
Baker	Bereuter	Boehner
Baldacci	Berkley	Bonilla
Baldwin	Berman	Bonior

Bono	Holden	Paul
Boswell	Holt	Payne
Boucher	Horn	Pease
Boyd	Hostettler	Pelosi
Brady (TX)	Houghton	Petry
Brown (FL)	Hoyer	Phelps
Bryant	Hunter	Pickering
Burr	Hutchinson	Pitts
Buyer	Hyde	Pombo
Callahan	Inslee	Pomeroy
Calvert	Isakson	Portman
Camp	Istook	Pryce (OH)
Canady	Jackson (IL)	Quinn
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Radanovich
Cardin	(TX)	Rahall
Carson	Jefferson	Rangel
Castle	Jenkins	Regula
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Reyes
Chambliss	Johnson, E. B.	Reynolds
Clayton	Johnson, Sam	Rivers
Clement	Jones (NC)	Rodriguez
Coble	Jones (OH)	Roemer
Collins	Kanjorski	Rogan
Combest	Kaptur	Rogers
Condit	Kelly	Rohrabacher
Conyers	Kennedy	Ros-Lehtinen
Cook	Kildee	Rothman
Cooksey	Kilpatrick	Roukema
Cox	Kind (WI)	Roybal-Allard
Coyne	King (NY)	Royce
Cramer	Kingston	Rush
Cubin	Kleckza	Ryan (WI)
Cummings	Knollenberg	Ryun (KS)
Cunningham	Kolbe	Salmon
Davis (FL)	Kuykendall	Sanders
Davis (IL)	LaFalce	Sandlin
Davis (VA)	LaHood	Sanford
Deal	Lampson	Saxton
DeGette	Lantos	Scarborough
DeLauro	Larson	Schakowsky
DeMint	Latham	Scott
Deutsch	LaTourrette	Sensenbrenner
Diaz-Balart	Leach	Serrano
Dicks	Lee	Sessions
Dingell	Levin	Shays
Doggett	Lewis (CA)	Sherman
Dooley	Lewis (KY)	Sherwood
Doolittle	Linder	Shimkus
Doyle	Lipinski	Shows
Dreier	Lofgren	Shuster
Dunn	Lowe	Simpson
Edwards	Lucas (KY)	Sisisky
Ehlers	Lucas (OK)	Skeen
Ehrlich	Luther	Skelton
Emerson	Maloney (CT)	Smith (MI)
Eshoo	Maloney (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Evans	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Everett	Markey	Smith (WA)
Ewing	Martinez	Snyder
Farr	Mascara	Souder
Fletcher	Matsui	Spence
Foley	McCarthy (MO)	Spratt
Ford	McCarthy (NY)	Stearns
Fossella	McCrery	Stenholm
Fowler	McHugh	Strickland
Frank (MA)	McInnis	Stump
Frelinghuysen	McIntyre	Sununu
Frost	McKeon	Tancredo
Gallegly	McKinney	Tanner
Ganske	Meehan	Tauzin
Gedensson	Menendez	Taylor (NC)
Gekas	Millender	Terry
Gephardt	McDonald	Thomas
Gibbons	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Gilchrest	Miller, Gary	Thune
Gillmor	Minge	Thurman
Gilman	Mink	Tiahrt
Gonzalez	Moakley	Tierney
Goodlatte	Mollohan	Toomey
Gordon	Moore	Towns
Goss	Moran (VA)	Traficant
Graham	Myrick	Turner
Granger	Nadler	Udall (CO)
Green (WI)	Napolitano	Upton
Gutierrez	Neal	Vitter
Hall (OH)	Nethercutt	Walden
Hall (TX)	Northup	Walsh
Hansen	Norwood	Wamp
Hastings (WA)	Nussle	Watkins
Hayes	Obey	Watt (NC)
Hayworth	Oliver	Waxman
Herger	Ortiz	Weiner
Hill (IN)	Ose	Weldon (FL)
Hinche	Owens	Weldon (PA)
Hinojosa	Oxley	Wexler
Hobson	Packard	Weygand
Hoeffel	Pascrell	
Hoekstra	Pastor	

Whitfield	Wolf	Wynn
Wilson	Woolsey	Young (FL)
	NAYS—51	
Aderholt	Hefley	Sabo
Becerra	Hill (MT)	Sanchez
Bilbray	Hilliard	Sawyer
Borski	Hooley	Schaffer
Brady (PA)	Hulshof	Slaughter
Capuano	Kucinich	Stark
Clay	Lewis (GA)	Sweeney
Clyburn	LoBiondo	Tauscher
Costello	McDermott	Thompson (CA)
Crane	McNulty	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Miller, George	Udall (NM)
English	Moran (KS)	Velazquez
Etheridge	Oberstar	Visclosky
Fattah	Pallone	Waters
Filner	Pickett	Weller
Green (TX)	Ramstad	Wicker
Gutknecht	Riley	Wu

## NOT VOTING—49

Brown (OH)	Goodling	Murtha
Burton	Greenwood	Ney
Campbell	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (MN)
Cannon	Hilleary	Peterson (PA)
Chenoweth-Hage	John	Porter
Coburn	Kasich	Price (NC)
Crowley	Klink	Shadegg
Danner	Largent	Shaw
Delahunt	Lazio	Stabenow
DeLay	McCollum	Stupak
Dickey	McGovern	Talent
Dixon	McIntosh	Taylor (MS)
Duncan	Meek (FL)	Watts (OK)
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Wise
Forbes	Metcalf	Young (AK)
Franks (NJ)	Mica	
Goode	Morella	

□ 1056

Mr. HILLIARD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4811, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 647 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 647

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany 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. 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 (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1100

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.

House Resolution 647 provides for the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for their hard work. I share the view expressed by the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman CALLAHAN) that this is a good bill; and as he stated last night in the Committee on Rules, the funding is too high for some, too low for others. It strikes an appropriate balance.

The bill contains \$14.897 billion in funding, slightly below the President's request of \$15.13 and includes an appropriation of \$5 billion to reduce the public debt.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the bill appropriates \$1.9 billion for military financing for Israel, as well as \$840 million for economic assistance to Israel.

I also believe it is very important that we are increasing the child survival and disease program fund and providing \$435 million for heavily indebted poor countries.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that we are increasing funding for the agency for international development by \$300 million over the prior fiscal year, bringing next year's funding to \$3.08 billion.

I support this rule. The underlying legislation is very important. Obviously, much work has gone into this legislation. Mr. Speaker, again, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for their hard work on this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to adopt both the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time. As the gentleman just explained to my colleagues, this rule waives all points of order against the conference report on the foreign operations bill.

I consider these programs funded by this bill to be our first line of national defense. I believe the goodwill and friendship created by these programs helps prevent international tensions that, if left unresolved, might lead to more serious conflict. I think that we have many, many examples like this.

I think the greatest example before us today is North Korea. Mr. Speaker,

I was saying a little bit about North Korea that it is a great example of what this bill is all about, because we, over the past 4 years through the world food program, have donated somewhere between 70 percent and 75 percent of all food aid, and humanitarian aid has brought us a tremendous amount of goodwill in North Korea.

It has really eased tensions, and I think it has, it has brought peace to a peninsula that has not had peace in a long time. That is an example of goodwill. That is an example of foreign aid that goes to save lives, that has really caught the attention of North Korea, South Korea, and so many countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker, moreover, this bill represents the spirit of American generosity and our commitment to the welfare of our fellow world citizens. This bill empowers individuals. It reduces hunger. It fights disease. It saves lives the world over.

I regret that many Americans do not see it that way. For that reason, the bill is very difficult to write. I applaud the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking Democratic member, for the work on this bill.

It has been difficult, but the result is a compromise that has support on both sides of the aisle. I am particularly pleased that many programs, as well as the overall total in the conference report, are increased over the levels in the original, inadequate House-passed bill.

One of the most important improvements in the funding is for debt relief. The conference report fully funds the President's request for \$435 million, including \$210 million in emergency supplemental funding. This is well over the original House bill. This money will help developing nations that are struggling to overcome crushing debts. This funding is critically important to allow these countries to get a fresh, debt-free start.

The bill increases the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund to \$248 million, more than last year's level, and this is \$77 million more than the original House bill. Included in this figure is \$110 million for UNICEF, the same as last year's level.

These programs give hope to the most vulnerable of the world's population, the children. These programs are aimed at improving the health of the children, enabling them to become healthy and productive adults.

I am also pleased that the bill prohibits foreign aid to any government which is aiding the rebels in Sierra Leone by providing military support or by assisting the illicit diamond trade in that country.

Overall, the bill provides \$14.9 billion for foreign operations, and that is \$1.8 billion more than the bill we originally passed on the House floor in July.

It is a 14 percent increase, and I am grateful for that. Still, it represents a 2 percent cut below the President's request. Also, it is less than the total appropriated last year, including supplemental and emergency funding.

Our Nation is the wealthiest in the world. We have the resources to help others and save lives, and I regret that getting the amount we finally achieved in this bill is such a struggle.

I do believe that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) have done the best they can in today's political environment. They have crafted this bill with compassion and understanding of the world's poor and needy people.

My regret over the low funding of the bill in no way diminishes my esteem for them and their work. In addition, I believe it is inappropriate to include in this bill the language that raises the overall spending cap for appropriations bills. This important provision should be considered separately.

Therefore, I will ask, or somebody on this side will ask, to defeat the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will ask to consider a concurrent resolution introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

This resolution would have the effect of amending the conference report to drop the language dealing with the spending caps. Furthermore, the resolution prohibits the House from adjourning until the spending caps are raised.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, but I want to commend my colleagues on the subcommittee for their help with regard to the provisions related to Armenia and specifically the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) for the work that they did on these provisions.

We are very happy with the fact that the level of assistance to Armenia at a minimum will be \$90 million, which is more than what the administration had requested.

We also have the provisions in the bill that the House language provides funding for confidence-building measures and other activities in furtherance of the peaceful resolution of regional conflicts, particularly with regard to Nagorno-Karabagh. As many of my colleagues know, this is a conflict that has been going on for some time, and we certainly want to do everything we can to provide for confidence-building measures in that region.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which prohibits direct U.S. assistance to Azerbaijan because of the continued blockade of Armenia, the language from the previous year is maintained in that regard. I think that is very important, because we need to continue

to send the message that this should not be direct assistance as long as the blockade of Armenia continues.

Lastly, I wanted to say that there is language in the report, language that says that in the event that Armenia is selected as the host site for the SES-AME project, which is essentially a physics project, the Synchrotron Light Source Particle Accelerator Project, there is report language that says that \$15 million of the funds made available for Armenia should support this or a comparable project.

I mention this, not only because the project itself is very important for the economic development of Armenia and I think the whole Caucasus's region, but also because it is an example of the type of development project that we would like to see more of. We would like to see more of U.S. assistance in the future, not as much the emphasis on humanitarian aid, more on development aid, and this is a good example.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear at the onset that my objection to this rule or to this bill has nothing to do with the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) have done their work.

The problem that I have was already mentioned and that is raising the caps on this particular bill. It makes no sense whatsoever. This is something that we should have done 6 months ago and would have avoided the problems that we now have.

What are the problems we now have? Eight of the nine appropriations bills that Congress has passed and sent to the President would spend more than the President requested. The nine bills that have been sent to the President would result in \$11.4 billion in outlays above the President's request.

The discretionary spending caps proposed by this rule would allow Congress to increase discretionary spending above the amount requested by the President, by \$13 billion in budget authority and \$8 billion in outlays. Now, the blame game has been going on and the finger pointing has been going on for weeks and will continue. But let us be real clear, and anyone that chooses to challenge me on these numbers, I will yield to them. This is the fourth year in a row that the Republican-controlled Congress has passed appropriations bills with higher discretionary spending outlays than the President has requested.

Mr. Speaker, although the Republican Congress cut discretionary spending with bipartisan help substantially in 1996, the first year after gaining the majority, total discretionary spending outlays in the 5 years that Republicans

have controlled the Congress have exceeded the President's request by \$4 billion in outlays.

By contrast, the Democratically controlled Congress appropriated less than Presidents Reagan and Bush requested during 7 years of the 12 years in office. Over the 12 years of the Reagan-Bush administrations, Congress appropriated \$42 billion less than the President requested.

The 106th Congress is on pace to increase discretionary spending by at least 5.2 percent above the rate of inflation. This is the largest increase in discretionary spending. Hear me, the largest increase in discretionary spending since the Budget Act of 1974 was passed.

According to the Bipartisan Concord Coalition, if discretionary spending continues to increase at the same rate that it has over the last 3 years under Republican Congress, nearly two-thirds of the projected \$2.3 billion surplus will be wiped out. By approving this rule, Congress will be voting to increase the discretionary spending caps for fiscal year 2001 by \$96 billion in budget authority and \$67 billion in outlays.

The Blue Dogs have proposed that in exchange for increasing discretionary spending caps for the next year to a more realistic level, Congress should set new caps to impose meaningful discipline on discretionary spending for the next 5 years and avoid this problem. This is not the Committee on Appropriations' problem. This was a leadership decision.

□ 1115

This is not an appropriations problem, this is a leadership problem. By the leadership putting a budget on the floor that everyone knew could not be sustained, we find ourselves in this position here on October 25. The same will occur next year if we do not choose to put some fiscal discipline into how we deal with budgets in this place. The discretionary caps for fiscal year 2001 provided no discipline in the appropriation process, none; and that is why we are here.

Now, after fiscal year 2002, the discretionary caps expire. By the way, the caps next year that Congress will be looking at will be \$551 billion in BA, almost \$100 billion below what we are talking about passing for this year.

Now, let me remind everybody again: the President proposed to spend \$624 billion this year in BA and \$637 billion in outlays. The Republicans suggested \$600 billion, which was a ridiculous amount; and they could not find votes on their own side. The Blue Dogs suggested 617 and 733. Now, today, with this vote, everyone that votes for this rule is voting to increase the caps over and above what the President requested and over and above what we would have had bipartisan cooperation for in holding the fiscal discipline in this body.

The Blue Dogs suggested a number. The leadership in this House said under

no circumstances will we do anything other than what we are wanting. Now this is what they are going to get. They will vote for increasing these caps, and so stop going out in campaigns all over the country and blaming Democrats for being the high spenders. It does not wash. It will not wash. I would be glad to yield to anyone that suggests that anything that I am saying is not 100 percent the truth. Quit talking about big-spending Democrats. Let us start talking about a big-spending Congress. Let us start talking about someone that had a grand strategy that would bring us almost to the election year in keeping us here by trying to come up with a false impression of what the budget will be.

Vote against this rule because of the caps, and then let us do our job.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I thank him for his work. I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) of the Committee on Rules on the Republican side for bringing this bill to the floor. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and certainly the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his work.

I wish that we were discussing this weeks ago when we were piling up a lot of pork all over these bills, particularly roads and bridges which all of us need, and various other entities, because I consider this bill a bill that spells relief. And I hope that there will be a way that we handle our fiscal responsibilities in a proper manner, but we also realize the importance of this initiative.

First of all, this bill protects and allows us to be the responsible world leader and promoter of democracy that is so very important. It also says that we value the needs of women around this world as it relates to legitimately based family planning. The agreement also applauds the fact that there is now a sense of freedom in the former Yugoslavia, Serbia. It authorizes up to \$100 million for assistance to Serbia; and having been in Kosovo and Albania and having seen Milosevic up close and knowing what he did to those people and that region, this is good news that we have an opportunity to stabilize that area.

I support the \$2.3 billion for development aid, including \$963 million for child survival and disease fund. The worst thing that we can find in developing nations are the number of children that are dying, the lack of opportunity, the poor health. This will be remedied in a large degree.

