

of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the South Platte River and Tributaries, Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska, published as House Document 669, 80th Congress, and other pertinent reports, in coordination with the City and County of Denver, and other interested Federal, State and local agencies, to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at this time, with particular reference to the desirability of developing a comprehensive watershed plan for the utilization and conservation of water and related land resources along the Denver County reach of the South Platte River, Denver, Colorado, in the interest of flood control, regional water supply and waste management, water quality improvements, recreation, fish and wildlife restoration and preservation, wise use of floodplain lands, and other associated environmental enhancements and protections.

DOCKET 2639: ARAPAHOE COUNTY, COLORADO

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives*, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the South Platte River and Tributaries, Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska, published as House Document 669, 80th Congress, and other pertinent reports, in coordination with the County of Arapahoe, and other interested Federal, State and local agencies, to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at this time, with particular reference to the desirability of developing a comprehensive watershed plan for the utilization and conservation of water and related land resources of the South Platte River Basin within the County of Arapahoe, Colorado, in the interest of flood control, regional water supply and waste management, water quality improvements, recreation, fish and wildlife restoration and preservation, wise use of floodplain lands, and other associated environmental enhancements and protections.

DOCKET 2640: ADAMS COUNTY, COLORADO

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives*, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the South Platte River and Tributaries, Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska, published as House Document 669, 80th Congress, and other pertinent reports, in coordination with the County of Adams, and other interested Federal, State and local agencies, to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at this time, with particular reference to the desirability of developing a comprehensive watershed plan for the utilization and conservation of water and related land resources of the South Platte River Basin within the County of Adams, Colorado, in the interest of flood control, regional water supply and waste management, water quality improvements, recreation, fish and wildlife restoration and preservation, wise use of floodplain lands, and other associated environmental enhancements and protections.

DOCKET 2641: VILLAGE OF FREEPORT, NEW YORK

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives*, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on Jones Inlet, New York, published as House Document 409, 77th Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports to determine whether any modifica-

tions of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time, in the interest of water resources development, including navigation, flood control, environmental restoration and protection, and other allied purposes for Freeport Creek, New York.

DOCKET 2642: ST. LOUIS RIVERFRONT, MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives*, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Mississippi River, between Coon Rapids Dam and the mouth of the Ohio River, published as House Document 669, 76th Congress, 3rd Session, and other pertinent reports to determine if improvements along the Mississippi River and its tributaries in St. Louis City, St. Louis County, and Jefferson County, Missouri, and Madison County, St. Clair County, and Monroe County, Illinois, are advisable at the present time, in the interest of public access, navigation, harbor safety, off-channel fleet-ing, intermodal facilities, water quality, environmental restoration and protection, and related purposes.

DOCKET 2643: EASTCHESTER BAY, NEW YORK

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives*, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Eastchester Creek (Hutchinson River), New York, published as House Document 749, 80th Congress, 2nd Session, and other pertinent reports to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of storm damage reduction, flood control, environmental restoration and protection, and other related purposes at Eastchester Bay for Edgewater Park and surrounding communities.

DOCKET 2644: PECKMAN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NEW JERSEY

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives*, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Passaic River Mainstem project, New Jersey and New York, published as House Document 163, 101st Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time, in the interest of water resources development, including flood control, environmental restoration and protection, stream bank restoration, and other applied purposes for the Peckman River and tributaries, New Jersey.

DOCKET 2645: WHITE RIVER, WASHINGTON

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives*, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Upper Puyallup River, Washington, dated 1936, as referenced in the Flood Control Act of 1936 (P.L. 74-738), the Puget Sound and adjacent Waters Study, authorized by Section 209 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1962 (P.L. 87-874) and other pertinent reports to determine whether modifications to the recommendations contained therein are advisable, with references toward providing improvements in the interest of water resource and watershed issues affecting Lake Tapps and the White River Watershed downstream of Mud Mountain Dam, Washington.

DOCKET 2646: ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLORIDA

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives*, That in accordance with Section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is requested to survey the shores of St. Johns County, Florida, with particular reference to the advisability of providing beach erosion control works in the area north of St. Augustine Inlet, the shoreline in the vicinity of Matanzas Inlet, and adjacent shorelines, as may be necessary in the interest of hurricane protection, storm damage reduction, beach erosion control, and other related purposes.

DOCKET 2647: MEDICINE LODGE AND SALT FORK RIVER BASINS, KANSAS

*Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives*, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Medicine Lodge and Salt Fork River Basins, published as House Document 758, 79th Congress, 2nd Session, and other pertinent reports to determine the feasibility of measures for improvements in the interest of flood control, water supply, recreation and allied purposes in vicinity of Kiowa, Kansas.

There was no objection.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF 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 546 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 546

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. When the reading for amendment reaches section 587, that section shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with "Provided" on page 11, line 23, through page 12, line 8; page 80, lines 18 through 24; page 121, line 1, through page 122, line 12. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. Before consideration of any other amendment to section 587, it shall be in order to consider, and to dispose of, an amendment to strike that section. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole

may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1545

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 546 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2001.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule also waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failing to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations bill or prohibiting reappropriations in a general appropriations bill, except as specified by the rule.

The rule leaves exposed to points of order, two legislative provisions and one earmark restriction, areas under the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule also waives points of order against amendments to the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI, prohibiting nonemergency designated amendments to be offered to an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation.

