

Gibbons
 Gilchrist
 Gillmor
 Gilman
 Gonzalez
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Goodling
 Gordon
 Goss
 Graham
 Granger
 Green (TX)
 Green (WI)
 Greenwood
 Gutierrez
 Gutknecht
 Hall (OH)
 Hall (TX)
 Hansen
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Herger
 Hill (IN)
 Hill (MT)
 Hilleary
 Hilliard
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Hoefel
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Hooley
 Horn
 Hostettler
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hutchinson
 Hyde
 Insee
 Isakson
 Istook
 Jackson (IL)
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 John
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kelly
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind (WI)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kleczka
 Klink
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 Kuykendall
 LaFalce
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Lantos
 Largent
 Larson
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lazio
 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
 McCarthy (MO)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum
 McCrery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McIntosh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinney
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Menendez
 Metcalf
 Mica
 Millender
 McDonald
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley
 Mollohan
 Moore
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Morella
 Murtha
 Myrick
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nethercutt
 Northup
 Norwood
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Ose
 Owens
 Oxley
 Packard
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pease
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 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

NAYS—7

Blumenauer
 DeFazio

Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Kucinich

Rush
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryun (KS)
 Sabo
 Salmon
 Sanchez
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Sanford
 Sawyer
 Saxton
 Scarborough
 Schaffer
 Schakowsky
 Scott
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shows
 Shuster
 Sisisky
 Skeen
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Snyder
 Souder
 Spence
 Spratt
 Stabenow
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Strickland
 Stump
 Stupak
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Talent
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Tautz
 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
 Watkins
 Watts (OK)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Weldon (FL)
 Weldon (PA)
 Weller
 Wexler
 Weygand
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson
 Wise
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

Stark
 Waters
 Watt (NC)

NOT VOTING—20

Archer
 Baca
 Borski
 Campbell
 Carson
 Chenoweth-Hage
 Clay
 Diaz-Balart
 Forbes
 Gekas
 Hunter
 Jones (OH)
 Kasich
 Matsui
 McNulty
 Ney
 Nussle
 Simpson
 Smith (WA)
 Vento

□ 2124

Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SHOWS and Mr. ACKERMAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4632

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, my name was mistakenly added as an original cosponsor of H.R. 4632. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as an original cosponsor of this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 546 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4811.

□ 2125

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) had been disposed of, and the bill was open for amendment from page 2, line 22 to page 3, line 17.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

In title I of the bill under the heading "EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE-SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION", after the first dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$25,000,000)".

In title II of the bill under the heading "BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE-FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT-DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE", after the first dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$49,500,000)".

In title II of the bill under the heading "BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE-FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT-OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT", after the first dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$30,000,000)".

In title II of the bill under the heading "BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE-DEPARTMENT OF STATE-INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT", after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by \$99,500,000)".

□ 2130

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) in offering this \$99.5 million counternarcotics aid amendment for Colombia.

The gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) and I have long worked together to aid the nation of Colombia, source of most of the world's cocaine and more than 70 percent of the heroin sold or seized on our Nation's streets.

Mr. Chairman, the Colombian National Police, the CNP, has long led the fight against drugs and has been doing its work effectively, although with the limited tools that they have had.

We reluctantly went along with the recently-passed Colombian emergency supplemental because that is what the Colombian government and the Clinton administration wanted; specifically, more aid to the Colombian military to fight drugs.

In the end, however, everyone knows that it is going to be the CNP that is going to have to eradicate the coca leaf and move gasoline from the helicopters and spray planes along with the herbicide to the distant and hard-to-reach fronts in places like southern Colombia, to eliminate the thousands of hectares of coca once the army takes control of those areas.

Drug fighting is a police function, not a military one, both in our Nation and in Colombia. Today the CNP lacks any real capacity to move the massive amounts of fuel that they and the army counternarcotics battalions may need. In fact, they have but only one workable supply plane, an old 1950 DC-3.

Last year's foreign ops appropriation bill in the committee incorporated report language at our request directing

the State Department to buy a more modern supply plane for the CNP, a Buffalo, which is a small version of the C-130 suitable for the jungles and remote runways in Colombia.

Predictably, the State Department ignored congressional advice and failed to act. In a recent operation near the Venezuelan border they have had to make so many fuel runs with small aircraft and their one DC-3 that they alerted the drug traffickers and narco guerillas of their plans, thereby losing their element of surprise.