Let me also thank the leaders as well who I worked with of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS); the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK); the gentleman from Iowa (Mr.

LEACH); and I know there are many others, including the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on the Marshall Plan. There is money in here to begin talking about fighting worldwide AIDS, but there is \$435 million in debt relief. This is a jubilee day for all of the religious denominations from the Jewish community to the Catholic community, the Muslim community, the Protestant community, if I might cite the general conference of Seventh-day Adventists who have been missionaries in the fields in these developing nations for many, many years. This is a fine day if this bill is passed, because we begin to start telling countries that we can build schools, we can build hospitals, we can build housing, we can tend to those who are devastatingly ill, we can begin nutrition plans, begin agricultural plans, we can do this because we do not have to pay the enormous amount of debt.

I would say that there is a 20-month delay on this for us to determine whether this can be implemented. I hope we move this along rather quickly. I hope we do not put a high bar for these developing nations so that they can, in fact, do what they need to do. I have worked very closely; in fact, as a freshman member, I added \$1 million to the African Development Fund Bank. I am delighted that it is now funded at \$100 million.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why there is the old adage, teach them to fish and they will be able to eat for days and days and years and years as opposed to giving them a fish. This is what the African Development Fund Bank does. It, in fact, gives them the ability to build small enterprises. It is an excellent program, and I support it.

I was a strong supporter of peace-keeping missions and I am gratified that we are engaged in peace, but I am also gratified on this point, Mr. Speaker.

The Congo, unfortunately, gets no money. I am hoping that we can find peace in the Congo in that region based upon African nations coming together and realizing that this country, the former Zaire, has to be in the midst of creating its own peace and not war. Then I am delighted that there is language dealing with prohibiting any country that provides support to Sierra Leone's Revolutionary United Front for any other country from helping, to prohibiting any money going to those countries that would destabilize those regions.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill; and I hope that it passes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH).

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his hard work on this bill. I know they have tried to forge an effective compromise.

I do want to touch on a few things that I think are important as we go

through this debate. The gentlewoman from Texas just said that this was a "jubilee day" for people of all religious faiths because of debt forgiveness, because now we can build schools across the world, and because children can now get vaccines. But I think it is important for us to recognize today that this money is not going to build schools. This money is going to bankers for debt relief.

So let us not sing that jubilee song too loudly.

Secondly, she implored that we not set the bar so high. Let me tell my colleagues something. Part of the problem is, and part of the reason that I oppose this bill, is that most of these countries are in debt today because their economic systems are in chaos and the IMF has not held them accountable. In fact, when a provision was attempted to be inserted on the Senate side that would have required these countries receiving debt forgiveness to open up their markets to world trade, it was rejected.

I would ask everybody to look at the countries whose debts are being forgiven today, and compare it to a Heritage Foundation and Wall Street Journal report on the Index of Economic Freedom. Heritage and the Wall Street Journal compile this list by judging economic freedom in 161 countries on factors like trade policy, fiscal burden of government, government intervention in the economy, monetary policy, capital flow in foreign investment, banking, wages and prices, property rights, regulation, and the black market.

And, surprise of surprises: the 30 countries whose debts are being forgiven are the least free economically, restrict trade and have more centralized, socialistic-type governments that control the economies of the debtor nations.

Under some circumstances, I might not have a problem forgiving these debts. But today we are forgiving debt without requiring the type of reforms that would prevent these countries from coming back to us to ask for debt forgiveness again in 4 or 5 years. We know they are going to come back, because we are not requiring economic reform in these countries. It is a lesson we should have learned over and over again.

I know this bill is going to pass. But after everybody votes for this debt forgiveness plan, I ask that they go back and look at the Wall Street Journal's and Heritage's Index of Economic Freedoms.

Again, it is no coincidence that these 30 countries that are going to be bailed out by American tax dollars today, through their banks, are the same ones that are the most restrictive economically. Before this happens again, I hope we demand reforms in the way that the IMF loans money and the way these countries have the debt forgiven by American taxpayers.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from

Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations and the former chairman. He has also been a great proponent of humanitarian aid for many years, and he has played a major part in helping a lot of people all over the world.

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

Let me say that I think the bill that has been developed, the underlying bill, the foreign operations appropriations bill is a quite responsible bill; and I congratulate everyone who is involved, especially the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

I want to talk, however, about something which has been attached to this bill in the form of the Stevens amendment, because I think that amendment brings us face-to-face with what has essentially been the institutional dishonesty which has plagued this Congress going back to 1981.

What happened in 1981 and in many years since is that after the passage of the Budget Act, which imposed a new budget organization plan on the Congress, the Congress, beginning with 1981, began to pass a series of fictional budget resolutions. They are outlines which the Congress has to pass of expected budget activities; and after those outlines are passed, then we can proceed to pass the actual appropriation bills.

What has happened since 1981 is that the Congress has adopted fixed targets for spending based on assumptions that are totally false or at variance with what we really expected to happen down the line. Because those assumptions about what will happen next in the Congress are so at variance with the truth, those assumptions have allowed the Congress to then pretend that it had room in the budget to pass very large tax cuts, which we did in 1981; to pass very large spending increases, which we did in 1981. We essentially doubled the military budget on borrowed money.

The Congress pretended, at the time, that it was not doing it on borrowed money; it pretended it was paying for it. So for 18 years, we have been digging out from the deficits caused by the failure of those initial budget assumptions to really tell Congress ahead of time what would happen to the deficit if certain actions were taken.

Now we face the same situation again. We had a budget deal in 1997, and both the administration and the Congress agreed they were going to jump off the cliff and assume certain things were going to happen over the next few years; and they did. And as a result, this Congress proceeded under a budget resolution which, in the end, had to be hugely amended in order to fit our actions into those budget fixes.

Now we have this situation. The permanent budget ceiling under which we have been operating for appropriated money is \$541 billion.

□ 1130

The budget resolution, which sort of bent that original number, the budget resolution that we have been operating under is about \$600 billion. Now the Stevens amendment is an attempt to bring that number into some relationship to reality. The Stevens amendment requires that we change that number to \$637 billion in discretionary spending for the next year.

Then guess what happens next year? Next year, the number reverts, and it goes back down to \$551 billion. Is there one person on this floor who believes that, having raised that cap from \$541 billion to \$600 billion to \$637 billion this year, that the Congress next year is going to cut enough money to get down to \$551 billion in discretionary spending? Anybody who believes that the Congress is going to do that needs three straightjackets and a visit to the funny farm. It just is not going to happen that way.

So my objection to the Stevens amendment is not in what it attempts to do. It attempts to bring this institution closer to the truth. My problem is that it contains an implied lie for the next fiscal year. This is not the fault of the author of the amendment. He is just trying to get through the day 1 year at a time.

But the problem is that, by keeping that number in place in the out years, this institution, in effect, continues to lie to the American people about what we expect to be spent in future years.

So under these circumstances, there is not a Member of this body who has a right to question the veracity of either candidate for President so long as we continue to follow these fictions.

So that is why I am going to vote no on the rule. That is why I am going to vote no on the previous question, so that we can separate out this question and have an honest discussion of what our expectations are, not just for this year, but for the years to come.

I also have another concern. This Congress has added billions of dollars in appropriation bills which have passed above the President's request in several instances. Some of that spending I voted for and some of it I voted against. Now this ceiling is being adjusted to take into account all of that spending and also supposedly to make room for the other bills which have yet to be passed.

The major bill which has yet to be passed is the Labor, Health and Education bill. That is the bill that sums up our concern about people in the shadows of life: the weak, the young, the old, the sick. I am not at all certain that the assumptions that will be made about this number will enable us to meet our responsibilities on that bill.

I do not want to be seen as endorsing this number which would, in essence, bless all of the additional spending that has been approved by this Congress so far this year, but then put us in a position where when Education

comes before us, we then say, "Oh, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, there is not enough room under the budget ceiling."

Oh, yes, we made enough room for the Energy and Water bill. We made enough room for the Defense bill. We made enough room for the Agriculture bill and the Transportation bill. But, oh, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no room in the inn to meet our responsibilities on class size, on teacher training, on after-school centers, on Pell Grants, on educations for disabled children. That is my concern with this process.

So I want to vote for the foreign aid bill. If there is a responsible coalition, a majority of people in both caucuses for that bill, I intend to do so. But I would ask people to vote no on the previous question on the rule so that we can have a more honest, for once, discussion with our constituents about what this Congress is really spending this year and does really intend to spend in the coming years.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

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

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say that I intend to vote for the previous question, and I intend to vote for the rule. This rule is basically the same rule that we have adopted for every appropriations bill. There is nothing unusual in the rule.

So we should do what we have done in all other instances. We ought to pass the rule so that we can get about the consideration of the bill on Foreign Operations.

On the previous question, the issue that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has indicated he will oppose the previous question so that he can offer an amendment to the rule which would provide a vehicle for us to eliminate the language in the bill relative to the budget caps.

Now, I do not have a strong disagreement with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on the budget caps, because I think he and I both agreed earlier in the year that the budget resolution was not realistic, that it did not really provide for the priorities of the Congress and for the priorities of the President of the United States.

But, nevertheless, the Congress adopted a budget resolution at a specific number. Well, obviously, as we took up the bills and as we passed it through the House, which we have passed all of them through the House, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot say that often enough, we have passed all those bills through the House, but then we have to negotiate with our colleagues in the other body because their priorities very often are different than our priorities. Once we resolve that, then we have priorities from the President of the United States whose priorities are different.

So we have one overall number, but three sets of priorities; and they do not all fit into that over-all number.

So the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I do not disagree on that. We have made that fairly clear throughout the year. So now we come to the point of getting real. It has been suggested on several occasions in the debates before that these budget numbers are not real.

Well, now we are at the point where we are getting real because the appropriations bills have all passed the House. We bring today the next, after the Foreign Operations bill today, there are only two other appropriations vehicles out there for us to take up and consider, pass and send to the President. So we are at crunch time.

A lot of those issues were real thorny and controversial, most of which have nothing at all to do with appropriations, most of which are something not related at all to appropriations, but appropriations bills are being used as vehicle just to deal with these philosophical or these political or these authorizing-type issues.

As the House passed the bills, we knew that we would be exceeding the caps. So in the House on the appropriation bills, we waived the caps. But this provision from this bill that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) objects to, it is a provision that would apply to the Senate.

The other body needs this language because they have advised us that, without increasing the budget number, the caps, that they would not be able to consider any further appropriations bills.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to clear up one thing. It is not that I am objecting to the Stevens amendment. What I am trying to do is raise concerns about how it is going to be applied, whether it will be applied evenly to all bills, including Labor-HHS.

Secondly, what I object to is the fiction that, after this cap gets raised to \$637 billion, that somehow this Congress expects next year to drop back down to \$551 billion. I think that the Committee on the Budget's procedures are forcing this Congress to live under a ludicrous fiction which, in essence, is a public lie which none of us should be participating in.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have agreed with each other many times that the budget process is far from perfect. We attempted to make some changes earlier this year, but we were not successful with legislation that would have made some changes. But he and I do not disagree on that.

But the point is, in order for the Senate to continue to proceed with consideration of further appropriations bills,

they need this budget cap raised. Because under their rules, they have to do this. In the House, we do not have to. This does not affect the House. We have already taken care of that problem in our House. But in the other body, they need to do this and they need a 60-Member vote in order to accomplish it.

So if we do not do it on this bill, we are going to have to do it on the next bill, which hopefully we will have on the floor tomorrow if a couple of unsettled issues are settled, and that is the Commerce Justice bill, that would be applied to another bill. The Commerce Justice bill the Senate has not passed. So it has got to be connected to another bill, which we expect to be the District of Columbia appropriations bill, which both Houses have passed.

So we really need to do this. It is not a matter of whether one likes it or whether one does not like it. But if we are going to conclude our work, not in the House, but if we are going to conclude our work in the other body, we have to do this. So we might as well do it now, get it over with, and get on about our business. Hopefully, before the week is over, we will conclude the consideration of the District of Columbia and Commerce State Justice bill and then the Health and Education bill hopefully before the week is over.

But we need to move this bill out of the way so we can make room on our schedule for the next two vehicles. Then, Mr. Speaker, the appropriations process will have been completed. It has been delayed this year for a number of reasons. I will not take the time to express my opinion as to why the delays took place, but there have been delays, many of which were not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations. But, nevertheless, there have been delays.

We need to move this rule today. We need to move this bill today. Then we have two other vehicles. Then our colleagues will be able to return to their districts and spend a few days on the campaign trail.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this rule today to let the American people know of the subterfuge that is going on in these waning days of the Congress.

If this rule passes, we will have a bill which amends the budget law to raise the spending limits that now enforce our discretionary budget to reflect the leadership's wanderlust for spending over the past 2 months. This is the day of reckoning for Republicans to wake up and admit the budget resolution they set forth earlier this year was based on a false premise.

But in typical fashion, the leadership has decided to determine unilaterally

the fiscal priorities of this Congress without a bipartisan agreement on education funding. No money for new teachers, no money for school repairs or expansion, no money for after-school.

I ask Members to support the Democratic effort to defeat the previous question so we can appropriately decide the scope of our education investment and then set the new spending levels accordingly.

I deeply regret that we have reached this point in the larger budget process. This is no way to run a budget process, a Congress, or a country. This body does not meet. We do not negotiate. We do not discuss. Republican leaders take off 5 days at a time; and as a result, our basic work is undone because we are not here doing our work. The result is one of the biggest budget disasters that anybody can remember.

My colleagues on the other side have been so busy throwing money at projects just to get out of town that we have already spent \$11.4 billion over the President's request, \$11.4 billion over what the President asked for, and they still have not spent a dime to hire a new teacher or build a new school.

They have not spent a dime on quality teaching or after-school programs because they have refused to make education the priority of this Congress.

□ 1145

We now pass a new CR every day because we are so far into the fiscal year and so far behind in our work. We should be focused on legislation to lift up every public school. This should be the true focus and passion of this Congress.

Instead, just yesterday Republican leaders rejected the bipartisan Johnson-Rangel bill supported by 228 Members, Democrats and Republicans, to help districts with school construction, and they came up with their own plan that is a day late and a dollar short. Their plan creates incentives that delay school construction, and half the benefit does not even go to school districts but to bond holders. Private investors. Not children, not principals, not teachers, but bond holders.

We are calling on the leadership to pass the bipartisan school construction measure to help modernize our schools. This bill reduces the burden on local taxpayers struggling to finance new construction for their communities. We urge Republican leaders to set aside their opposition and provide enough funding for teachers, emergency school repairs, after-school programs and teacher training, and to put all these measures into the education bill so the President can sign a bill that improves our schools this year.

Let us not block progress on education. Let us impose order on this irresponsible budget process. Let us do the work of the American people on education. Stop the delays, stop the foot dragging, stop the electioneering and accomplish something meaningful

for our children. We can still salvage something important from this budget process. Let us get it done, and let us get it done this week.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that has produced this legislation; and again I want to commend him for his hard work on it.

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

I am very surprised to hear the minority leader come before this body, a man who knows the inner workings of this body probably more than anyone else, and try to confuse this body with unrelated facts to what we are talking about.

Let us step back from all this rhetoric that we just heard and look at where we are. The minority leader ought to be here praising what we have accomplished by bringing this bill to the floor today. The minority and the majority worked together. We did not sit in some back room, like we did last year, and negotiate this with the White House or the President's representative and to come forth with something in the middle of the night. We have negotiated this bill for the last 6 months and without outside interference, which is something that the minority leader ought to be encouraging. We bring before our colleagues today an agreed-upon foreign operations bill for the fiscal year 2001.