The rule also grants the chairman of the Committee of the Whole the authority to postpone votes and reduce voting time to 5 minutes provided that the first vote in a series is not less than 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the rule provides that Members who have

preprinted their amendments in the RECORD prior to their consideration will be given priority in recognition to offer their amendments, if otherwise consistent with House rules.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides a fair approach for the consideration of the foreign aid appropriations bill.

One controversial area, which always lends itself to important debate on the floor involves family planning funds and their potential use for performing or promoting abortion, and the so-called Mexico City policy which prohibits U.S. assistance to foreign organizations that perform abortions, or engage in lobbying activities to change such laws.

While I am personally strongly pro-life, under the regular rules of the House, a Member will have the opportunity to strike the section in the bill related to the Mexico City policy and the full House will have an opportunity to debate and vote on this issue.

Although several Members requested waivers for legislative amendments, the Committee on Rules chose to report a standard, open rule without granting waivers to any amendments. So no particular area is given special consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and also the underlying legislation. A lot of work has gone into it.

I am pleased to see that this is the 11th appropriations bill to come before the House, and that this bill is within the committee's budget allocation.

I think the pace of the work for the House this Congress has been truly remarkable. I think that the Speaker needs to be commended and congratulated especially for this, as well as all of those who have worked so hard in bringing forth the appropriations bills.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for their hard work on this important bill. I urge adoption of both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule, which will allow for consideration of H.R. 4811, which is a bill that makes appropriations for foreign operations, as my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has explained. This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule will permit all Members on both sides of the aisle to offer amendments that are germane and that conform to the rules for appropriations bills.

Within the severe funding restraints placed on the Committee on Appropriations, the subcommittee made a number of positive choices for which I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

The bill increases the child survival and disease programs fund to a level about \$119 million more than last year's funding. This bill includes \$110 million for UNICEF, the same as last year's level.

These programs continue to demonstrate a commitment to the most vulnerable of the world's population, the children. Their health and well-being represents the hope for the future of the world.

The committee report directs the agency for international development to consider initiating a school feeding program in Sierra Leone to boost nutrition and school attendance in this war-ravaged country. I recently returned with my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), from visiting Sierra Leone and we can assure my colleagues that this program is much needed.

The bill also contains funding for the global alliance for vaccines and immunizations. The lack of immunizations results in the death of about 8,000 children every day, and the funding in this bill will help close the gap between children who are immunized and those who are not.

Though there are some highlights in the bill, I am deeply troubled by the overall low funding levels. The bill cuts the President's requests by 12 percent. In fact, the overall funding is even lower than last year.

Mr. Speaker, cutting off foreign assistance in a time of enormous budget surpluses is irresponsible. It is unconscionable. Never before has the United States had so much wealth available to help the poorest of the world's poor. It is irresponsible to do so little when we have so much.

We can eliminate tuberculosis in the world and polio and cholera and so many things that we can do. We can save so many lives with a few dollars.

Most people in this country when we ask them how much money do they think we spend out of our total budget for foreign aid, most will say somewhere between 17 percent and 25 percent, when, in fact, all we are talking about today of foreign aid is less than 1 percent. And of the humanitarian part, it is less than one-half of 1 percent.

Our basic principles tell us that when we reap of financial windfall, we save some, we invest some, and we donate some to charity. Is that not what we teach our children?

As a Nation, we are going in the wrong direction. It is our obligation to help the needy, both in our own country and overseas. This is what a great Nation does.

I am especially disappointed over the low funding for debt relief. A number of

developing nations are struggling to overcome crushing debts that they can never repay, and now is the time to reduce these debts. But instead, the bill slashes the President's request for debt-reduction programs by \$180 million, more than two-thirds cut.

The cut comes on top of the failure by Congress to provide any of the President's request for \$210 million in fiscal year 2000 supplemental appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, by turning our backs on the debtor nations, we are condemning them to carry impossible financial burdens. I am ashamed.

A number of amendments were proposed that would increase the funding levels for the most important foreign assistance programs, and these amendments required a waiver of the House rules; however, the Committee on Rules chose not to make any in order.

So that while this is an open rule, the amendments needed the most to improve the bill cannot be offered. There are so many things that my colleagues can say about this bill that it does not do.

As I said earlier, there are some good highlights, some good spending in it from the standpoint of child survival, but when it comes to debt relief and when it comes to development assistance, which has been cut by 50 percent since 1985, I remember when we had a budget that was around \$19 billion, now the budget is below \$12 billion. Egypt and Israel take half of it, and the rest goes to the poor.

We could do so much better. We could end hunger, feed people, save lives, end so many diseases that we have in the world today. Yet, we become a Congress that is parsimonious and it is just not right.

We need to do better, and if there is ever a Congress that could lead, ever a Congress that could be known for something that would be generous to our own country and overseas, it would be to lead in this area, to save lives.

So for all of these reasons and because the rule is restrictive, was very restrictive and I thought there were very good amendments that could have been offered and were not protected by the Committee on Rules, I believe this rule should be opposed, it ought to go down.

We ought to start over again. We can do better than this. We have a chance to save so many lives, and we are making a big mistake with this bill.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, we do not have any other speakers on our side of the aisle. We look forward to getting to the debate on the underlying legislation. It is a good bill. We have \$13.340 billion in this bill for foreign aid, a lot of important programs we want to get to work on.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle will address their concerns about the bill before us today, citing the cuts in funding to some of the poorest countries and to international financial institutions, and adoption of this so-called Mexico City language.