Unless we in the Congress rectify this supply line situation, we are going to have dozens of good helicopters for which Congress has provided the sorely needed funds sitting idly on the ground in Colombia. We are going to have to have some of the world's most expensive flower pots growing weeds under them in Colombia unless we act appropriately.

Mr. Chairman, the CNP are the best anti-narcotics police in the Americas. Yesterday they seized three tons of cocaine headed for Mexico and ultimately toward our Nation. The CNP needs this modest aid proposed by the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON), and we should be giving it to them, both for the CNP and the future for our youngsters in America.

This effort to fight drugs at the source is in our Nation's interest. I urge a yes vote for its adoption.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple in nature. It moves money from three accounts bloated with bureaucracy and into an account which helps fight the scourge of drugs which are devastating our society.

As the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) just said, our allies, the Colombian National Police, just yesterday seized three metric tons of cocaine destined for the United States through Mexico. This is just the latest testament that the Congress has provided aid to the right people in Colombia.

With the six Black Hawk Helicopters the Congress provided to the CNP last year, the CNP has eradicated more opium, which is used to make heroin, than it did in 1998, and nearly as much as it did last year, and they have only had the Black Hawk Helicopters for 4 months.

Yet in the Colombia supplemental aid package, the Clinton administration chose to virtually ignore our CNP allies and start a duplicative Colombian army unit, providing only \$100 million to the CNP while spending nearly \$1 billion on an army unit.

Throughout the process, the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and I have tried to explain why there needed to be a more equitable distribution of aid between the two. Yet, despite our long involvement with Colombia, not to mention our role as authorizers, we were ignored.

To this end, I include for the RECORD a letter and a request which the gen-

tleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and I wrote to have the needs of the CNP addressed in the supplemental. I wanted to offer another amendment which would have directed funding to the CNP, but that amendment would have been subject to a point of order that I am sure my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), would have raised.

I hope that after I withdraw this amendment, the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) will consider a more equitable distribution of funds in the conference with the Senate.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We were pleased to support your Colombian aid proposal last week, and we will continue to provide any assistance necessary to see that the package is enacted into law. To that end, senior committee staff members from both our committees have just returned from a bipartisan staff delegation to Colombia. They met with many Colombian officials, including our friend General Serrano, and were able to gather information about the current situation there, and about the Clinton Administration's Colombian aid proposal. Their analysis can help improve the efficiency of our aid package.

BLACK HAWKS

On a bright note, the Colombian National Police (CNP) have finally received all six Black Hawk utility helicopters that Congress provided for them under your leadership, and the last three are scheduled to begin missions next week. The earlier problems with the floor armoring have been resolved, and the weapons systems seem to be operational. The only concern remains that FARC terrorists likely have surface-to-air missiles, and these Black Hawks are not equipped with inexpensive flares and chaff, which provide the best protection against such attacks by diverting the missile away from the helicopter. Finally, the CNP appears to be able to absorb the two additional Black Hawks we provided to them in the supplemental appropriations package passed by the House. They are grateful!

The Black Hawks have already paid for themselves. On a recent mission FARC terrorists ambushed a squad of CNP officers just 30 miles from Bogota in La Pena. A single Black Hawk was able to land and extract 21 fully armed CNP officers, lifting them to safety. It is comforting to know that the Congress' efforts helped save the lives of these good men.

AMMUNITION

The .50 caliber ammunition supply appears to still be a problem. As you may remember, the State Department bought 2 million rounds of .50 caliber ammunition for the GAU-19 defensive weapons systems that were manufactured during the Eisenhower Administration, in 1952 (see photo). Even worse, the State Department purchased 5 million additional rounds of this aged and useless ammunition (spending a total of approximately \$10 million). The 50 year-old ammunition was suitable for the weapons of the Eisenhower era, but according to the manufacturer, it cannot be safely used in the defensive rapid-fire weapons systems that we purchased for the CNP to protect our nearly \$100 million U.S. taxpayer-financed helicopter investment.

The State Department insists it can operate the weapons at a reduced rate of fire. However the manufacturer has explicitly warned the State Department not to use this aged ammunition because of serious risk of endangering the operator and/or weapon. The manufacturer says only ammunition manufactured after 1983 is safe to use in this weapon. Clearly, this situation must be addressed immediately, before someone is injured or killed and/or an expensive weapon is damaged or destroyed. The easy answer is to buy new ammunition, instead of trying to do this on the cheap.