My colleague can confuse all he wants with his lack of addressing issues in this bill on educational matters. I am surprised that the minority leader did not say we do not fix the notch-baby problem either. There are a lot of things that we do not do, but there are a lot of things we ought not be doing. What we are doing is bringing before the Members a bill, a consensus bill of both the minority and the majority that is a responsible bill to provide for the needs of the State Department and our foreign affairs for the next fiscal year.

It is not everything I wanted. It is not everything the minority ranking member wanted. But it is a good bill, and it has been manufactured in this institution without the involvement of the White House.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman misheard the distinguished minority leader. I did not hear a single word of criticism about the gentleman's work product.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think we heard a message, though, that is going out to all our Members over C-SPAN television confusing the fact about education and all these other issues which have nothing to do with where we are here today.

This simply says, as the chairman of our committee brought to the attention of the membership, that it facilitates the Senate by passing some rider to our bill that facilitates this bill to come up in the United States Senate. So I would respectfully not want to argue with the ranking member of our full committee, but I would say that none of the things that the minority leader mentioned has anything to do with this bill.

So I am urging the Members of this House, Republicans and Democrats, to vote for the previous question and to vote for the rule and let us get on with the business of the day, doing it like we are supposed to do it, between and amongst ourselves, without the tremendous pressure and input in a back-room deal with the President of the United States.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, Democrats have been chastised by their own leadership if they cosponsor bills, especially on Medicare. The whole partisanship in the direction instead of working together, while the President and our leadership and our appropriators are setting down with the President trying to negotiate these bills; and the President is sitting down trying to work with us, our colleagues on this side, their leadership, is so far extreme and so intent on taking back the majority that gridlock is the answer for them.

I would say when the gentleman from Missouri talks about increased costs going into this bill, I would remind people that the U.S.S. *Cole* that just went through a terrorist attack, that incident is going to cost \$150 million to repair the *Cole*. It is going to take \$4.5 million for a company out of Norway to come and transport the *Cole* so we can repair that ship.

The Chief of Naval Operations has put in a report, I have it and I will submit it for the RECORD, that says that because of all of the deployments that this administration has had us go on, \$260 billion worth, which has come out of Defense, we have tired out our equipment and we have tired out our people. What they have had to do with equipment is take ship repair money and transfer it over for our submarine and our carrier refueling, nuclear refueling.

We have 22 ships tied up at the ports both in the Atlantic and Pacific fleets. They cannot go anywhere because they have had two and three times deferred maintenance. They cannot go anywhere. Before, they put them out to sea, hoping that they would not be in a war. Some did not have Ra-domes, some did not have radars, some did not have crash control or damage control, but yet they have put them out just to complete the mission. Well, they are gone.

Right now the CNO, and I am certain that my colleagues on the Democrat

side have some ship repair industry in their districts, is \$283 million short in ship repair because they have had to shift it over to nuclear refueling for subs and carriers because of all these deployments. I think that is wrong.

The gentleman from Missouri talked about construction for schools. If the gentleman from Missouri would waive Davis-Bacon, which costs 35 percent more to build our schools because they have to pay the union wage, most of us would support it. The gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), in San Diego, has had \$5 million by the unions before his opponent ever put in a nickel. Five million dollars. And they talk about campaign finance reform. What a joke.

I went to 18 districts over the last month. I went to 18 districts, and the minimum amount spent by these union bosses was \$1 million against our vulnerable candidates. Would my colleagues waive Davis-Bacon for their union bosses? Do they care about school construction, or do they care about the schools?

Alan Bersin, San Diego superintendent, a Clinton appointee, asked me if I would support a local school bond. I said absolutely. It is the most Republican thing I could be asked to do, because we do not end up with only 48 cents out of a dollar going to the classroom. We end up with a 100 percent or at least 90 percent because we do not have to go through the bureaucracy of here in Washington, D.C. The leadership on that side wants to put the money here in Washington and have the bureaucracy eat up over half of it. We are saying no. Let us waive Davis-Bacon, let us build school construction, let us put it in school bonds, and let us get 90 cents out of a dollar and not pay off the union bosses and make it competitive.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to simply say that I think many of us support the foreign aid bill, the substance of it. There is no question about it. We do have a problem with one aspect of the rule itself, and that is what I would like to address before I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will urge a "no" vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer a substitute rule. The rule will adopt a concurrent resolution striking the spending caps sections from the conference report. It will make in order the foreign affairs conference report after the Senate also adopts the concurrent resolution. It will require the issue of caps be addressed before we adjourn sine die.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the text of the amendment that I would offer along with extraneous material, as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION AMENDMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT ON FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, FY 2001

Strike out all after the resolving clause, and insert the following:

"That upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have adopted a concurrent resolution introduced by Representative Obey on October 25, 2000, directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to make corrections in the enrollment 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.

Sec. 2. Only upon receipt of a message from the Senate informing the House of the adoption of the concurrent resolution, it shall be in order to consider the conference report on 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, and all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are hereby waived. The conference report shall be considered as having been read when called up for consideration."

Sec. 3. For the remainder of the 106th Congress, it shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a sine die adjournment resolution until the House disposes of a bill or joint resolution to be introduced by Representative Obey adjusting the discretionary spending caps for fiscal year 2001.

#### H. CON. RES. 436

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 4811, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:*

(1) In section 101(a), insert before "are hereby enacted into law" the following: "and as modified in accordance with subsection (c)."

(2) In section 101(b), insert before the period at the end the following: ", modified in accordance with subsection (c)".

(3) At the end of section 101, add the following new subsection:

"(c) The modification referred to in subsections (a) and (b) to the text of the bill referred to in subsection (a) is as follows: title VII is modified by striking section 701."

#### THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives*, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry,



asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Republican majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

The vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda to offer an alternative plan.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his courtesy. I think we have had a very interesting debate. I want to reiterate that the underlying legislation is extremely important; the foreign aid legislation. The rule is fair, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I thought it was interesting that we heard, during the debate, criticism of the budget process by our friends on the other side of the aisle, a budget process that was created when they were in the majority. Now they criticize it. We heard that we spend too much money, and yet they say that a number of their priorities are not met; that they need more money. They have said that we have taken too long, and yet then we hear that they would be comfortable if they had more time. So,

obviously, that is the essence of debate: Honest disagreement.

I again want to commend the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), for what I consider a very good work product and to reiterate what we heard from the chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG). It is time to pass this legislation and move on to the other two appropriations conference reports that we need to pass as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution as well as the conference report, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 210, nays 197, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 545]

YEAS—210

Aderholt	Cooksey	Greenwood
Archer	Cox	Gutknecht
Armey	Crane	Hansen
Bachus	Cubin	Hastings (WA)
Baker	Cunningham	Hayes
Ballenger	Davis (VA)	Hayworth
Barr	Deal	Hefley
Barrett (NE)	DeLay	Herger
Bartlett	DeMint	Hill (MT)
Barton	Diaz-Balart	Hilleary
Bass	Doolittle	Hobson
Bereuter	Dreier	Hoekstra
Biggert	Duncan	Horn
Bilbray	Dunn	Hostettler
Bilirakis	Ehlers	Houghton
Bliley	Ehrlich	Hulshof
Blunt	Emerson	Hunter
Boehlert	English	Hutchinson
Boehner	Everett	Hyde
Bonilla	Ewing	Isakson
Bono	Fletcher	Istook
Brady (TX)	Foley	Jenkins
Bryant	Fossella	Johnson (CT)
Burr	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Burton	Frelinghuysen	Jones (NC)
Buyer	Gallegly	Kasich
Callahan	Ganske	Kelly
Calvert	Gekas	King (NY)
Camp	Gibbons	Kingston
Canady	Gilchrest	Knollenberg
Cannon	Gillmor	Kolbe
Castle	Gilman	Kuykendall
Chabot	Goode	LaHood
Chambliss	Goodlatte	Latham
Coble	Goodling	LaTourette
Coburn	Goss	Leach
Collins	Graham	Lewis (CA)
Combust	Granger	Lewis (KY)
Cook	Green (WI)	Linder

LoBiondo	Quinn	Souder
Lucas (OK)	Radanovich	Spence
Manzullo	Ramstad	Stearns
Martinez	Regula	Stump
McCrery	Reynolds	Sununu
McHugh	Riley	Sweeney
McInnis	Rogan	Tancredo
McKeon	Rogers	Tauzin
Metcalf	Rohrabacher	Taylor (NC)
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Terry
Miller, Gary	Roukema	Thomas
Moran (KS)	Royce	Thornberry
Morella	Ryan (WI)	Thune
Myrick	Ryun (KS)	Tiahrt
Nethercutt	Salmon	Toomey
Ney	Sanford	Traficant
Northup	Saxton	Upton
Norwood	Scarborough	Vitter
Nussle	Schaffer	Walden
Ose	Sensenbrenner	Walsh
Oxley	Sessions	Wamp
Packard	Shaw	Watkins
Paul	Shays	Weldon (FL)
Pease	Sherwood	Weldon (PA)
Petri	Shinkus	Weller
Pickering	Shuster	Whitefield
Pitts	Simpson	Wicker
Pombo	Skeen	Wilson
Porter	Smith (MI)	Wolf
Portman	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)

NAYS—197

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Mollohan
Ackerman	Gonzalez	Moore
Allen	Gordon	Moran (VA)
Andrews	Green (TX)	Murtha
Baca	Gutierrez	Nadler
Baird	Hall (OH)	Napolitano
Baldacci	Hall (TX)	Neal
Baldwin	Hill (IN)	Oberstar
Barcia	Hilliard	Obey
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Olver
Becerra	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Bentsen	Hoeffel	Owens
Berkley	Holden	Pallone
Berman	Holt	Pascarell
Berry	Hooley	Pastor
Bishop	Hoyer	Payne
Blagojevich	Inslee	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Jackson (IL)	Peterson (MN)
Bonior	Jackson-Lee	Phelps
Borski	(TX)	Pickett
Boswell	Jefferson	Pomeroy
Boucher	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Boyd	Jones (OH)	Rahall
Brady (PA)	Kanjorski	Rangel
Brown (FL)	Kaptur	Reyes
Capps	Kennedy	Rivers
Capuano	Kildee	Rodriguez
Cardin	Kilpatrick	Roemer
Carson	Kind (WI)	Rothman
Clay	Klecza	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Kucinich	Rush
Clement	LaFalce	Sabo
Clyburn	Lampson	Sanchez
Condit	Lantos	Sanders
Conyers	Larson	Sandlin
Costello	Lee	Sawyer
Coyne	Levin	Schakowsky
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Scott
Crowley	Lipinski	Serrano
Cummings	Lofgren	Sherman
Davis (FL)	Lowey	Shows
Davis (IL)	Lucas (KY)	Sisisky
DeFazio	Luther	Skelton
DeGette	Maloney (CT)	Slaughter
DeLauro	Maloney (NY)	Smith (WA)
Deutsch	Markey	Snyder
Dicks	Mascara	Spratt
Dingell	Matsui	Stabenow
Dixon	McCarthy (MO)	Stark
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Stenholm
Dooley	McDermott	Strickland
Doyle	McIntyre	Tanner
Eshoo	McKinney	Tauscher
Etheridge	McNulty	Taylor (MS)
Evans	Meehan	Thompson (CA)
Farr	Meek (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Fattah	Menendez	Thurman
Filner	Millender	Tierney
Forbes	McDonald	Towns
Ford	Miller, George	Turner
Frank (MA)	Minge	Udall (CO)
Frost	Mink	Udall (NM)
Gejdenson	Moakley	Velazquez



Visclosky	Weiner	Wu
Waters	Wexler	Wynn
Watt (NC)	Weygand	
Waxman	Woolsey	

## NOT VOTING—25

Brown (OH)	Hastings (FL)	Mica
Campbell	John	Peterson (PA)
Chenoweth-Hage	Klink	Shadegg
Danner	Largent	Stupak
Delahunt	Lazio	Talent
Dickey	McCollum	Watts (OK)
Edwards	McGovern	Wise
Engel	McIntosh	
Franks (NJ)	Meeks (NY)	

□ 1217

Mr. FORBES changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 647, I call up the conference report on 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.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 647, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 24, 2000, at page H10759.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

## 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 on the conference report to accompany H.R. 4811, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the House the fiscal year 2001 conference report for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs.

It includes no new taxes. It protects the national security, and it does nothing to threaten the solvency of the Social Security system.

This is my sixth and final year, under the rules, as chairman of this subcommittee; and I want to take this opportunity to thank the subcommittee, the entire subcommittee, including the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our ranking member, and all of the staff who have worked so well with me during this last 6 years.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially proud that we reached our compromise agreement within the Congress as required by the Constitution and without participation at the White House. As some may recall at this very moment last year, we were negotiating with the White House on the year 2000 appropriation bill for foreign operations. In the middle of the night, a document was brought to me that I totally disagreed with that was negotiated by Jack Lew, the President's representative to the Congress on these issues. So incensed was I, Mr. Speaker, that I refused to handle the bill and voted against my own bill.

This year we did it right. Even though there are some things in this bill that I do not totally agree with, there are some things and most things I do agree with.

What I am especially proud of is that we were able to work with the minority and that we worked out, as the Constitution says, an agreement between the House and the Senate minority and the majority; and we bring before this House today a bill that was handled by the House of Representatives and the United States Senate and not consummated in some back room negotiating with some bureaucrat from the White House. I am especially pleased with that.

Mr. Speaker, this bill totals \$14.9 billion in discretionary budget authority. It includes \$14.4 billion in regular funding and just under \$500 million in supplemental funding. These supplements were originally requested for the fiscal year 2000, but have been included in this conference report to meet urgent needs in Southern Africa and Eastern Europe and to provide part of the debt relief package for heavily indebted poor countries.

If we include the President's regular budget request for fiscal year 2001, plus the request for the fiscal year 2000 supplementals that are included in the conference agreement, the President's total request was \$15.8 billion. This conference report is almost \$900 million below the President's request. We are also at \$1.5 billion below the fiscal 2000 enacted level.

While we did cut funding significantly below the President's request, we were able to provide full funding for debt relief and provide \$42 million more than he requested for overseas refugees. This bill contains \$435 million for debt relief, as well as important reforms affecting the International Monetary Fund. I remain skeptical but

hopeful that the HIPC program will actually help poor people as intended. I ask all of the religious leaders who supported HIPC to work with the committee to make sure that it lives up to the promises that were made.

The conference agreement also includes \$315 million in funding to combat HIV/AIDS and \$60 million to limit tuberculosis, both of which are very important priorities for Members on both sides of the aisle.

I am especially proud of the \$295 million provided for the child survival and maternal health, the program that has helped Rotary International help eliminate polio. It is the best thing this Congress has done in the last 5 years since I have been chairman.

The conference report continues to phase out economic assistance to Israel, while providing an increase of \$60 million to meet Israel's current military needs. Of the total funding in this bill, over \$5.2 billion, or 35 percent of it, is dedicated to the Middle East. As usual, we prohibit funding for the PLO and the Palestinian Authority. While funds are available for the West Bank/Gaza program of AID, they are subject to the overall Middle East spending cap. Based on a freeze on Middle East spending, with the exception of the increase in military assistance for Israel, the administration's request for this program is cut by approximately 25 percent.

The conference report also restores funding for foreign military financing grants for our allies and friends around the world. The Waters and Lee amendments that were adopted on the House floor would have resulted in the elimination of our military assistance to the countries of Eastern Europe and to the Baltic States. Those amendments also cut funding for Israel. Given what is going on in the Middle East, we could not accept cuts in Israel's military assistance that were approved by the House and have to have provided full funding.