Mr. Speaker, I share many of these concerns and would urge my colleagues to oppose the rule. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to use my time to focus on some of the more positive aspects of this legislation with regard to Armenia.

These provisions are the result of the hard work of Members on both sides of the aisle, including both the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the ranking Democrat, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), as well as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), I see out there, and others.

Under the bill, the Republic of Armenia would receive 12.5 percent of the total account for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union, which translates into \$92.5 million. While the dollar amount would represent a reduction from the \$102.4 million in fiscal year 2000, the amount in the current bill actually represents a slight increase in the percentage of the IS act.

Given the fact that budgets are tight this year and the total level of assistance to the IS has been decreased, I appreciate the fact that the appropriators have recognized the need to continue our commitment to Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, Armenia is a nation that has continued on the path of democracy and free market economic reforms, despite daunting challenges both external and internal. Armenia continues to suffer the effects of blockades imposed by its neighbor to the west, Turkey, and to its neighbor to the east, Azerbaijan.

In addition, the tragic shooting last October from the Armenian parliament, claiming the life of both the prime minister and the speaker of the parliament, could have undermined Armenian democracy. But President Kocharian, who was our guest here on Capitol Hill just 2 weeks ago, took resolute and effective action to prevent the situation from unraveling, thereby keeping Armenian democracy on track.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to applaud the members of the subcommittee for maintaining section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which restricts assistance to the government of Azerbaijan until that country lifts its blockades of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.

I also want to salute the subcommittee for providing funding for confidence-building measures to resolve the Nagorno Karabagh conflict, and also for language which urges the Secretary of State to move forthwith to appoint a high-level, long-term special negotiator to facilitate direct negotiations and any other contacts that

will bring peace to the people of the Caucasus.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention that as we get into the debate on the amendments to this bill, it is expected that our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), will offer one or more amendments to single out India for a punitive cut in development assistance. Similar attempts to stigmatize India have been defeated by increasingly lopsided bipartisan margins in recent years.

These amendments have been opposed by the chairman and the ranking members of the subcommittee, as well as the Committee on International Relations.

The arguments against the Burton amendment are stronger this year than they have ever been. In March, President Clinton completed the first visit to India by an American president in more than 20 years. India is the world's largest democracy with over a billion people.

Mr. Speaker, it is a country that has made tremendous progress in free-market economic reforms over the past decade. Cutting development aid to India will only serve to hamper America's efforts to reduce poverty, eradicate disease and promote broad-based economic growth in the world's second most populous nation.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue Congress' long-standing bipartisan tradition of defeating ill-advised efforts to punish India through the Foreign Operations bill. I do not think this is the appropriate vehicle, and it is ill advised more than ever this year.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak in support of the rule and of course this bill, H.R. 4811, the fiscal year 2001 appropriations bill for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), who I think, because of his leadership and determination in steering this bill through the legislative process, we have something that may draw some disdain from some, but I think it is a wholesome bill. It is a good bill.

This rule is obviously one calculated to bring about some debate that, in the end, will bring us a product that I think will be proper. It is never easy for a chairman to do that. I believe that the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), with his fairness and his leadership, and frankly an astonishing amount of patience, which he has done each year during this appropriations process, is something that we should make note of.

I also would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, who has provided leadership on many important issues and promoted, I think, her views with a great deal of energy and enthusiasm.

Of course, I would be lacking if I did not support and thank the staff for the great work that they have done, all of them. I note Mr. Shank and Mr. Flickner are two that have been extraordinarily helpful, and all of them have been very much involved in this process to bring about a bill that is drafted, I think, for success.

Mr. Speaker, this is a responsible bill that effectively allocates the foreign assistance that we have available while providing crucial support for our country's national security.

In the region of the former Soviet Union, this bill helps to strengthen our relationship with our friend and ally, Armenia. The U.S. relationship with Armenia is vital to our effort in promoting democratization, economic development, peace and stability in the independent states and particularly the Southern Caucasus.

This bill contains much-needed funding for Armenia as well as important language directing the administration without further delay to release the remainder of the \$20 million provided in 1998 for the victims of the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict.

I believe we have produced a productive, positive approach that will facilitate peace in the Caucasus by emphasizing confidence-building measures which have been discussed among the parties at NATO and OSCE summits.

This bill also contains critical assistance to Lebanon. I successfully sponsored an amendment during full committee consideration with support on both sides to increase aid to Lebanon from \$15 million to \$18 million.

The withdrawal of Israeli forces, armed forces from South Lebanon, creates a great and immediate need for the U.S. and the international community to assist the people of that region. This additional funding will provide an important start by allowing USAID to expand its program in Southern Lebanon. However, I am hopeful that the U.S. will be able to provide a significant aid package to Lebanon in the near future to help rebuild its school, repair and rebuild its infrastructure, and further our goal of establishing a comprehensive lasting peace throughout the region. I look forward to working with the subcommittee on this effort.

This bill also provides important protections for our national security. Once again, conditions have been included on aid to North Korea through the Korean Energy Development Organization. Since 1994, when the United States and North Korea established KEDO and the Agreed Framework, the United States has upheld its commitments to North Korea.

I might add that North Korea is the biggest recipient of foreign aid from

the U.S. in Eastern Asia and Southern Asia. However, hundreds of thousands of North Koreans have died from starvation while Pyongyang continues to divert our aid to their military.