□ 1230

We have provided up to \$100 million in assistance for Serbia. While that aid is conditioned upon Serbian cooperation with the prosecution of war criminals and other matters, we suspend the application of these provisions until March 31, 2001, in order to give the new democratic government in Serbia time to consolidate its gains. Until that time, we expect the Department of State will use existing authority under the appropriations accounts for Eastern Europe to weigh provisions of law that could unduly complicate the provision of assistance to Serbia, such as section 564 of the conference report.

We also provide \$89 million in assistance for Montenegro and \$65 million in assistance for Croatia and urge support for Macedonia based on its cooperation during the Kosovo air campaign.

The conference agreement also provides \$25 million for the International

Fund for Ireland in support of the Good Friday peace agreement. This is a \$5.4 million appropriation above the President's request, but I believe it is important that we continue to provide as much support as possible to bring peace to Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members support the passage of this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

**FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4811)**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE						
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES						
Subsidy appropriation .....	759,000	963,000	742,500	768,000	865,000	+ 106,000
(Direct loan authorization) .....	(1,350,000)	(960,000)	(960,000)	(960,000)	(865,000)	(-485,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization) .....	(10,400,000)	(15,040,000)	(15,040,000)	(15,040,000)	(13,535,000)	(+3,135,000)
Administrative expenses .....	55,000	63,000	55,000	58,000	62,000	+7,000
Negative subsidy .....	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000	.....
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States .....	799,000	1,011,000	782,500	811,000	912,000	+ 113,000
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION						
Noncredit account:						
Administrative expenses .....	35,000	39,000	37,000	38,000	38,000	+3,000
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections .....	-303,000	-283,000	-283,000	-283,000	-283,000	+20,000
Subsidy appropriation .....	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	.....
(Direct loan authorization) .....	(130,000)	(127,000)	(127,000)	(127,000)	(127,000)	(-3,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization) .....	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	.....
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation .....	-244,000	-220,000	-222,000	-221,000	-221,000	+23,000
TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY						
Trade and development agency .....	44,000	54,000	46,000	46,000	50,000	+6,000
Total, title I, Export and investment assistance .....	599,000	845,000	606,500	636,000	741,000	+142,000
(Loan authorizations) .....	(12,880,000)	(17,127,000)	(17,127,000)	(17,127,000)	(15,527,000)	(+2,647,000)
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Agency for International Development						
Child survival and disease programs fund .....	715,000	659,250	886,000	.....	963,000	+248,000
UNICEF .....	(110,000)	.....	(110,000)	.....	(110,000)	.....
Global health .....	.....	.....	.....	651,000	.....	.....
Development assistance .....	1,228,000	948,822	1,258,000	1,368,250	1,305,000	+77,000
Development Fund for Africa .....	.....	532,928	.....	.....	.....	.....
International disaster assistance .....	202,880	220,000	165,000	220,000	165,000	-37,880
Emergency funding .....	25,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-25,000
Transition Initiatives .....	.....	.....	40,000	.....	50,000	+50,000
(By transfer) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	(5,000)	(+5,000)
Micro & Small Enterprise Development program account:						
Subsidy appropriation .....	1,500	.....	1,500	.....	1,500	.....
(Guaranteed loan authorization) .....	(30,000)	.....	(30,000)	.....	(30,000)	.....
Administrative expenses .....	500	.....	500	.....	500	.....
Urban and environmental credit program account:						
Subsidy appropriation .....	1,500	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,500
(Guaranteed loan authorization) .....	(14,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-14,000)
Administrative expenses .....	5,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-5,000
Development credit programs account:						
Subsidy appropriation .....	.....	.....	1,500	.....	1,500	+1,500
(By transfer) .....	(3,000)	(15,000)	(2,000)	.....	(5,000)	(+2,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization) .....	(40,000)	(213,000)	(49,700)	.....	(49,700)	(+9,700)
Administrative expenses .....	.....	8,000	6,495	4,000	4,000	+4,000
Subtotal, development assistance .....	2,179,380	2,369,000	2,358,995	2,243,250	2,490,500	+311,120
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund .....	43,837	44,489	44,489	44,489	44,489	+652
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development .....	520,000	520,000	509,000	510,000	520,000	.....
(By transfer) .....	.....	.....	.....	.....	(1,000)	(+1,000)
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General .....	25,000	27,000	27,000	25,000	27,000	+2,000
Total, Agency for International Development .....	2,768,217	2,960,489	2,939,484	2,822,739	3,081,989	+313,772
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance						
Economic support fund:						
Camp David countries .....	1,695,000	1,535,000	1,535,000	1,535,000	1,535,000	-160,000
Other .....	650,500	778,000	673,900	685,000	760,000	+108,500
Subtotal, Economic support fund .....	2,345,500	2,313,000	2,208,900	2,220,000	2,295,000	-50,500
Emergency funding .....	450,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-450,000
International Fund for Ireland .....	19,600	.....	25,000	.....	25,000	+5,400
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States .....	535,000	610,000	535,000	635,000	600,000	+65,000
Emergency funding .....	50,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-50,000
Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union .....						
.....	839,000	830,000	740,000	775,000	810,000	-29,000
Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance .....	4,239,100	3,753,000	3,508,900	3,630,000	3,730,000	-509,100

**FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4811) — continued**  
 (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>INDEPENDENT AGENCIES</b>						
<b>Inter-American Foundation</b>						
Appropriation.....		20,000				
(By transfer).....	(5,000)		(10,000)		(12,000)	(+7,000)
Total.....	(5,000)	(20,000)	(10,000)		(12,000)	(+7,000)
<b>African Development Foundation</b>						
Appropriation.....		16,000				
(By transfer).....	(14,400)		(16,000)	(14,400)	(16,000)	(+1,600)
Total.....	(14,400)	(16,000)	(16,000)	(14,400)	(16,000)	(+1,600)
<b>Peace Corps</b>						
Appropriation.....	245,000	275,000	258,000	244,000	265,000	+20,000
<b>Department of State</b>						
International narcotics control and law enforcement.....	305,000	312,000	305,000	220,000	325,000	+20,000
Assistance for counternarcotics activities (emergency funding).....	1,018,500					-1,018,500
Assistance to Plan Colombia.....		256,000				
Migration and refugee assistance.....	625,000	658,212	645,000	615,000	700,000	+75,000
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund.....	12,500	20,000	12,500	15,000	15,000	+2,500
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs.....	216,600	346,740	241,600	215,000	311,600	+95,000
Total, Department of State.....	2,177,600	1,592,952	1,204,100	1,065,000	1,351,600	-826,000
<b>Department of the Treasury</b>						
International affairs technical assistance.....	1,500	7,000	2,000	5,000	6,000	+4,500
Debt restructuring.....	123,000	262,000	238,000	75,000	238,000	+115,000
United States community adjustment and investment program.....	10,000	10,000				-10,000
Subtotal, Department of the Treasury.....	134,500	279,000	240,000	80,000	244,000	+109,500
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance.....	9,564,417	8,896,441	8,150,484	7,841,739	8,672,589	-891,828
Appropriations.....	(8,020,917)	(8,896,441)	(8,150,484)	(7,841,739)	(8,672,589)	(+651,872)
Emergency funding.....	(1,543,500)					(-1,543,500)
(By transfer).....	(22,400)	(15,000)	(28,000)	(14,400)	(39,000)	(+16,600)
(Loan authorizations).....	(84,000)	(213,000)	(79,700)		(79,700)	(-4,300)
<b>TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
International Military Education and Training.....	50,000	55,000	47,250	55,000	55,000	+5,000
<b>Foreign Military Financing Program:</b>						
<b>Grants:</b>						
Camp David countries.....	3,220,000	3,280,000	3,237,505	3,280,000	3,280,000	+60,000
Other.....	200,000	258,200	30,495	239,000	265,000	+65,000
Subtotal, grants.....	3,420,000	3,538,200	3,268,000	3,519,000	3,545,000	+125,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(33,000)	(+2,505)
FMF program level.....	(3,420,000)	(3,538,200)	(3,268,000)	(3,519,000)	(3,545,000)	(+125,000)
Total, Foreign Military Financing.....	3,420,000	3,538,200	3,268,000	3,519,000	3,545,000	+125,000
Emergency Funding.....	1,375,000					-1,375,000
<b>Special Defense Acquisition Fund:</b>						
Offsetting collections.....	-6,000					+6,000
Peacekeeping operations.....	153,000	134,000	117,900	85,000	127,000	-26,000
Total, title III, Military assistance.....	4,992,000	3,727,200	3,433,150	3,659,000	3,727,000	-1,265,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(33,000)	(+2,505)
<b>TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE</b>						
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>						
<b>International Financial Institutions</b>						
<b>World Bank Group</b>						
<b>Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:</b>						
Global Environment Facility.....	35,800	175,567	35,800	50,000	108,000	+72,200
Contribution to the International Development Association.....	775,000	835,570	566,600	750,000	775,000	
Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency.....	4,000	16,000	4,900	4,000	10,000	+6,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions).....	(20,000)	(80,000)	(24,500)	(80,000)	(50,000)	(+30,000)
Total, World Bank Group.....	814,800	1,027,137	607,300	804,000	893,000	+78,200

**FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4811) — continued**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital .....	25,611					-25,611
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions) .....	(1,503,719)					(-1,503,719)
Contribution to the Inter-American Investment Corporation .....	16,000	34,000	8,000	10,000	25,000	+9,000
Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund .....		25,900	10,000		10,000	+10,000
Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank .....	41,611	59,900	18,000	10,000	35,000	-6,611
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital .....	13,728					-13,728
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions) .....	(672,745)					(-672,745)
Contribution to the Asian Development Fund .....	77,000	125,000	72,000	100,000	72,000	-5,000
Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank .....	90,728	125,000	72,000	100,000	72,000	-18,728
Contribution to the African Development Bank:						
Paid-in capital .....	4,100	6,100	3,100	6,100	6,100	+2,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions) .....	(64,000)	(95,983)	(49,574)	(95,983)	(97,549)	(+33,549)
Contribution to the African Development Fund .....	128,000	100,000	72,000	72,000	100,000	-28,000
Total .....	132,100	106,100	75,100	78,100	106,100	-26,000
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:						
Paid-in capital .....	35,779	35,779	35,779	35,779	35,779	
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions) .....	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	
Contribution to the International Fund for Agricultural Development .....			5,000		5,000	+5,000
Total, International Financial Institutions .....	1,115,018	1,353,916	813,179	1,027,879	1,146,879	+31,861
(Limitation on callable capital subscript) .....	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(299,221)	(270,787)	(-2,112,915)
International Organizations and Programs						
Appropriation .....	183,000	354,000	183,000	288,000	186,000	+3,000
(By transfer) .....	(2,500)	(2,500)		(2,500)		(-2,500)
Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance .....	1,298,018	1,707,916	996,179	1,315,879	1,332,879	+34,861
(By transfer) .....	(2,500)	(2,500)		(2,500)		(-2,500)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript) .....	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(299,221)	(270,787)	(-2,112,915)
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS						
Economic development administration (contingent emergency appropriations) for FY 2000 .....				250,000		
International Health Emergencies (contingent emergency appropriations) ....				40,000		
Total, title V .....				290,000		
TITLE VI						
SOUTHERN AFRICA REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
Agency for International Development						
Economic support fund (FY 2000, emergency appropriations) .....		183,000				
International disaster assistance:						
FY 2000 emergency appropriations .....		10,000				
FY 2000 Contingent emergency appropriations .....			160,000	35,000		
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations .....					135,000	+135,000
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development (FY 2000, emergency appropriations) .....		21,000				
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations .....					13,000	+13,000
Total, AID .....		214,000	160,000	35,000	148,000	+148,000
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance						
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States:						
FY 2000 emergency appropriations .....		195,000				
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations .....					75,825	+75,825
Military Assistance						
International Military Education and Training:						
FY 2000 emergency appropriations .....		2,875				
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations .....					2,875	+2,875
Foreign Military Financing Program:						
FY 2000 emergency appropriations .....		31,000				
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations .....					31,000	+31,000

**FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS**  
**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4811) — continued**  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Conference	Conference vs. enacted
<b>Department of the Treasury</b>						
Debt restructuring:						
FY 2000 appropriations .....		210,000				
FY 2001 Contingent emergency appropriations .....					210,000	+210,000
PLAN COLOMBIA						
BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE						
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT						
<b>Department of State</b>						
Assistance for Plan Colombia and for Andean regional counternarcotics (emergency appropriations) .....				934,100		
Contingent emergency appropriations .....						
<b>DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</b>						
Drug Enforcement Administration						
Salaries and expenses .....				17,850		
Methamphetamine initiative (contingent emergency appropriations) .....				40,000		
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration .....				57,850		
Office of Justice Programs						
State and Local Law Enforcement assistance (rescission) .....				-7,850		
Total, Department of Justice .....				50,000		
<b>DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE</b>						
Military construction, Defense-wide (contingent emergency appropriations) ..				8,500		
Department of Defense .....				37,600		
<hr/>						
Total, title VI .....		652,875	160,000	1,065,200	467,700	+467,700
FY 2001 contingent emergency .....					(467,700)	(+467,700)
FY 2000 funding .....		(652,875)	(160,000)	(1,065,200)		
<hr/>						
Grand total .....	16,453,435	15,829,432	13,346,313	14,807,818	14,941,168	-1,512,267
FY 2001 appropriations .....	(16,453,435)	(15,176,557)	(13,186,313)	(13,492,618)	(14,941,168)	(-1,512,267)
Appropriations .....	(13,534,935)	(15,176,557)	(13,186,313)	(13,452,618)	(14,473,468)	(+938,533)
Emergency appropriations .....	(2,918,500)			(40,000)	(467,700)	(-2,450,800)
FY 2000 appropriations .....		(652,875)	(160,000)	(1,315,200)		
(By transfer) .....	(24,900)	(17,500)	(28,000)	(16,900)	(39,000)	(+14,100)
(Limitation on administrative expenses) .....	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(33,000)	(+2,505)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript) .....	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(299,221)	(270,787)	(-2,112,915)
(Loan authorizations) .....	(12,964,000)	(17,340,000)	(17,206,700)	(17,127,000)	(15,606,700)	(+2,642,700)

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today to join in presenting our Foreign Operations conference report. I do not use this word often around here about legislation that is being brought to the floor, but I really am genuinely proud of the priorities that are in this bill. Would I like to see more money in some of the areas, for example, in the AIDS account? Yes. As I said last night to the Committee on Rules, this is not a bill I would have written; but it is a bill I can support, because, while I would have liked more, the priorities are definitely in order.

Before I begin my remarks about the bill, Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge that our distinguished chairman will be managing this bill as chairman for the last time. I want to thank him for his leadership. I also want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), who will be leaving the Congress, who are two distinguished members of the committee.

I want to also point out to our colleagues that since the bill came to the floor in its original form and today, we have lost our former colleague, Congressman Sid Yates. I bring up Sid because Sid served on the Foreign Operations Committee since the day it was formed. It was the Marshall Plan committee, imagine in those days, and, except for a brief hiatus when he left to run for Senate and came back, Sid served on the committee from then, the late 1940s, until he left Congress nearly 2 years ago. So I want to acknowledge all of the work that he did to promote democratic values and the compassion of the American people, and also as a tough budgeter on the committee. We will acknowledge the staff as we go on, but I did want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for their fine work.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman pointed out some of the aspects of the bill to our colleagues so they know what they are voting on; and I want to revisit some of those issues. In doing so, I want to recall to our colleagues' minds a quote from President Kennedy that I am fond of bringing up when we do this bill. Every person in America, practically, or certainly of a certain age, is familiar with President Kennedy's inaugural address when he said to the citizens of America, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country." But not many people know that the very next line in that speech is, President Kennedy said to the citizens of the world, "ask not what America can do for you, but what we can do working together for the freedom of mankind."

It is in that spirit that I ask my colleagues to support this important leg-

islation that is here today, because in demonstrating the compassion of the American people, in recognizing that it is in our national interest to promote the global environmental health and stop the spread of AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and helping countries develop so we develop markets for our products, this is all in our interest, but it is all in furtherance of the freedom of mankind as well.

The total funding bill, as has been mentioned, is \$14.9 billion and is just almost near the President's request, a couple hundred million dollars short of that. The bill fully funds the President's request for \$435 million for international debt relief. This is a very important accomplishment of this Congress, and it could not have happened without bipartisan cooperation. I think it never would have happened without the outside mobilization of the religious community throughout our country in this Jubilee Year to ask for forgiveness, including debt forgiveness.

This means the United States will be finally able to live up to the pledges made 2 years ago to the international community to engage in meaningful debt relief for the world's poorest countries. That language has been included to require the U.S. to oppose any loan from the international banks or IMF when it imposes user fees for a condition. More on that later.

The bill also contains on the subject of AIDS, which is a very high priority here.

Before I leave debt relief, I want to recognize the work of the authorizers, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE); the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS); the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS); the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK); and also the great work of the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio, on this. This has really been a bipartisan cooperative effort.

On the subject of AIDS, we are all familiar with the dramatic increase that this body voted on, the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), on the day she came back from the AIDS conference in Africa, and the bill includes \$315 million for HIV-AIDS and which includes \$20 million for the World Bank HIV-AIDS trust fund, which was the good work of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the chairman of the Committee on Banking.

I hoped for more funding, as I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks, for HIV-AIDS and the trust fund, but the increases provided in this bill, along with the increased funding anticipated in the Labor-HHS bill, will bring about real advances in the fight against HIV-AIDS.

I want to talk for a moment about the international family funding, which has gone from 372 to 425 million dollars. No funding can be obligated

until February 15. However, no Mexico City language has been included. I want to commend the President of the United States for his steadfastness on this, excluding this language from the bill; and I want to also commend Democrats and Republicans for working together on this, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. Maloney) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), in terms of the Mexico City language, and, of course, the very distinguished members of our subcommittee on the Democratic side, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), who all helped to make this bill a success.

The bill contains a total of \$693 million for the Child Survival Account, part of which we are going to call the Callahan Child Survival Maternal Health Account, in tribute to the fine work he has done on this. This account funds the HIV programs, as well as providing \$50 million for global alliance for vaccines and immunizations and \$60 million for tuberculosis.

The overall funding includes funding for the African Development Bank, for increased funding for the Inter-American Development Bank.

I just want to say on Serbia, because that is a question that has been asked, the language in the bill, the agreement allows up to \$100 million in assistance for what I would characterize as an appropriate degree of flexibility. It is a compromise. More on that as the debate continues.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman might find this somewhat of a surprise when I rise in support of his bill, because the gentleman has known for years that I was one of the leading opponents of our foreign aid programs. I did so because I did not think they worked. I did not think that the claims of helping poor people were actually authentic. I would be here on the floor, and I had the privilege of being the ranking member on this subcommittee some years ago, and I remember being berated by others who would say this money is for the poorest of the poor.

Well, I am willing to help the poorest of the poor, but in those days the money was not going to help the poor, it was going to help the people who ran the countries where the poorest of the poor lived. Under the dynamic leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), things have changed. Reforms have been put into



effect by his leadership that make it possible for me to stand here and support this bill.

The gentleman has done a good job in facing up to the tough issues in the foreign workplace. He has dealt with foreign leaders in a very professional and dignified, but tough, way.

I also want to compliment the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). She has been very aggressive in making her own viewpoint known, but she has cooperated completely with the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN). They have been a good team.

I would say as an aside, Mr. Speaker, that I really wish that we did not have the rule that the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) could not continue to be chairman of this subcommittee, but under the term limits that we imposed on ourselves for committee chairmen and subcommittee chairmen, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has to give up the leadership of this subcommittee. I think that is a mistake. I think the Congress will be worse off because of that, because of the ability that he has to deal with these international issues and to deal with international leaders, and also because of his ability in a nonsense way to bring together many divergent viewpoints that are held by many of our Members.

So the gentleman has done a really good job, and I just want to commend the gentleman as strongly as I possibly can for the good job that he has done, and tell him that I will continue to seek a way to keep him as chairman of the subcommittee when the time comes.

This is a good bill, Mr. Speaker. He and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) have done a really good job in identifying real needs and putting in safeguards that, in fact, will guarantee for the most part that the poorest of the poor that need the help are going to get the help.

Is it a perfect bill? Is it one that I read every word of it and read every section and say, gee, I agree with everything? No. To the contrary, there are still some things in this bill that I would prefer not be here. But, for the most part, I do agree with what is in the bill.

Again, I commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the good job they have done. I hope we can proceed to complete that action on this bill today, because we have two other conference reports that we need to get to quickly so the House and the Congress can complete its appropriations mission for this year.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the committee.

(Mrs. LOWEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report, and I want to thank our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who have worked so hard to craft this fair, bipartisan foreign operations bill. Of course, also our staff on both sides, who have done superb work on this bill. It goes a long way toward adequately funding United States foreign policy priorities, and it really has been a pleasure to work with the chairman and our ranking member. I thank them for their efforts and their superb work.

There are a lot of good things in this bill, and I would like to highlight just a few. First and foremost, this conference report removes the anti-democratic global gag rule restrictions that have threatened our international family planning programs throughout the past year. The language jeopardizes the lives of women around the world and undermines a key objective of United States foreign policy, the promotion of democracy around the world.

I am also pleased that this bill fully funds our yearly aid package for Israel. As recent events have shown, helping Israel, our ally in the Middle East, maintain its qualitative military edge in the region, remains an urgent United States national security objective.

The measure also provides \$435 million for international debt relief, a hard-fought victory for our efforts to help the poorest of the poor throughout the world. One of the guiding principles of United States foreign policy is that, whenever possible, we should use our assistance to enable developing countries to stand on their own two feet. Because of this historic funding, many of the countries benefiting from these funds will, for the first time, be able to spend the necessary resources on health care and education for their citizens, rather than spending large percentages of their budget servicing debt. I am proud that the United States will be a partner in this international initiative.

The conference report also demonstrates a strong commitment to combatting HIV-AIDS, and it also supports a high United States contribution to the global alliance for vaccines and immunizations and supports the international AIDS vaccine initiative, two multilateral efforts to combat the infectious diseases that cause widespread human devastation and cripple developing economies.

□ 1245

Mr. Speaker, I stood up here many times before to share with my colleagues why I think our investment in foreign aid is so important. In my judgment, the single most important argument for this investment is that in times of great prosperity and burgeoning budget surpluses, we have a responsibility to help those who have been left behind.

As a fortunate Nation, we have the moral obligation to alleviate some of the terrible, heartbreaking suffering in the world. But there is also another reason why our foreign assistance is so important. And that is because in the long run, we in the United States will reap the benefits from the stability shown by our aid.

Countries that are now top candidates for foreign assistance can use our aid to strengthen their democracies, stabilize their economies, and improve the health and well-being of their citizens. I strongly support the bill and again thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of our Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this conference report, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this effective and responsible bill.

The gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) deserves extraordinary praise, I think, for his accessibility, his leadership, his thoughtfulness, his patience, his effectiveness, last of all, but most importantly.

I would also like to extend congratulations to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

I think the two of them, although it was difficult on some of the issues, work together very well. I do not want to forget the staff, and I am not going to start naming them, but the work that they have done is something that we should all be cheering about and saluting.

There are many things in this bill that deserve to be highlighted. First, this bill provides important funding for countries in the Middle East to help support peace in that region. Now, at this most difficult time, this funding is as important as it has ever been.

The United States has reiterated its support for Israel, Egypt and Jordan, countries which have successfully negotiated peace agreements, by providing significant economic and security assistance.

I am pleased also that we have provided \$35 million to help the people of Lebanon. I must point out that this money will not be sent to the Lebanese government; rather, this money will be used to expand the USAID program in Southern Lebanon, so that American NGOs, nongovernment organizations, will be able to directly provide services to the Lebanese people while monitoring the results of our efforts.

The bill also provides important funding for countries of the former Soviet Union, including \$90 million for our ally, Armenia. In addition, we are financing confidence-building measures for the countries of the Southern Caucasus to help build a foundation for peace among Armenia, Nagorno-Karabagh and Azerbaijan.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased that the cuts made to foreign military financing during consideration on the House floor have been restored. This funding is essential for our allies, such as the Baltic countries, Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia.

Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons to support this bill, and the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, should again be commended for accommodating the Members of this body while crafting a very effective and responsible piece of legislation. I urge all Members to vote in favor of this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a very valued member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I will take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for his leadership over these last several years that I have had a chance to work with the gentleman. I want to thank the gentleman for allowing me to participate and also including some of the projects. I thank the gentleman very much for his leadership.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our ranking member, for her undying efforts to work to get the job done. I want to thank the two of them. They certainly have brought a great deal to the floor. We would all hope for more money, at least on our side; but it certainly is a good bill. And I would urge my colleagues to support it.

I want to say special thanks to the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for being persistent, to see that Mozambique, one of the most stable countries on the African continent, is able to continue in their prosperity.

I know without their leadership, we would not have seen the early release of the dollars and then the final effort here in this bill. I want to thank both the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN).

We live in a global economy. When America deals well as the leading country in the world, it is our obligation to be a partner in the rest of the world, and this bill begins that effort. And I certainly want to add my voice to those who say that when we live in a global economy, and as the richest country in the world that God has blessed us to be born and raised in, that responsibility is beginning to be met with this foreign operations bill in front of us.

With the international family planning language set, with the \$420 million

appropriation there to help family planning for women all over the world, it is a major effort. I commend the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for working closely and hard on that.

Debt relief for some of the poorest countries in the world, understanding that this country only has a small fraction of that debt relief, that much of it is from other countries, by us being the leaders in the world, our effort in this bill will certainly help those poor countries and send a signal to those other countries where much of that debt is held; Africa, the continent, the largest in the world, from funding the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, helping in reaching out.

This is a bill that we can support. Thanks again to the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our ranking member, for their support of our projects.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the gentleman who supported the previous question just a few minutes ago.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, there are probably a lot of our staff that are watching this bill, and they come to Washington fundamentally to hope that they can be involved in changing the world.

I think in a lot of ways this bill is a breakthrough, a historic precedent, an effort to really bring about great change in the world. I am referring to the section of this bill that provides debt relief for the poorest countries.

America has unprecedented economic and political and military power. And I do not think countries are much different than people. When people are successful, very successful, there is a tendency in human beings for resentment to build, and the person who is successful has it incumbent on them to try to work to share some of their bounty and to exercise humility as they carry on with their success.

The same is true with nations. When nations experience unprecedented economic success and political success and military success, great resentment begins to build, in fact some anger and hatred; some of which we have seen exhibited across this world in the last few weeks.

But in this bill is an effort to share our bounty, the wonderful American bounty, not only to share that bounty with the poorest of the poor, but then as a Nation to become a model and a leader among all the other free nations of the world to pitch in and do their share to share with the poorest of the poor. The Congress of the United States deserves great credit for the aid and the forgiveness of debt to the poorest countries in the world.

The President of the United States has shown great leadership in a meet-

ing that was just held several weeks ago, and his staff deserves to be commended for their effort to carry through on this project. Religious leaders all over this country of all faiths, Jews and Christians, who got together to assert that this is the jubilee year, the year to give a fresh start to the poorest of the poor, have pitched in and have been relentless in their efforts to try to make sure that we share our bounty in a responsible way.

My good friend, my good friend Bono from the rock band U2, who set aside musical scores and concerts and albums and CDs in an effort to try to give something back to humanity. This has gone as high as the Pope, to the President of the United States, to religious leaders across this country to political leaders.

This program in forgiving debt is not to give relief to dictators and thieves and other countries. In fact, the reform language in this bill was written by Senator JESSE HELMS, one of the greatest reformers of the international institutions. I, myself, have chased the World Bank and the IMF to bring about needed reforms.

The debt relief in this bill is designed to make sure that these countries act responsibly; that, in fact, that the money that is forgiven by these countries will be used to deal with the health problems and the economic development problems of the poorest of the poor.

The jubilee year is special. The jubilee year is special because it is recognized in our great Old Testament, and it means that those who have bounty will forgive the debts of those who have little.

This is not just forgiveness. This is a down payment to give these countries a new start, to move towards free markets, to move to clean up the corrupt systems all over this world, but particularly the corrupt systems in Africa.

What the Congress engages in today is what can only be called a historic act of grace, and a historic act of grace is proper in the jubilee year. The United States provides the leadership, but so many of our other allies and friends around the world must join in. This is a time when we have provided that leadership, and we should be encouraged that we are all part of changing this world in which we live.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

Mr. BARRETT of Nebreska. Although remarks in debate may identify Senate sponsorship of particular propositions, debate may not characterize Senators.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations, the long-time chair of the Foreign Operations Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I think there are many good things in this bill, and I especially

want to say that I think that the debt relief provisions in this bill are long overdue. They will not cost the American taxpayers, because this is debt on the part of destitute countries that would never be repaid anyway. This is simply fessing up to the fact.

I would simply like to take one moment to make a comment on one region of the world that is funded heavily in this bill.

I do not believe that any Member of this House has been more supportive of the peace process or more insistent that the legitimate concerns of the Palestinians or the Arab world be brought into account in dealing with our problems in the Middle East, but I cannot begin to describe how dismayed I am at the way Mr. Arafat, and I believe even more so, a number of Arab governments have refused to recognize the opportunity presented to them by the extended hand of Mr. Barak, the leader of the State of Israel.

This was the greatest opportunity for peace that that region has seen in the over 30 years that I have been following events in that region.

I do not excuse the actions of Mr. Sharon in clumsily provoking antagonism in that region, and I recognize the concerns about the level of violence that has been inflicted by both sides in that region. But I believe that the Arab refusal to take Mr. Barak's hand is profoundly and tragically short-sighted, and I would hope that both sides, regardless of injustices perceived to be created by the other, I would hope that both sides recognize that it is not just they, but all of us who are at a precipice, and that is a precipice that we do not want to leap from.

It is going to be virtually impossible to put together a civilized policy in that part of the world, unless both sides recognize that the overall imperative that they both have is to bring peace to the people that they are supposed to represent. With that, I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for doing their usual, fine work.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, (Ms. LEHTINEN-ROS).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Callahan), the chairman, on an important project addressed in both the House and the Senate committee reports, which originally accompanied this bill for the purpose of securing a clear understanding of the conferees' intent. I am speaking about the Cuban transition project.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, I would be most pleased to enter into a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, allow me to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. Callahan) for a fine bill.

The Senate committee report states clearly that it supports the \$3.5 million be provided through USAID for the important initiative to provide policymakers, analysts and others with accurate information and practical policy recommendations that will be needed over a multiyear basis to assist this country in preparing for the next stage of our interaction with the Cuban community and nation.

□ 1300

The gentleman's House committee report similarly supported this project, and it is my understanding that the gentleman does support this project, and indeed, that it receive support from USAID.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, the gentlewoman's understanding is indeed correct. Inasmuch as support for this project was clearly stated in both the House and Senate reports, we did not restate it in this statement of managers. However, the legislative history is clear. It is the committee's intention that the Cuban Transition Project be supported by USAID in fiscal year 2001 as indicated.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for reiterating his support and clarifying the intent of this subcommittee. It is true that this project has the strong support of the chairman of the House Committee on International Relations, and I know that this committee will also be expressing its support to the agency.