North Korea has repeatedly antagonized its neighbors and threatened to launch ballistic missiles capable of hitting America. The conditions of KEDO contained in this bill are necessary to ensure North Korea is living up to its end of the bargain and uphold the national security of the United States.

I am also pleased there is language in this bill to prohibit the administration from implementing the Kyoto Protocol on climate change without first sending it to the Senate for advice and consent as required by the U.S. Constitution.

Both USAID and the State Department have attempted to pursue programs and activities solely contained in the Kyoto Protocol. I have documented these efforts in subcommittee hearing. I have also discussed this matter on numerous occasions with USAID administrator Brady Anderson.

Section 577 of this bill provides an appropriate balance by prohibiting the administration from engaging in activities specifically related to the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol, such as carbon emissions trading, while at the same time protecting the long-standing programs and activities within USAID which have been previously and specifically authorized by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to support this rule for what I think is a very responsible bill. The subject of foreign aid often sparks heated debate on this floor, but I hope all Members will unite behind this fair bill and what I believe to be a good rule to maintain U.S. leadership and strengthen our influence across the globe.

I ask for Members on both sides of the aisle to support the rule and the bill.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reference language that is contained in this bill that is identical to language included in the Agriculture appropriations bill that was offered as amendment No. 58 by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), who just spoke relative to the Kyoto Protocol.

I would like to follow up my remarks made during the floor debate on the Agriculture appropriations bill. I was supportive of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and as agreed to by myself and other Members.

I also agree with the gentleman's characterization of the language as identical to the provision offered on

Energy and Water and as contained in this bill today. Essentially, it is also the same language as contained in the VA-HUD and CJS appropriations bills.

However, I would adamantly disagree with one of the gentleman's characterizations of the provision, both in his statement relative to the Agriculture bill as well as to his statement just made now relative to his use of the word "specifically." They do not reflect our agreement with the statutory language that is now contained in the Agriculture bill and in this bill.

I would note for the RECORD that the word "specifically" is not used in terms of authorization in the bill language in this legislation. The assertion of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) that activities must be specifically authorized from my perspective is not correct. There are many activities that the administration engages in that fall within generally authorized activities.

He has stated that he has no intention of disrupting these constitutional authorities or the ability of the administration to negotiate the climate change treaty or to engage developing countries in a manner consistent with Senate Resolution 98, for instance; and yet his characterization in the RECORD that activities must be specifically authorized is not reflective of the statutory language that was agreed upon and adopted by this House.

Additionally, the gentleman from Michigan has stated in the past that the United Nations Framework Convention, which was ratified by the United States Senate in 1992, requires specific implementing legislation for programs or initiatives. That is also, from my perspective, not correct. A ratified treaty carries the weight of law. The U.S. has many obligations and commitments that it agreed to under this ratified treaty and that are authorized without "specific implementing legislation" beyond the treaty. No one, I believe, can reinterpret the law or a treaty by making statements for the RECORD.

Finally, there are many programs and activities that are funded by the Congress and carried out by the administration that are not "specifically authorized" by Congress. I am very concerned about the use on the floor.

The gentleman's use of the word "specifically authorized" in his floor remarks, for example, could include voluntary nonregulatory programs or initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases, programs that also reduce energy bills, improve the Nation's energy security, and reduce local air pollutants.

I do want to make it clear that, again, I agree with the language contained in this bill, in the Agriculture bill, the Energy and Water bill, as well as CJS and VA-HUD.

I would note that the word "specifically" is not included in any of the report language and is not included in any of the bill language, and I would not want there to be confusion about the use of this word.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). She is the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. She is a great advocate for people hurting in our country and around the world.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his very impressive leadership on issues of concern to people in need throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, today we are going to consider a bill that is very, very important because it will define how Congress sees our leadership role in the world.

Unfortunately, we will not have the fullest of debates on the bill because of this rule that we have before us. So I, with great reluctance and great respect for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), who is presenting the rule, rise in opposition to it. I do so for the following reasons:

The bill that we will consider later today, if this rule passes, is seriously deficient in the resources to match the responsibilities of our great Nation. In the past, I have tried to be cooperative, and if it was a close call, come down on the side of moving the process along. But this bill is a hollow shell. The only remedy we would have had is if the Committee on Rules would have allowed some amendments to be in order which would have helped correct some of the deficiencies in the bill.

The Committee on Rules did not allow any of the amendments to be in order. These amendments would have addressed the serious concern that many Members in this House have about international debt relief. Several of us had amendments to redress the lack in the bill.

One that I had proposed would have called for an increased funding of \$390 million to bring the total in the bill up to the President's request for the supplemental and for the next fiscal year of approximately \$470 million.

My request was for the Committee on Rules to allow us to have this amendment come to the floor under emergency designation. There is already precedent in the bill that will be considered later.

The distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of our committee, placed in the bill funding for storm relief in Mozambique and Southern Africa; and that money, we are very grateful that that money is in there. It was really put in under the leadership of the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK). That money survived the process. We are grateful for that. It did also establish a precedent which is emergency designation within this particular appropriations bill.

Indeed, the debt relief is an emergency. We have a situation where sev-

eral of the highly impoverished countries are suffering under oppressive burdens of debt. Some of them pay more on their debt each year than they do for education or for health care for their people.

Many of these debts have been incurred by previous regimes and now these countries have to bear that burden and are unable to lift themselves up and enjoy for their people some of the benefits of the more democratic systems that they have entered into.

So the bill contains only \$82 million of the \$472 million in pending requests for debt relief, and we have no opportunity to address that under emergency designation. The bill contains only \$2 million of \$244 million that we wanted for AIDS, global AIDS issues. At the same time as the whole world of those interested in HIV/AIDS is converging, on Durban, South Africa, in conference on how to deal with this pandemic that is afflicting the world and especially Africa and Asia at the same time we are deprived of having an amendment to acknowledge that emergency with a \$40 million emergency designation. The rule does not allow that. I must oppose that rule.

□ 1615

And then there is the oppressive language on international family planning. The President had requested \$541 million. The bill puts in \$285 million with the stipulation that if the oppressive language is in there and the waivers are used, that is reduced by over \$12 million, down to \$372 as opposed to \$541 that the President has requested. So the number is too low, the language is a gag rule, and we were not allowed to have an amendment.

The Greenwood-Lowey amendment was not made in order so that this House could work its will. It was not a question of changing policy, it was a question of having this opportunity within this House of Representatives to have a clean vote on that. In the past, our chairman has provided that the bill would come to the floor clean of any language relating to Mexico City and the House would then work its will. This year is different. It contains the oppressive language with no remedy allowed in the rule.

And so I must oppose this rule, urge my colleagues to do so, and also to oppose the bill that may follow.

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill on foreign operations.

I say this notwithstanding what I recognize to be a great deal of hard work on the part of the chairman and the ranking member, and notwithstanding what I think are very good provisions regarding aid to Armenia. But the sad fact is that this bill is another case in which our rhetoric far ex-

ceeds our actions. We talk a great deal about helping poor countries, but when we look specifically at the issue of debt relief, we find that we have provided a level of funding that is woefully inadequate.

This bill contains only \$82 million of the \$472 million requested for multilateral debt relief assistance. I mention that because this debt relief is not the United States going it alone, this debt relief is in the context of working with the G-7 countries, the major developed countries in the world, who have made a commitment to provide debt relief jointly to sub-Saharan Africa and other developing countries.

Why is this problem so bad? For example, consider Tanzania. The government spends four times as much money on debt payments as it does on health and education combined. In Uganda, Zambia, Nicaragua, and Honduras, the government spending on debt service is greater than government spending on health and education combined. These countries cannot develop under this crushing burden of debt.

I would also mention that debt relief is not conducted in a vacuum. It is tied to democratization. It is tied to economic reforms. These reforms have been occurring, but these countries still need debt relief.

Probably most crucial today, however, in today's debate, is this simple fact. Twenty-two million have died in sub-Saharan Africa of AIDS. The crisis in sub-Saharan Africa is pandemic. We have a situation in which those countries cannot provide the health care that they need to, the education about AIDS that they need to because they are providing debt service, debt service which basically provides money going from the poorest countries back to the wealthiest countries.

We have an opportunity to exert leadership, to say to the world that, working in concert with other developed countries, we are going to provide debt relief, to put some action behind our rhetoric, to provide relief for AIDS, and to provide general debt relief so poorer countries can develop and progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the rule and the underlying bill.

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

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Firstly, let us have it clearly understood that foreign assistance is an aid to America, it is not a hindrance.

When we came to Congress, those of us in 1992, we spent \$18 billion in America on foreign assistance. Now we propose in this measure less than \$12 billion. Overall, the bill cuts programs which benefit Africa and Latin America by 15 percent. The bill also cuts nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, de-

mining, and related programs by 32 percent from the administration's request, and it cuts 27 percent from funding for Eastern Europe and the Baltic states.

Mr. Speaker, I just returned from a CODEL to Bucharest, Romania, led by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and Senator GEORGE VOINOVICH, along with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and several others of us. There we met with more than 350 parliamentarians representing 54 countries. And let me tell my colleagues that the whole week we were there we were touting the leading role that the United States plays in the world. Frankly, I hope none of our colleagues from those parliamentary bodies are watching the procedures in this House today, because I am embarrassed.

Setting aside the procedural problems with this rule, the fact that several amendments that would make this bill stronger have been disallowed, the underlying bill itself is weak to the point of impotency. We tout ourselves as being one of the most charitable nations in this world, and yet this bill appropriates less than 20 percent of the President's request for debt relief. This level of funding will deny relief to some countries, such as Mozambique and Bolivia, who have already met the conditions necessary to obtain debt relief. In addition, this low level of funding would seriously jeopardize the highly indebted poor country initiative because it may lead other bilateral donors to reduce their contributions.

Defeat this rule and defeat this bill.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this unfair rule. The foreign operations appropriations bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation we will consider this year.

It is up to this Congress to provide the resources that are adequate to maintain the United States' leadership in the international community. That is why I am deeply disappointed that this rule denies a voice to some key constituencies in this Congress and denies the House the opportunity to respond to some of the most urgent global needs.

For instance, this rule denies Congress the opportunity to debate our amendment to eliminate the anti-democratic Mexico City language that is already included in the bill. The very same amendment passed the House last year during the debate over foreign operations. I am outraged that we are prohibited from even letting the House express its will on this issue and have a free and fair debate.

This rule also denies Congress the opportunity to respond adequately to the global AIDS crisis. Our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi), sought to offer an amend-

ment increasing funding for the AIDS crisis and giving these funds an emergency designation. Our administration has made it clear that the AIDS crisis is a national security emergency, and former Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin called it the biggest impediment to economic development in Africa.