I would like to ask if the gentleman would be willing to further advise the agency formally of his position on this matter. I would be most appreciative of his assistance in this regard. Indeed, it would be very invaluable.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would again yield, I assure the gentlewoman that the subcommittee will continue to work with her to ensure that USAID funds on these important programs are spent.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a very distinguished member of our subcommittee.

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this conference report. This conference report is not a perfect product, but I think it is a good compromise and one that we can all live with. Passing this conference report is important to demonstrate America's leadership abroad. The aid provided in this bill can significantly improve the lives of hundreds of millions of people around the world. Too much is at stake in this conference report; and despite some of its shortcomings, I urge Members' support for this conference report.

I want to start my remarks by commending the gentleman from Alabama

(Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, and the other members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and the subcommittee staff for the work that they have done to get us here today. I want to especially thank the chairman and the ranking member for working with me in the subcommittee to improve some sections of this conference report with respect to Africa and those countries that are not as fortunate as the United States.

If the United States is to maintain its position as a global leader, we must act like one and assist those countries most in need. This conference report goes a long way in doing just that. There may be some Members of this body who disagree, but it is in our national interests to create opportunities and spread stability throughout the world by combating infectious diseases, poverty, working for conflict resolution, enhancing democratization, and fostering the conditions for economic growth. This conference report, Mr. Speaker, moves us in that direction.

The budget authority for the Foreign Operations Conference Report was \$14.8 billion. Even though this amount is just shy of the President's request, I think it does tremendous good. Consider this: this conference report fully funds the President's request for \$435 million in international debt relief, it contains \$315 million to combat HIV/AIDS worldwide. In July of this year, this conference report was insufficient regarding the African Development Bank and the African Development Fund. I worked with the subcommittee markup, the full committee markup and floor consideration to ensure that these accounts were increased. I am pleased to say that this conference report includes \$6.1 million for the African Development Bank and \$100 million for the African Development Fund.

This conference report includes \$425 million for international family planning, and under the chairman's leadership, the conference report contains large increases for the child survival and disease account, more than \$248 million over fiscal year 2000. Within this account, \$60 million is included for tuberculosis, \$45 million for malaria, \$50 million for the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunizations.

Many nations on the continent of Africa are making unprecedented progress towards democratic rule and open markets. This is why I had hoped and continue to hope that the development fund for Africa would be included as a separate account. As a separate account, DFA funding would be assured to remain focused on the long-term problems and development priorities of our African partners.

In July, when this bill was first being considered on the House Floor, I said, "In turning our attention to some important regions of the world, we should not turn our back on others." This conference report demonstrates that the

U.S. has not turned its back on the world.

Again, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the ranking member, and their staffs for all of the work that they have done and for listening to and addressing my concerns. Again, I want to reiterate my support for this conference report.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on International Relations, I am convinced that foreign assistance is a good investment for America in two cases, where it strengthens our national security and where it exports our values of freedom, democracy, free enterprise, freedom of speech and religion, all of our exports.

Foreign assistance, when it hits the mark, can make a real difference for America; and I appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the ranking member on this issue when we have hit that mark.

One area of the bill, though, I am terribly disappointed in and it deals with heavily indebted poor countries but probably not an area that we are thinking of. I think in addition to providing them a fresh start, I had hoped that we would also get in return a measure of justice for America and for American families of violent crime. Here is the problem. It used to be in past days that criminals would flee justice by running to the county line or to the State line. Today, criminals run to another country or to another continent. As a result, Americans are victims of violent crime, child abduction, terrorism, money laundering, drug trafficking; and we have very little hope of returning these criminals to face American justice.

That is because many of our treaties with other countries are outdated, but most importantly because 40 percent of the world is a safe haven for these criminals. They have no agreement with America to return them for justice here. Mr. Speaker, 35 of those countries happen to be heavily indebted poor countries; and I was hopeful that in this bill, we would have a provision that said in return for this fresh start, work with us to begin negotiations on extradition treaties. Not that they have to have one in place, because those take time, they have to be negotiated, they have to be thoughtful; but only that they responsibly sit down with America to discuss, to start negotiations so we can close safe havens.

I do not think it is fair that we subsidize any country anywhere that would harbor the terrorists that attacked the U.S.S. *Cole* recently. This issue will not be going away, and I am hopeful that we can work in a bipartisan manner to address this in the future.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gen-

tleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and recognize him for the extraordinary work he did in the international debt relief provision.

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, 40,000 people died of starvation and inadequate medical care. Today, 40,000 people will die. Tomorrow, I believe we will significantly reduce those numbers because of the debt relief provisions within this bill.

About 2 weeks ago, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI); the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS); the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH); and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS); and myself met with President Clinton and a representative of the National Catholic Bishops Conference, the president of Bread for The World, the Reverend Andy Young, and the Reverend Pat Robertson, and the White House; and we said that the most important foreign policy initiative for the new millennium would be the full funding of debt relief for the highly impoverished countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker, everyone should support this, the most important foreign policy initiative for the new millennium.

Nothing that Congress has done this year has the potential to do so much good so quickly as passage of debt relief funding. This week, Congress and the President reached an agreement to provide \$435 million in funding for a multi-country initiative that will relieve the world's poorest countries of their international debt burdens. The agreement will also authorize the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to conduct a revaluation of its gold holdings in order to make even more resources available for debt relief. Our success in this area is in large part due to the consistent and effective efforts of the NGOs and the multi-faith coalition involved in the Jubilee 2000 effort, who have seen this as a highly appropriate way to celebrate Jubilee 2000. I fully concur. This week's victory for debt relief is a fitting victory for them and a tribute to the Jubilee year.

In 1999, the House Banking Committee approved H.R. 1095, which I co-sponsored with Chairman JIM LEACH. This bipartisan effort laid the groundwork for this week's agreement. H.R. 1095 authorized a multi-year initiative that will substantially reduce the debt owed by the poorest countries, provided they agree to use the resources to invest in their own citizens in the form of better education, health services, and serving other critical needs.

Forty-thousand people, half of them children, die each day as a result of starvation or inadequate medical care in poor countries. Debt relief will have a direct impact on this tragic situation. By freeing these countries of the burden of financing their debt, much of it incurred many years ago by corrupt regimes and dictatorships, we will help them make new funds available for anti-poverty programs. Debt burdens effectively hold hostage the public budgets of poor countries, with debt payments often accounting for 20 percent or more

of the budget. With little room in their discretionary budgets to make basic social and economic investments or even to maintain a minimal level of services, these countries are forced to rely on outside sources of support in the form of grants and concessional loans, which are themselves too often in short supply. Only substantial debt relief will help to break this cycle of dependency.

Debt relief granted by the U.S. and other creditors in recent years is already bearing fruit. In Mozambique, the government has committed debt savings to an expansion of basic medicines in government clinics. In Bolivia, spending on health care, education, and other social programs increased by \$119 million last year, a direct result of savings for debt relief. Not only do the poverty reduction strategies address critical short-term needs such as medicine and provision of food, these countries are also using their debt relief savings to make important long-term investments in their people and their economies. Uganda, for example, has used debt relief savings to eliminate the fees charged to grade school students. As a result, enrollment rates have nearly doubled since the introduction of the debt relief initiative, and Uganda is fast approaching universal enrollment in primary education with 94 percent of the primary school age population now in school.

These reforms are working because the debt relief initiative approved by Congress requires accountability, transparency in decision-making, and a responsible use of resources targeted on poverty alleviation. For example, Uganda's Poverty Action Fund has a transparent and accountable structure of management, with reports on financial allocations released quarterly at meetings of donors and NGO's. Working with officials at the World Bank and IMF, and with oversight from our own Treasury Department, all countries approved for debt relief will have comparable systems of accountability.

But let's be clear about the magnitude of the challenge before us, which goes far beyond sound fiscal management. Nearly half of the world's population lives on less than \$2 a day. And of the 2 billion people that will be added to the world's population over the next 25 years, 97 percent will be in developing countries where poverty is most prevalent. We are facing a poverty time bomb. Our \$435 million commitment is an important step toward improving this situation, but it will not single-handedly turn it around. I hope that this year's funding demonstrates a resolve to remain fully engaged in efforts to address the crises of poverty around the world.

Unfortunately, the tremendous political struggle associated with securing the \$435 million this year, as well as a steadily declining development assistance budget, should give us pause in this respect. From Washington's perspective, these are too often seen as the problems of remote countries lacking strategic geopolitical significance for the United States. The U.S. spends less in real terms on development aid today than we did during the 1980's, and we spend less as a share of our economy than any of the other 20 OECD countries.

My greatest hope for the debt relief initiative does not rest in the dollars we've made available this year. It is in the bipartisan, multi-faith coalition that has formed around the issue and

around the broader goal of sustained development in the world's poor countries. This coalition has given voice to a problem that has no political consistency within the United States. We must work hard on both sides of the aisle in the coming months and years to strengthen the coalition and strengthen the U.S. resolve to make a lasting commitment to alleviating global poverty.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the very distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee that oversees international debt relief, and a real leader and fighter who was successful on this floor in increasing the funding for debt relief.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the conference report for H.R. 4811, the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. This conference report has broad bipartisan support and is a substantial improvement over the bill that passed the House on July 13, 2000.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) who has been the real driving force behind this legislation to craft a bill that we could all support. But I would also like to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the CBC and particularly the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her work, particularly as it relates to AIDS.

There are many substantial items in this bill, but I would like to make special mention of debt relief and AIDS. I am especially pleased that the conference report provides a total of \$435 million to forgive the debts of the world's poorest countries. This appropriation fully funds the President's request and when leveraged with contributions from other creditor countries, will forgive \$27 billion in debt owed by these impoverished countries. The conference report also includes language to permit the International Monetary Fund to use the earnings from the reevaluation of its gold reserves to fund its share of the international debt relief program.

Throughout this Congress, I have been working on this issue, and I have been inspired by the breadth and depth of the commitment to the forgiveness of poor country debts. I have worked with debt relief supporters from both sides of the aisle, as well as officials representing the administration and the Treasury Department, to ensure that the debt relief program will benefit the world's poorest people. I have also met with church leaders, development advocates, civil society leaders from poor countries, and many other members of the worldwide Jubilee 2000 movement which has been working to make debt relief a reality. The success of our efforts proves that we can overcome our differences.

Again, the money that is afforded for AIDS in this bill will help to deal with the problem of the epidemic that could not be dealt with because of the burden of the debt.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), a leader in the fight for protecting reproductive rights throughout the world.

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her great leadership on this bill.

We are 25 days late and \$11 billion over the President's request. The bill does many good things, funding for Israel and other countries in the Middle East. It has funding for debt relief, relief for the AIDS epidemic. But I object to the fact that the bill also raises the cap on the total amount of discretionary spending on this and other fiscal year 2001 appropriations bills by \$37 billion.

The conference report is the first step toward restoring the U.S.'s commitment to saving women's lives through international family planning without the onerous gag rule. The anti-democratic gag rule would have silenced women around the world by barring them from using their own funds to lobby for or against abortions or perform abortions. This is a short-term solution as it removes the gag rule until February 15, 2001, when the next President would have the ability to support or gag women's voices around the world. This is another reason why the choice for President on November 7 is so important.

Last year, President Clinton pledged to women Members of Congress that he would not sign any legislation that included the gag rule again. We thank him for standing firm and removing the gag rule that would be unconstitutional in our own country and it is unconscionable to force it on some of the world's poorest women.

□ 1315

This conference report is the first time in 5 years that this body has increased funding for international family planning. Just 5 years ago, we spent \$200 million more a year to save women's lives.

With the increase in this bill today, raising USAID funding to \$425 million from \$385 million last year, we are taking the first step to restoring our commitment to the life-saving resources international family planning provides to some of the world's poorest women.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who, as I said before, coming back from Durban, South Africa, was successful on the floor increasing funds for HIV/AIDS, and with this bill taking a very

major first step for the World Bank Trust Fund.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Foreign Operations conference report. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), ranking member, for their tireless and dedicated work really on behalf of our human family.

The funding in this bill signifies our Nation's commitment to peace and stability and to progress around the world. I am also pleased that the conference report includes funding for the flood victims of Mozambique and Madagascar and appeals the global gag rule so important to women in developing countries. It also includes debt relief funding, which is long overdue.

I want to express a special thanks to Jubilee 2000, our faith-based organization, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH) for their successful efforts.

Debt relief is so important to poverty alleviation and to fighting the HIV/AIDS pandemic. As we all know this pandemic is wreaking havoc in Africa like no other disease in the history of humankind. But Africa is only the epicenter of this pandemic. It is a ticking time bomb in India, Asia and the Caribbean. So that is why the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH) and myself offered the World Bank AIDS Trust Fund.

I want to just thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), and all of those Members on the conference committee for reporting out \$20 million for the trust fund, an excellent first start.

But we must do more. We must continue to fight until we make sure that we eradicate AIDS from the face of the globe. Six thousand people are dying in Africa every day now of AIDS. There are 12 million children who are orphans in Africa.

We must enlist our international partners in the private sector in a global international effort led by the United States, and we also must enhance the United States contribution to our joint U.N. program on AIDS.

In closing, I would just like to once again thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), ranking member, for her support, her commitment and her hard work. I want to encourage her to keep up the good fight.

I want to also once again thank the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH), the members of the Congressional Black Caucus, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), ranking member, and former Congressman Ron Dellums for all of their hard work and their leadership.

I remind this Congress that fighting international AIDS is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It is a moral issue that demands a moral response.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and in recognizing him, acknowledge the work that he did along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) in helping to shape the flexible compromise that we have in here, enabling us to go forward with assistance to Serbia while respecting the work of the War Crimes Tribunal.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I really want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the work she has done on this bill. This is a conference report very much worth supporting. I congratulate her and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the subcommittee.

I have had the honor of representing this body on the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe with some of our other colleagues, the Helsinki Commission. I just really want to compliment the language we have in aid to Serbia, because I believe it is consistent with the position that we have taken on the Helsinki Commission.

We welcome Serbia's change of leadership of Mr. Milosevic being removed from power. It is appropriate that we now participate with Serbia on foreign assistance. I support the provisions in the bill that does that.

I also think it is important that we make it clear, and we do, that, for ongoing assistance, Serbia must cooperate with the international Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia, that it must take steps to comply with the Dayton Accords, and it must take steps to implement the rule of law and protection for minority rights.

My colleagues spelled that out in their conference report, and I applaud them for it. It is a good compromise. I support it. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), a very valued member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, who from day one has been very involved in helping us shape this debt relief package.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, first let me commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), ranking member of the subcommittee, on the compromise.

I support this bill. In particular, on the debt relief, I would like to make two points. One is, even though the United States is the smallest creditor among the industrialized nations in this, the debt relief package would not go forward without the participation

and the leadership of the United States. So it is critical that we take a role in this.

I would say to the critics of the IMF, the World Bank, the last thing one wants is for the U.S. not to be involved in this because they will then take a leadership role. I think it is very important Members understand that.

Second of all, I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his language providing for the moratorium, the 2-year moratorium, on new debt to HPIC countries. This is something I proposed in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services when we were working on the authorization.

I think it makes a great deal of sense, even countries going to the soft loan window, that when we relieve their debt, that we do not get them back into the red again. We ought to let them build out of it. I commend my colleagues for that. I think it makes a great deal of sense.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), who has been a very important part of our challenge to shape language on family planning. He has been doing that ongoing. He is a very valued member of this effort.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the fiscal year 2001 Foreign Operations appropriations bill.