How can we, as the international health community gathers in Durban, South Africa to discuss this pandemic, turn our backs on this crisis? Debt relief has been severely underfunded, and the committee denied the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and others the opportunity to designate this important funding as an emergency.

As developing nations are crushed under the burden of mounting debt, unable to devote the necessary resources to the health and education of their people, we continue to deny this funding. Without this relief, my colleagues, we are dooming countries that have tried hard to break the cycle of poverty to repeat this cycle indefinitely.

Extreme poverty worldwide is an emergency. We should have been able to designate it as such, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), a member of the Committee on Rules, and to express to him the value of his contributions to end world hunger and his leadership on this issue.

Let me also comment on the chairman and the ranking member of this subcommittee, realizing that in many instances they have worked together on issues, and I particularly thank the members of the subcommittee the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), and others on that committee that have worked so hard on the issue of HIV/AIDS internationally.

I rise to indicate that I wish in addition to having an open rule, that points of order on certain very vital issues could have been waived. It is clear that if this Nation wants to continue living in peace, then we must encourage world peace and world economic order. With regard to foreign aid, foreign assistance, this appropriations bill is an investment in our peace. And until we go home to our districts and explain what foreign aid is all about, we will continue with this mismatched debate on the floor of the House providing for legislation that does not do its job.

One in five South Africans are HIV positive and are dying. The reason they are dying is because there is no access to the prescription drugs at a cost that they can deal with that we have the privilege of having in this Nation. A population that is dying cannot build its Nation, cannot raise its children,

and cannot provide economically for itself. Simple as that. When a Nation crumbles under its own weight, its own burden of debt, its own health problems, it impacts the very citizens in our respective locations where we come from. The comfort of being able to go to a doctor, to be educated, even though we have our own problems, is hurt by the fact that the world is hurting.

To not provide the dollars that are needed for debt relief adds additionally to the burden of the United States of America and its citizens. A simple investment of the amount of monies that are necessary to provide this debt relief would be an investment for our safety and our security.

I would hope that when we debate this bill that we will find it in our hearts, Mr. Speaker, to pass amendments that will remedy the problems in this bill and truly invest in world peace and world order.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just say that this bill is very inadequate, and I want really the people that listen in and watch the Congress in action, because so many people are under the misunderstanding that we spend so much of our total budget on foreign aid, to understand that the fact is that is not true.

If we put everything together, including aid to Israel and Egypt, of our total budget it is less than 1 percent that goes for foreign aid. Most people across the country think that we spend somewhere between 17 and 25 percent of our total budget on foreign aid. We have done polls on it. A lot of our elected officials run against foreign aid and they tell people we spend too much money, but the fact is it is less than 1 percent.

In our own country the bottom 2½ to 3 percent of our people live in great poverty, whether it is in the cities or in Appalachia or in other parts. As a matter of fact, they rank as low as any people of the poorest of the poor in the Third World countries. The first thing this Congress ought to do is take care of that problem.

Now, this bill does not have anything to do with that, but if Congress was going to be known for anything, and I would love to see this someday, I would love to be part of a Congress that someday said we are going to take care of our poor. They are going to be fed and they are going to have shelter and they are going to have clean water. And then we could take some of this tremendous surplus that we have and forget about giving these multibillion dollar giveaways on tax cuts to so many people and start helping some people live, to eat, to be immunized, to pay for debt, to have development assistance so they can help themselves.

For every dollar we invest overseas, we get \$2.37 back. This is not a bad deal for us. Economically it is a good deal, if we want to consider it just on economic terms.

□ 1630

But this budget is inadequate. We can do better. Hopefully some day, and I do not know if I will be around, I would like to be part of a Congress that ends hunger, that ends disease. We can end tuberculosis, we can end cholera and we can end polio and so many of the diseases in the world. We have the ability.

So, with that, I apologize to my colleagues for going on and on and on. They have heard me give this speech many times, but it needs to be said over and over again.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), for whom I have great respect, and also all the Members who have spoken this afternoon on this issue.

I know that there is always more money that could be spent. There are always more things that could be done by Government. But I am not ashamed of what the American people, through their Congress, do in foreign aid.

We are spending \$13.340 billion. That is \$13,340 billion in this bill for assistance for peoples in other countries, for the poor and the needy in other countries. I think that is something that the American people have to be very proud of and that is something in the tradition of generosity of the American people. And so, I support this legislation. I thank all of those who have worked so hard on it, especially the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN).

Mr. Speaker, I urge at this point support also for this rule, which will bring to the floor the legislation for consideration of debate in an open rule permitting any amendment that is germane and pursuant to the House rules. So I support this rule. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, there is language contained in this bill that is identical to language included in the Agriculture Appropriations bill as amendment #58 by Mr. KNOLLENBERG relating to the Kyoto Protocol.

I would like to follow up my remarks on the floor, during deliberations on the Agricultural Appropriations bill. I was supportive of the amendment offered by Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and as agreed to by myself and other members. I agree fully with Mr. KNOLLENBERG's characterization of the language as identical to the provision adopted on Energy and Water, and contained in the Foreign Operations bill, and essentially the same as on VA/HUD and CJS.

However, I would disagree with one of Mr. KNOLLENBERG's characterizations of the provision, both in his remarks made on the floor, and as submitted for the RECORD. They do not reflect our agreement or the statutory language which is now contained in the Agricultural Appropriations bill and the other bills mentioned.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG's assertion that activities must be specifically authorized is incorrect. There are many activities that the administration engages in that fall within generally authorized activities. Mr. KNOLLENBERG has stat-

ed that he has no intention of disrupting these constitutional authorities, or the ability of the administration to negotiate the climate change treaty or to engage developing countries in a manner consistent with Senate Resolution 98, for instance. And yet, his characterization in the RECORD that activities must be specifically authorized is not reflected in the statutory provision that was agreed upon and adopted.

Additionally, he stated that the United Nations Framework Convention, which was ratified by the United States after consent by the Senate in 1992, requires specific implementing legislation for programs or initiatives. That is also incorrect. A ratified treaty carries the weight of law, and the United States has many obligations and commitments that it agreed to under this ratified treaty, and that are authorized without "specific implementing legislation" beyond the treaty. No one can reinterpret the law by making statements on the floor.

Finally, there are many programs and activities that are funded by the Congress, and carried out by the administration, that are not "specifically authorized" by Congress. For example: Mr. KNOLLENBERG's characterization made on the floor using the word "specifically"—which is not contained in this bill, the Agriculture, Energy and Water, or VA/HUD bills, implies that some regulatory and non-regulatory programs that have bipartisan support and that save money for businesses and consumers, help the environment, and improve public health would have to be rolled back.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG's use of the word "specifically" authorized in this floor remarks would include voluntary, non-regulatory programs or initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases—programs that also reduce energy bills, improve the nation's energy security, and reduce local air pollutants. Let me be clear. The language in this bill and those mentioned before very deliberately does not include the word "specifically" and I wanted to ensure for the record that the gentleman's floor characterization does not represent our agreement on this issue and it is not the congressional intent in this bill.

The language included in this bill does not do anything to interfere with valuable research, existing programs, or ongoing initiatives designed to carry out the United States' voluntary commitments under the 1992 Climate Change Convention."

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 199, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

YEAS—225

Aderholt	Goodling	Pease
Archer	Goss	Peterson (MN)
Armey	Graham	Peterson (PA)
Bachus	Granger	Petri
Baker	Green (WI)	Pickering
Ballenger	Greenwood	Pitts
Barr	Gutknecht	Pombo
Barrett (NE)	Hansen	Porter
Bartlett	Hastings (WA)	Portman
Barton	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Bass	Hayworth	Quinn
Bateman	Hefley	Radanovich
Bereuter	Herger	Ramstad
Biggert	Hill (MT)	Regula
Bilbray	Hilleary	Reynolds
Bilirakis	Hobson	Riley
Bliley	Hoeffel	Rogan
Blunt	Hoekstra	Rogers
Boehlert	Horn	Rohrabacher
Boehner	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonilla	Houghton	Roukema
Bono	Hulshof	Royce
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Ryan (WI)
Bryant	Hutchinson	Ryun (KS)
Burr	Hyde	Salmon
Burton	Isakson	Sanford
Buyer	Istook	Saxton
Callahan	Jenkins	Scarborough
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Schaffer
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Jones (NC)	Sessions
Cannon	Kasich	Shadegg
Castle	Kelly	Shaw
Chabot	King (NY)	Shays
Chambliss	Kingston	Sherwood
Coble	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Coburn	Kolbe	Shuster
Collins	Kuykendall	Simpson
Combest	LaHood	Skeen
Cook	Largent	Smith (MI)
Cox	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Crane	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Cubin	Lazio	Souder
Cunningham	Leach	Spence
Davis (VA)	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Deal	Lewis (KY)	Stump
DeLay	Linder	Sununu
DeMint	LoBiondo	Sweeney
Diaz-Balart	Lucas (OK)	Talent
Dickey	Manzullo	Tancredo
Doolittle	Martinez	Tauzin
Dreier	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Duncan	McCrery	Terry
Dunn	McHugh	Thomas
Ehlers	McInnis	Thornberry
Ehrlich	McIntosh	Thune
Emerson	McIntyre	Tiahrt
English	McKeon	Toomey
Everett	Metcalfe	Trafficant
Ewing	Mica	Upton
Fletcher	Miller (FL)	Vitter
Foley	Miller, Gary	Walden
Fossella	Moore	Walsh
Fowler	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Franks (NJ)	Morella	Watkins
Frelinghuysen	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Galleghy	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Ganske	Ney	Weldon (PA)
Gekas	Northup	Weller
Gibbons	Norwood	Whitfield
Gilchrest	Nussle	Wicker
Gillmor	Ose	Wilson
Gilman	Oxley	Wolf
Goode	Packard	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Paul	Young (FL)

NAYS—199

Abercrombie	Borski	Cummings
Ackerman	Boswell	Danner
Allen	Boucher	Davis (FL)
Andrews	Boyd	Davis (IL)
Baca	Brady (PA)	DeFazio
Baird	Brown (FL)	DeGette
Baldacci	Brown (OH)	Delahunt
Baldwin	Capps	DeLauro
Barcia	Capuano	Deutsch
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Dicks
Becerra	Clayton	Dingell
Bentsen	Clement	Dixon
Berkley	Clyburn	Doggett
Berman	Condit	Dooley
Berry	Conyers	Doyle
Bishop	Costello	Edwards
Blagojevich	Coyne	Engel
Blumenauer	Cramer	Eshoo
Bonior	Crowley	Etheridge