I sincerely thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), ranking member, for their tireless efforts on behalf of this bill.

From the explosion of violence in the Middle East to the historic democratic transition in Yugoslavia, the funding included in this package will have a tremendous impact throughout our world.

The scope of this bill is not limited to bilateral aid and debt relief. It takes into account important health issues as well.

It gives me great pleasure to vote for a Foreign Operations bill that does not contain the global gag rule.

The \$425 million for international family planning will allow agencies around the world to do their job, to protect the lives of women and children.

I want to thank the President for his dedication to eliminating this harmful provision in this Foreign Operations bill.

This bill provides \$435 million in debt relief to regional banks in Africa and Latin America.

I would like to mention two projects of particular importance to me, and the strengthening of the peace process in Northern Ireland.

I would be remiss if I did not thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) in seeing that this money is provided in this bill.

The bill provides for \$25 million for the International Fund for Ireland and \$250,000 for Project Children. Both projects promote tolerance, understanding and cooperation in the north of Ireland.

The International Fund for Ireland is a wonderful program which bridges sectarian and political divides by bringing people in both the North and the Republic of Ireland together to build stronger communities. With contributions from the United States, the European Union, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, IFI has established the objectives of promoting economic and social advancement, and encourages contact, dialogue, and reconciliation between Unionists and Nationalists throughout Ireland.

Project Children was created in 1995 to bring outstanding students from Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland to the United States for the summer.

This provides students with the opportunity to develop leadership skills, gain valuable work experience at the highest levels in the U.S. political system, and offers a new perspective on the politics and culture of Northern Ireland, Ireland and the United States. Most importantly, this program allows the future leaders of Ireland to work in an environment of mutual respect, to demonstrate the progress that can be made by implementing a strategy, of tolerance and cooperation.

Tolerance and Cooperation. These are two things that seem to be quite elusive these days.

The latest eruption of violence in the Middle East has been cause for concern by many nations around the world.

The United States has been a firm and active supporter of the Middle East peace process for many years. We have sought to negotiate a peace that would be acceptable to all parties involved. Unfortunately, negotiating a lasting peace is impossible when all parties are not acting in good faith. Mr. Arafat has chosen the path of violence over the path of peace. The United States cannot condone such a decision. The provisions and funding included in this bill appropriately reflect the position of the United States on this matter. I encourage Mr. Barak and Mr. Arafat to return to the bargaining table as soon as possible. Nothing is gained when life is lost.

Clearly, this bill covers a wide spectrum of issues that are crucial to U.S. interests throughout the world. With that in mind, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTSCH), a great advocate for peace in the Middle East.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I wish that this bill literally had tens of billions of dollars of more aid for peace in the Middle East, because I think all of us know that, had there been a closure at the Camp David meeting, that we would have been asked to do that. I for one would have been ready to step up to the plate and vote and support that type of concept.

But I stand in front of my colleagues today as someone who has been supporting legislation to actually cut back and eliminate all aid, both direct and

indirect aid, to the Palestinian Authority. The reason that I have done that is, unfortunately, what we have seen over the last several weeks is either one of two situations.

Either, one, Chairman Arafat has purposely, consciously chosen not to stop the violence, or the second is that he cannot stop the violence. Either one of those outcomes, either one of those explanations is reason enough to stop literally hundreds of millions of American taxpayer dollars funneling to the Palestinian Authority.

I urge my colleagues, even in the short time that we have left, to support this legislation and add it as one of our final acts before the end of this Congress.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), another champion for peace in the Middle East.

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal to commend this bill, and I commend the authors and sponsors of it: \$435 million for debt relief, funds for peace in Northern Ireland, \$2.9 billion for Israel, but not a penny for the Palestinian Authority.

I, like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), believe that this is an opportunity to use this bill as an opportunity to pass along a message.

For virtually the entire existence of Israel, Chairman Arafat has had at his desk two buttons, one button that read "peace" and one button that read "war." At every major crossroads in our history, we have seen Mr. Arafat press the war button.

When it was time to consider the partition plan at the very beginning of the creation of the State of Israel, a plan that, frankly, hurt Israel, did not allow her to control Jerusalem, it was the Palestinians that said no. Ever since then, Yasser Arafat and the Palestinians have chosen war over peace. Today he is waging war.

Let us not be romantic about what goes on there. Let us not allow the image of people throwing stones change the fact that Israel is surrounded by nations that are at war with her.

We have to make the message clear from this House that enough is enough. Until Arafat is prepared to press the button that stands for peace, we will stand four square with our ally, Israel, in the Middle East.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 30 seconds remaining. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) be agreeable to yielding 1 minute of his time?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in responding to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), this is my swan song. In order to yield her time, I am going to have to leave out an entire verse.

Ms. PELOSI. Is that the part about me, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of cooperation such as has existed for the last year, I yield 1½ minutes of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Alabama be more agreeable to a unanimous consent to add 2 minutes on each side?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would rather not do that, but I yield 1½ minutes of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am most grateful for the time. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is, as always, a gentleman.

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

Mr. Speaker, this debate today I think points to the quality of the bill that the committee has brought before the full House. I think it is clear from the participation of so many Members that they have been participating every step of the way.

We are blessed in this House by a very active Congressional Black Caucus, Hispanic Caucus, Congressional Women's Caucus, all of whom have taken a very particular interest in this bill and different provisions in it. Their involvement has helped us produce a better bill.

The involvement of the outside community, particularly the Jubilee 2000 initiative of the ecumenical movement for debt forgiveness in this jubilee year has helped us produce good policy that will help people throughout the world, helped us produce a better bill.

We have commended each other variously and severally and individually as to our participation in various parts of the bill. I want to also recognize the Clinton administration. We are very proud of the debt relief provisions in this bill. The President has been a leader on this issue, has made it a very high priority as has Secretary Summers, Gene Sperling, his advisor, and others in the administration. They have helped us get where we are today on that score.

I also want to again commend the President for his commitment to reproductive freedom by staying with us with the promise of not signing a bill that would have the restrictive language that was contained in the bill last year.

Very important to all of this, though, Mr. Speaker, are our staff: Charlie Flickner, John Shank, Chris Walker, Gloria Maes, Nancy Tippins on the Republican side; Mark Murray and Jon Stivers on the Democratic side. I want to commend them for all of their hard work in bringing us to where we are today.

Then I would like to once again say good-bye to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD), two valued members of the committee, and commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), our distinguished chairman. It is a pleasure to work with him, Mr. Speaker. We do have our differences.

As I said last night, this is not a bill I would have written. It is a compromise. It has good priorities in it. We still have a long way to go. On HIV/AIDS, a disease that challenges the conscience of this world and certainly of our country with all of our tremendous resources, we have increased the funding; and with the World Bank Trust Fund, we have taken a major first step. But we must recognize that much more needs to be done.

□ 1330

We must all recognize that all of this is in our national interest, in our national interest to help the poorest of the poor in the world, to spread Democratic values, to make the world a more peaceful and safe place, to expand our own economy by promoting our exports. All of this is contained in this bill. This is a better bill because of the active involvement of our colleagues, the outside groups and the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and commend our distinguished chairman once again for his extraordinary service.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I echo the sentiments of my colleague from California with respect to our staff people who have helped us, assisted us, during these last 6 years: Mr. Flickner, Mr. Shank, Mr. Walker, Ms. Maes, along with Nancy Tippins, my legislative director, have been invaluable to me. When I came to foreign operations, I will assure my colleagues that I thought foreign was spelled F-O-R-E-I-G-N operations. They have educated me, they have worked with me, they have schooled me with respect to this great world that we live in. It has been tremendous that we have been able to achieve the successes that we have, which could not have been done without them.

Also Mark Murray on the Democratic side has been extremely cooperative, as has the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). Jim Dyer, Mr. Parkinson, Mr. Mikel in our full committee office, as well as the chairman of our full committee, Mr. Young, have been extremely cooperative during these past 6 years. What a glorious past 6 years it has been and how fast it has gone by. How rapidly we have been able to learn about the world.

Mr. Speaker, we have had the opportunity to visit in bipartisan delegations countries that some of us did not know existed before we became involved in this committee. We have traversed the jungles of South America



and Central America. We have visited countries that used to be the Soviet nation that are now independent states and listened to the leaders of those new nations strive for democracy and plead with us to send them additional technical assistance. Not cash, assistance in establishing a democracy and market economy.

What an interesting trip it has been. And I certainly would never, never regret for a moment that this opportunity to chair this subcommittee was given to me. With respect to the distinguished offer of our chairman of our full committee to consider the possibility of making me the chairman of this committee again next year, before he does that, I think I should advise him that I have had about all the fun I can stand. So I will want to talk to him before that decision is made. Yes, I want to be chairman. Yes, I have enjoyed foreign operations. Yes, I think we have accomplished a great deal. But before this final decision is made, let us sit down and have a cup of coffee and decide what might be best for me for the next 6 years.

With respect to foreign operations, when I first became chairman of this committee, I read a report about the attitude of the American people, a poll that was taken about their attitude toward foreign policy and foreign aid. The American people thought that 20 percent of the money that we appropriate went to foreign aid. In reality, this bill that we pass today represents 2 percent of the total appropriations that we will make this year. So our contribution is not anywhere near what the American people think.

In explaining foreign operations and foreign aid to the people of south Alabama, and indeed the people of the entire country, not one person that I have met during this entire 6 years has given any indication that they do not support direct aid to people who need it, to starving children, to sick people, to uneducated people.

No one objects to that. They object to years past when all of this money was given to the leaders of corrupt nations. No longer, because of the cooperation I have received from the minority and this House and the Senate, do we provide much of this direct aid outside of the Middle East. All of our efforts are concentrated in a manner that will ensure that the monies that we appropriate today go for the intended purposes, and that is to provide for the needy throughout the world, the less fortunate than those here in the United States.

Many comments have been made today about debt forgiveness. Not one individual on the Republican or Democratic side of this body disagrees with the intended purpose of debt forgiveness. There are some of us who question whether or not this entire \$435 million will actually get to its intended purpose because the United States of America has already forgiven its bilateral debt to all these nations,

and a lot of this money will go to these nations and just be channeled through to a bank that has made a bad loan. But no one disagrees with the Jubilee Year intentions of providing for those of us that are not so fortunate. So, yes, the \$435 million is there, and I challenge those supporters of debt forgiveness to make absolutely certain that this money goes for its intended purpose.

It has been a great year. I will admit that we have had some trying times. The chairman of this committee has given me the opportunity to sit with some of my colleagues at the White House and to discuss the possibilities of the occupation that we went into in Kosovo. I sat with some of my colleagues, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA), and worried about our troops going into Bosnia. And even though, for instance, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) and I both disagreed about the involvement of our troops in Bosnia, nevertheless the Commander in Chief said that that was what he was going to do, and so we both came back and supported it.

So it has given me the opportunity to be involved in a process even though I disagreed at times with the President. I have disagreed with the Secretary of State. I have disagreed with the minority side of this House. But it has been a tremendous experience for me to have played a part in these historical events that have taken place during the last 6 years.

So I suppose my swan song on this particular bill, I say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), would be patterned after one of her former residents of California, although ultimately he wised up and moved to the south, to Florida, but Frank Sinatra had that song that he sang, his theme song, "I Did It My Way."

This year, we did it our way. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and I and our committee members and our chairman of our full committee sat down together and negotiated a bill that is not exactly what I would like in its entirety, nor is it exactly what the gentlewoman would like in its entirety, but it is a bill that originated in this House, that was compromised within the body of the legislative branch of government and which did not involve negotiations at some late-night hour with the President of the United States.

This is a bill, Mr. Speaker, that was formulated by this body. It is a bill that deserves the support of this entire body, and I urge a "yes" vote on passage of this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama for bringing this conference report to the floor. While this subcommittee works with one of the smaller allocations, this bill is usually one of the most contentious. The Chairman and his staff have done an outstanding job of trying to address numerous concerns while working

within the constraints of, what I consider, too small a budget for the important programs that this bill supports.

I am pleased that the conference committee continues to recognize the needs of areas of conflict, such as Armenia, and Cyprus, and I hope that a peaceful settlement will soon be reached in both of these regions. I am also pleased that the committee recognizes areas of the world where unfortunately people have to flight for democracy and the rule of law such as Burma and Tibet.

Further, I strongly support the committee's continued suspension of military aid to and engagement with Indonesia until the East Timorese refugees are safely returned home and until there is accountability for the perpetrators of the violence which is occurring throughout Indonesia not only on Timor island, but also in the Moluccas, Aceh and West Papua.

I am pleased that the Migration and Refugee Assistance account is funded above the President's request. This is money which is critically needed in areas throughout the world to aid the most desperate peoples, the refugees who have been forced out of their homes. The increase is especially needed today in light of the increasing danger faced by refugees assistance workers as seen in the recent murders of UNHCR workers in West Timor and Guinea.

Also, I support the final funding level of the Global Environment Facility and the funding provided for biodiversity programs implemented through USAID. As indicated in the House Report and the Statement of Managers, the Congress supports increased funding for important biodiversity programs as protection of natural resources around the world becomes more critical as populations increase and economies expand.

Finally, I am pleased that agreements were reached on the two most contentious issues—debt relief for the world's poorest countries and international family planning. I support full funding for the U.S. contribution to the global initiative to alleviate the debt of the most impoverished countries and I am pleased that the Mexico City language was not included in this year's bill. The small increase in funding for international voluntary family planning program is at least a step in the right direction and will help to improve the health of countless women and children around the world, but a great deal more is needed.

While I support most aspects of this bill, I raise one concern regarding the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative (IAVI). As an early, strong and constant supporter of efforts to combat the global AIDS epidemic, I support the overall goal of this initiative. However, I raise concerns with the process. In the appropriations bill funding the National Institutes of Health (NIH), we do not earmark by disease or provide any funds for specific private research organizations. We believe that this should be determined by the scientists and researchers who know what is ripe for funding. Echoing concerns raised by Dr. Harold Varmus, Nobel Prize recipient for research and former Director of NIH, I believe that explicit support for IAVI sets a dangerous precedent for funding of medical research.

Finally, I remain concerned with the continued under funding in U.S. foreign assistance. As I have said before, the U.S. is now the sole superpower and world leader. Yet, we are not leading. As our role in the world becomes

more important, our budget for foreign operations continues to lag behind our level of responsibility, thereby, limiting the impact we can have on global development.

Again, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Alabama and his staff for their hard work and ultimate success in bringing a free-standing Foreign Operations Conference Report to the floor.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for FY 2001. I'd like to thank Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI for once again including \$13 million in funding for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act expands President Bush's Enterprise for the Americas Initiative and provides a creative market-oriented approach to protect the world's most threatened tropical forests on a sustained basis. It is a cost-effective way to respond to the global crisis in tropical forests—since 1950, half of the world's tropical forests have been lost. The groups that have the most experience preserving tropical forests—including the Nature Conservancy, World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International and others—agree with this approach, and the Administration strongly supports it as well. It is an excellent example of the kind of bipartisan approach we should have on environmental issues.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act gives the President authority to reduce or cancel U.S. AID and/or P.L. 480 debt owed by an eligible country to the United States. In return, the country creates a fund in its local currency to preserve, maintain, and restore its tropical forests.

I am delighted that on September 12, 2000 the United States and Bangladesh signed the first Tropical Forest Conservation Act agreement. This agreement will allow Bangladesh to save \$10 million in debt payments to the U.S. over 18 years. In return, Bangladesh is setting aside \$8.5 million in its local currency to endow a Tropical Forest Conservation Fund.

Bangladesh's tropical forests cover more than three million acres, including an area that is home to 400 endangered Bengal tigers, the world's largest single population. The area also contains one of the largest mangrove forests in the world, and it has wetlands of internationally-recognized importance. Bangladesh is home to more than 5,000 species of plants, compared to 18,000 in the United States, which is 67 times its size. Clearly, the debt-for-forest arrangement with Bangladesh will play an important role in preserving endangered species and protecting biodiversity, as well as help that struggling nation's economy.

On another front, our government is actively involved in debt treatment discussions with the government of Belize, including a possible debt swap option with non-government organizations. This is an excellent example of a public-private partnership to protect tropical forests.

Several other countries have expressed interest in participating in Tropical Forest Conservation agreements including El Salvador, Peru, Thailand, Paraguay, Ecuador, Indonesia, Costa Rica, and the Philippines.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act preserves and protects important tropical forests worldwide in a fiscally responsible fashion,

and I call upon my colleagues to support the conference report which provides the funds necessary to implement this important program.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. Although this legislation contains some important and worthwhile provisions, it unfortunately contains more provisions that I oppose.

I applaud the appropriators and the administration for including Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) debt relief funding. For decades many poor countries have been forced to spend large portions of their income to pay down debts incurred in an attempt to restructure their economies. In some cases this money was lost to fraud and abuse by leaders in these countries. For other countries this money failed to reform the economy. In other cases the money successfully transformed the economy, but they have been unable to provide health services and education because of the burdens of this debt. This initiative of debt relief is a good first step in helping the poorest in our world begin to receive the education and public health services they need by reducing their country's debt burden.

This bill also includes no restrictions on international family planning activities for non-profit organizations. I'm not sure why my anti-abortion colleagues have allowed this bill to proceed, but I'm thankful that this body has begun to realize that we cannot force our own personal morality on other people. I hope that in the future this body will continue on this path and support a woman's right to choose.

The funding for international HIV/AIDS programs and tuberculosis control programs will also provide much needed relief to those countries who are experiencing unprecedented outbreaks in these diseases. Most of this suffering is occurring in Africa, where these diseases threaten not only to kill millions of people, but also threaten the very stability of these countries. By providing this funding we will help alleviate the suffering of families around the world.

Unfortunately, I have several objections to this bill. Primarily, the continued American taxpayer subsidy of foreign militaries and U.S. defense contractors. This bill contains over \$3 billion in aid to a handful of countries to purchase missiles, tanks, guns, attack helicopters, and fighter planes. In a time of increased tension and conflict this body should be working to reduce the number of guns in this world rather than wasting taxpayer money increasing the killing potential of foreign militaries.

Through this appropriation bill we also fail to protect human rights by continuing to provide anti-narcotics funding to countries with well-documented violations of human rights. It also does not include requirements that the School of Americas include human rights training in its course work. These failures will encourage human rights violators to continue their actions.

Finally this bill includes an increase in the spending caps for this year's budget. While Members on the other side of the aisle, claim to be fiscally conservative, their actions continue to spend billions of dollars that fail to protect future programs. If we approve this increase my Republican colleagues will push to spend more money on irresponsible tax cuts to benefit the wealthy and push through their

BBRA give-back bill which will provide billions of dollars to HMO's which continue to drop seniors from their Medicare programs. This spending will not benefit the majority of Americans while at the same time kowtowing to the wealthy and special interests.

It is with these considerations that I vote against this appropriations bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and the nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the conference report on H.R. 4811 will be followed by 5-minute votes on each of the following motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays were ordered yesterday: H.R. 782, H.R. 5375, H. Con. Res. 426, and S. 2547.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 307, nays 101, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 546]

YEAS—307

Abercrombie	Coyne	Hall (OH)
Ackerman	Cramer	Hastings (WA)
Allen	Crane	Hill (IN)
Andrews	Crowley	Hill (MT)
Armey	Cummings	Hilliard
Baca	Davis (FL)	Hinchey
Bachus	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Baird	Davis (VA)	Hobson
Baker	DeGette	Hoefel
Baldacci	DeLauro	Holden
Baldwin	Deutsch	Holt
Ballenger	Diaz-Balart	Hooley
Barcia	Dickey	Horn
Barrett (WI)	Dicks	Houghton
Bartlett	Dingell	Hoyer
Bass	Dixon	Hulshof
Becerra	Doggett	Hyde
Bentsen	Dooley	Inslee
Bereuter	Doyle	Isakson
Berkley	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Berman	Dunn	Jackson-Lee
Biggart	Ehlers	(TX)
Bilbray	Ehrlich	Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis	English	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Blagojevich	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Bliley	Evans	Kaptur
Blumenauer	Ewing	Kasich
Boehler	Farr	Kelly
Boehner	Fattah	Kennedy
Bonilla	Filner	Kildee
Bonior	Fletcher	Kilpatrick
Bono	Foley	King (NY)
Borski	Forbes	Kingston
Boswell	Ford	Klecza
Boucher	Fossella	Knollenberg
Brady (PA)	Fowler	Kolbe
Brown (FL)	Frank (MA)	Kuykendall
Bryant	Frelinghuysen	LaFalce
Burr	Frost	LaHood
Burton	Gallegly	Lampson
Buyer	Ganske	Lantos
Callahan	Gejdenson	Larson
Calvert	Gekas	Latham
Camp	Gibbons	LaTourette
Capps	Gilchrest	Leach
Capuano	Gillmor	Lee
Cardin	Gilman	Levin
Carson	Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Goodling	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Gordon	Linder
Clayton	Granger	Lipinski
Clement	Green (TX)	LoBiondo
Clyburn	Green (WI)	Lofgren
Coble	Greenwood	Lowe
Cooksey	Gutierrez	Lucas (KY)
Costello	Gutknecht	Maloney (CT)

Maloney (NY) Pease  
 Markey Pelosi  
 Martinez Petri  
 Mascara Pickett  
 Matsui Pomeroy  
 McCarthy (MO) Porter  
 McCarthy (NY) Portman  
 McCrery Price (NC)  
 McHugh Pryce (OH)  
 McIntyre Quinn  
 McKeon Radanovich  
 McKinney Ramstad  
 McNulty Rangel  
 Meehan Regula  
 Meek (FL) Reyes  
 Menendez Reynolds  
 Metcalf Rodriguez  
 Millender Rogan  
 McDonald Rogers  
 Miller, George Ros-Lehtinen  
 Minge Rothman  
 Mink Roukema  
 Moakley Roybal-Allard  
 Mollohan Royce  
 Moore Rush  
 Moran (VA) Ryan (WI)  
 Morella Sabo  
 Murtha Sanchez  
 Nadler Sanders  
 Napolitano Sawyer  
 Neal Saxton  
 Nethercutt Schakowsky  
 Ney Scott  
 Northup Serrano  
 Nussle Sessions  
 Obey Shaw  
 Olver Shays  
 Ortiz Sherman  
 Ose Sherwood  
 Owens Shimkus  
 Oxley Shuster  
 Packard Simpson  
 Pallone Sisisky  
 Pascrell Skeen  
 Pastor Skelton  
 Payne Slaughter

## NAYS—101

Aderholt Hall (TX)  
 Archer Hansen  
 Barr Hayes  
 Barrett (NE) Hayworth  
 Barton Hefley  
 Berry Herger  
 Blunt Hilleary  
 Boyd Hoekstra  
 Brady (TX) Hostettler  
 Canady Hunter  
 Cannon Hutchinson  
 Chabot Istook  
 Chambliss Jefferson  
 Coburn Jenkins  
 Collins Johnson, Sam  
 Combest Jones (NC)  
 Condit Kind (WI)  
 Cook Kucinich  
 Cox Lewis (KY)  
 Cubin Lucas (OK)  
 Cunningham Luther  
 Deal Manzullo  
 DeFazio McDermott  
 DeLay McInnis  
 DeMint Miller (FL)  
 Doolittle Miller, Gary  
 Duncan Moran (KS)  
 Edwards Myrick  
 Emerson Norwood  
 Everett Oberstar  
 Goode Paul  
 Goodlatte Peterson (MN)  
 Goss Phelps  
 Graham Pickering

## NOT VOTING—24

Brown (OH) Gephardt  
 Campbell Hastings (FL)  
 Chenoweth-Hage John  
 Conyers Klink  
 Danner Largent  
 Delahunt Lazio  
 Engel McCollum  
 Franks (NJ) McGovern

## □ 1358

Messrs. HERGER, MCINNIS, CAN-  
 ADY, GOODLATTE and WHITFIELD  
 changed their vote from “yea” to  
 “nay.”

So the conference report was agreed  
 to.

The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on  
 the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I mistakenly  
 voted in favor of the Conference Report to  
 H.R. 4811, making appropriations for foreign  
 operations, export financing, and related pro-  
 grams for the fiscal year ending September  
 30, 2001, and for other purposes. My vote  
 should have been recorded as a vote in oppo-  
 sition to the passage of the Conference Re-  
 port.

## □ 1400

OLDER AMERICANS ACT  
 AMENDMENTS OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr.  
 BARRETT of Nebraska). The unfinished  
 business is the question of suspending  
 the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 782,  
 as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The  
 question is on the motion offered by  
 the gentleman from California (Mr.  
 MCKEON) that the House suspend the  
 rules and pass the bill, H.R. 782, as  
 amended, on which the yeas and nays  
 are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—yeas 405, nays 2,  
 not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 547]

## YEAS—405

Abercrombie Brown (FL)  
 Ackerman Bryant  
 Aderholt Diaz-Balart  
 Allen Burr  
 Andrews Burton  
 Archer Buyer  
 Arney Callahan  
 Baca Calvert  
 Bachus Camp  
 Baird Canady  
 Baker Cannon  
 Baldacci Capps  
 Baldwin Capuano  
 Ballenger Cardin  
 Barcia Carson  
 Barr Castle  
 Barrett (NE) Chabot  
 Barrett (WI) Chambliss  
 Bartlett Clay  
 Barton Clayton  
 Bass Clement  
 Becerra Clyburn  
 Bentsen Coble  
 Bereuter Coburn  
 Berkley Collins  
 Berman Combest  
 Berry Condit  
 Biggert Conyers  
 Bilbray Cook  
 Bilirakis Cooksey  
 Bishop Costello  
 Blagojevich Cox  
 Biley Coyne  
 Blumenauer Cramer  
 Blunt Crane  
 Boehlert Crowley  
 Boehner Cubin  
 Bonilla Cummings  
 Bonior Cunningham  
 Bono Davis (FL)  
 Borski Davis (IL)  
 Boswell Davis (VA)  
 Boucher Deal  
 Boyd DeFazio  
 Brady (PA) DeGette  
 Brady (TX) DeLauro  
 DeLay

DeMint  
 Deutsch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dickey  
 Dicks  
 Dingell  
 Dixon  
 Doggett  
 Dooley  
 Doolittle  
 Doyle  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Dunn  
 Edwards  
 Ehlers  
 Ehrlich  
 Emerson  
 English  
 Eshoo  
 Etheridge  
 Evans  
 Everett  
 Ewing  
 Farr  
 Fattah  
 Filner  
 Fletcher  
 Foley  
 Forbes  
 Ford  
 Fossella  
 Fowler  
 Frank (MA)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Frost  
 Gallegly  
 Ganske  
 Gejdenson  
 Gekas  
 Gibbons  
 Gilchrest  
 Gillmor  
 Gilman  
 Gonzalez  
 Goode

Goodlatte  
 Goodling  
 Gordon  
 Goss  
 Graham  
 Granger  
 Green (TX)  
 Green (WI)  
 Greenwood  
 Gutierrez  
 Gutknecht  
 Hall (OH)  
 Hall (TX)  
 Hansen  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Hayes  
 Hayworth  
 Hefley  
 Herger  
 Hill (IN)  
 Hill (MT)  
 Hilleary  
 Hilliard  
 Hinojosa  
 Hobson  
 Hoefel  
 Hoekstra  
 Holden  
 Holt  
 Hooley  
 Hostettler  
 Houghton  
 Hoyer  
 Hulshof  
 Hunter  
 Hutchinson  
 Hyde  
 Inslee  
 Isakson  
 Istook  
 Jackson (IL)  
 Jackson-Lee  
 (TX)  
 Jefferson  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (CT)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones (NC)  
 Jones (OH)  
 Kanjorski  
 Kaptur  
 Kasich  
 Kelly  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick  
 Kind (WI)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kleczka  
 Knollenberg  
 Kolbe  
 Kucinich  
 Kuykendall  
 LaFalce  
 LaHood  
 Lampson  
 Lantos  
 Larson  
 Latham  
 LaTourette  
 Leach  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (KY)  
 Linder  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Lofgren  
 Lowey  
 Lucas (KY)  
 Lucas (OK)  
 Luther  
 Maloney (CT)  
 Maloney (NY)  
 Manzullo

Markey  
 Martinez  
 Mascara  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (MO)  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCrery  
 McDermott  
 McHugh  
 McInnis  
 McIntyre  
 McKeon  
 McKinney  
 McNulty  
 Meehan  
 Meek (FL)  
 Menendez  
 Metcalf  
 Millender-  
 McDonald  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Miller, George  
 Minge  
 Mink  
 Moakley  
 Mollohan  
 Moore  
 Moran (KS)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Morella  
 Murtha  
 Myrick  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nethercutt  
 Ney  
 Northup  
 Norwood  
 Nussle  
 Oberstar  
 Obey  
 Olver  
 Ortiz  
 Ose  
 Owens  
 Oxley  
 Packard  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Pastor  
 Payne  
 Pease  
 Pelosi  
 Peterson (MN)  
 Petri  
 Phelps  
 Pickering  
 Pickett  
 Pitts  
 Pombo  
 Pomeroy  
 Porter  
 Portman  
 Price (NC)  
 Pryce (OH)  
 Quinn  
 Radanovich  
 Rahall  
 Ramstad  
 Rangel  
 Regula  
 Reyes  
 Reynolds  
 Riley  
 Rivers  
 Rodriguez  
 Roemer  
 Rogan  
 Rogers  
 Rohrabacher  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Rothman  
 Roukema  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Royce  
 Rush  
 Ryan (WI)  
 Ryun (KS)

## NAYS—2

Sanford

## NOT VOTING—25

Brown (OH) Delahunt  
 Campbell Engel  
 Chenoweth-Hage Franks (NJ)  
 Danner Gephardt

Sabo  
 Salmon  
 Sanchez  
 Sanders  
 Sandlin  
 Sawyer  
 Saxton  
 Scarborough  
 Schaffer  
 Schakowsky  
 Scott  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shaw  
 Shays  
 Sherman  
 Sherwood  
 Shimkus  
 Shows  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sisisky  
 Skeen  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (MI)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (VA)  
 Snyder  
 Souder  
 Spence  
 Spratt  
 Stabenow  
 Stark  
 Stearns  
 Stenholm  
 Strickland  
 Stump  
 Sununu  
 Sweeney  
 Tancredo  
 Tanner  
 Tauscher  
 Tauzin  
 Taylor (MS)  
 Taylor (NC)  
 Terry  
 Thomas  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thornberry  
 Thune  
 Thurman  
 Tiahrt  
 Tierney  
 Toomey  
 Towns  
 Traficant  
 Turner  
 Udall (CO)  
 Udall (NM)  
 Upton  
 Velazquez  
 Visclosky  
 Vitter  
 Walden  
 Walsh  
 Wamp  
 Waters  
 Watkins  
 Watt (NC)  
 Watts (OK)  
 Weiner  
 Weldon (FL)  
 Weldon (PA)  
 Weller  
 Wexler  
 Weygand  
 Whitfield  
 Wicker  
 Wilson  
 Wolf  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Wynn  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (FL)