Evans	Lipinski	Rodriguez
Farr	Lofgren	Roemer
Fattah	Lowe	Rothman
Filner	Lucas (KY)	Royal-Allard
Ford	Luther	Rush
Frank (MA)	Maloney (CT)	Sabo
Frost	Maloney (NY)	Sanchez
Gejdenson	Markey	Sanders
Gephardt	Mascara	Sandlin
Gonzalez	McCarthy (MO)	Sawyer
Gordon	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
Green (TX)	McDermott	Scott
Gutierrez	McGovern	Serrano
Hall (OH)	McKinney	Sherman
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Shows
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Sisisky
Hill (IN)	Meeks (NY)	Skelton
Hilliard	Menendez	Slaughter
Hinche	Millender	Snyder
Hinojosa	McDonald	Spratt
Holden	Miller, George	Stabenow
Holt	Minge	Stark
Hooley	Mink	Stenholm
Hoyer	Moakley	Strickland
Inslee	Mollohan	Stupak
Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Tanner
Jackson-Lee	Murtha	Tauscher
(TX)	Nadler	Taylor (MS)
Jefferson	Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
John	Neal	Thompson (MS)
Johnson, E.B.	Oberstar	Thurman
Jones (OH)	Obey	Tierney
Kanjorski	Olver	Towns
Kaptur	Ortiz	Turner
Kennedy	Owens	Udall (CO)
Kildee	Pallone	Udall (NM)
Kilpatrick	Pascarell	Velazquez
Kind (WI)	Pastor	Visclosky
Kleczka	Payne	Waters
Klink	Pelosi	Watt (NC)
Kucinich	Phelps	Waxman
LaFalce	Pickett	Weiner
Lampson	Pomeroy	Wexler
Lantos	Price (NC)	Weygand
Larson	Rahall	Wise
Lee	Rangel	Woolsey
Levin	Reyes	Wu
Lewis (GA)	Rivers	Wynn

## NOT VOTING—10

Campbell	Cooksey	Smith (WA)
Carson	Forbes	Vento
Chenoweth-Hage	Matsui	
Clay	McNulty	

□ 1652

Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. CRAMER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 546 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on

the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4811.

□ 1655

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, 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).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the floor today H.R. 4811, the fiscal year 2001 Appropriations Act for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. I urge all Members to support this bill.

The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a bill with total discretionary spending of \$13.281 billion. This compares to an enacted level, excluding emergency spending and including scoring adjustments, of \$13.432 billion. The President requested \$15.132 billion for the programs funded through this bill. In short, the bill responsibly reduces foreign aid spending by \$151 million below fiscal year 2000 and by \$1.8 billion below the President's fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Mr. Chairman, there are those including the ranking member the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) who are disappointed in some of the funding levels for specific programs and activities covered by this bill. I sympathize with them, but we have a 302(b) allocation that limits us to the spending in this bill, and I have no choice but to live within that level. While it is true that the pending bill significantly cuts foreign aid spending below what the President has requested, I disagree with the rhetoric that we may hear today about the bad things that this bill does. Let me be clear: this bill preserves U.S. national interests and maintains American commitments abroad.

The bill increases funding above last year's level for a number of critical initiatives which support U.S. national interests and which help to achieve America's humanitarian goals. These include increasing the child survival account by \$119 million to a total of \$834 million. Mr. Chairman, we receive more requests, more letters of support about the child survival than any other single issue in this bill.

I know my colleagues will be pleased to hear that we have made such a sig-

nificant increase once again in this crucial child survival account.

We are increasing HIV/AIDS funding by \$27 million, up to \$202 million; non-proliferation and antiterrorism programs by \$25 million, up to \$241 million; increasing the fund for Ireland by \$5.4 million, up to \$25 million; increasing the Peace Corps by \$13 million, up to \$258 million; and increasing refugee programs by \$20 million, up to \$657 million.

□ 1700

In addition, the pending bill fully funds the President's request for economic and military assistance for Israel, Egypt and Jordan; and this includes an increase of \$60 million in military assistance for Israel. Indeed, 39 percent of the funds in this bill, or over \$5.2 billion, will be available and be provided to the Middle East.

Let me just comment once again about the controversy that has been discussed in the last several months about the Phalcon sale by Israel to China. As of this morning, as I announced earlier on the floor, the Israeli government contacted me by telephone and told me Mr. Barak had requested that I be informed and that the Congress be informed that the Phalcon sale to China has been stopped. I think that is a tremendous step in the right direction, and I applaud the decision of the prime minister in making this decision.

I know many Members of the House have expressed to me and shared in my concern and yet were concerned about the possibility of a lengthy debate. So since that has been consummated and our objective has been fulfilled, there will be no need to discuss that reduction in the early disbursement account for Israel.

Further, this bill continues to support American involvement in Africa and Latin America. H.R. 4811 ensures at least \$1.55 billion for sub-Saharan Africa for development of humanitarian programs next year. In addition, thanks to the efforts of the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of our subcommittee, we have included funds urgently needed for Mozambique, Madagascar, and southern Africa; and the committee directs that development funding for Latin America be no less than the fiscal year 2000 amount.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the pending bill benefits American business by increasing funding for the Export-Import Bank and provides central funding for OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and for the U.S. Trade and Development Agency. In addition, the bill, thanks to the efforts of one of our colleagues from Ohio, retains longstanding Buy America requirements and protection for American jobs.

I urge Members today to read the editorial in the Washington Post entitled "An Unobserved War." It states that "not much notice is paid in the West these days to the war in Chechnya."