SUPPORT CAPACITY/SUPPLY LINE

The most disturbing revelation from the trip was the discovery that there had been little consideration given to how the push into southern Colombia would be supported. The only certainty is that increased levels of fuel and herbicide will have to be flown in due to the remote locations of the forward operating bases, where often even contracted commercial planes refuse to land or there is no commercial source to purchase gasoline. Possibly even more critical than defending the helicopters themselves is the ability to support and maintain a supply line to keep the helicopters flying. Otherwise many if not all, of the helicopters provided in this package will constantly be waiting for their next tank of gas or spare part.

Shockingly, the State Department plans to use the CNP's 2 aging DC-3's (their third is being cannibalized to keep the other two in the air) as the backbone of the support effort. These planes from the FDR/Truman era are 60 years old (see photo), do not have a reliable spare parts supply line, and have some sort of mechanical trouble on nearly every mission. Almost every flight is flown with the potential of engine failure on take-offs and landings due to a recurring malfunction in the electronics system—which has been ongoing for the last two years.

As you may remember, General Serrano requested a Buffalo transport plane over a year ago (in his 1999 \$51 million priority list). Congress placed report language directing the State Department to purchase the Buffalo supply plane in this year's House Foreign Operations Appropriations Report. However the State Department chose to ignore the report language, saying it was non-binding.

In order to sustain the operations tempo necessary to be the primary supplier of fuel and herbicide for the push into southern Colombia, the CNP needs to update and increase its number of supply planes. The Buffalo appears to be the best platform for the project.

One specific example of the need for increased supply plane capacity is a recent CNP operation that required 18 staging flights by inadequate fixed-wing aircraft, like the DC-3, to supply in advance a supposedly "secret" mission in Vichada to destroy a clandestine cocaine lab. The 18 staging flights (10 for fuel alone) cost the CNP the critical element of surprise. Unfortunately, FARC terrorists had already taken their cocaine and all incriminating evidence, and abandoned the lab well before the CNP was able to execute its mission. If the CNP had the Buffalo supply plane Congress directed the State Department to purchase, the 18 trips could have been decreased to one or two.

CRITICAL NEEDS

Mr. Speaker, we have been pleased to help gain the support needed to pass the supplemental appropriations bill, however there are a few things which have been overlooked in the construction of this package. General Serrano, when asked by committee staff if he needed anything further to support both the CNP Black Hawks and the Colombian

Army's push into southern Colombia, favored the following modest list of items that he felt were critical to the CNP's ability to successfully execute the supply mission for Plan Colombia. It is our hope that the House would push for the following items in conference, if and when it occurs.

\$52 million—to purchase 4 Buffalo transport/supply aircraft (\$13 million each).

\$3.5 million—to update the CNP sidearms with Sig-Arms for the DANTI, DIJIN, COPEZ, and CIP, the key units involved in the day-to-day struggle against narco-traffickers and their FARC terrorist allies.

\$200,000—to purchase anti-missile defense kits for the 6 CNP Black Hawks to help protect them from surface-to-air missiles.

\$10 million—to purchase new .50 caliber ammunition for CNP GAU-19 weapons systems.

\$1.5 million—to purchase one additional two-seat T-65 Turbo Thrush spraying aircraft for CNP training purposes.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON,

Chairman, Government Reform Committee.

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,

Chairman, International Relations Committee.

Enclosures.

P.S. Just yesterday a newly modified Huey II was shot down by the FARC, who took 8 CNP officers hostage, including those wounded in the crash. This only further proves the point that we need to get the CNP the best equipment possible, including FLIR and capable defensive weapons systems, as this shows anything less is dangerous, penny wise and pound foolish.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 27 offered by Ms. WATERS: Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$82,500,000)".

Page 3, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$7,000,000)".

Page 30, line 8, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$155,600,000)".

Page 33, line 6, after the first dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$5,250,000)".

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$200,000,000)".

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase debt relief appropriations by \$155.6 million to fully fund the administration's request for \$225 million for debt relief for the world's poorest countries.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard an awful lot this evening about debt relief. I would like to again thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the wonderful leadership that she has given in this debate.

I suppose there are many who would be wondering why are we going to hear more about it. We are going to hear more about it because this issue is not

going to die easily. It is not going to die easily because we have reneged on our commitment as leaders in this world, and at the G-8 conference we made a commitment. We made a commitment to debt relief that has not been honored. We made a commitment to debt relief for the world's poorest countries, the world's poorest countries that are being impoverished by their debts.

In Tanzania, Zambia, Niger, Nicaragua, Honduras and Uganda, government spending on debt service payments is greater than government spending on health and education combined. These debt payments constitute a transfer of wealth from the world's poorest countries to the world's richest countries.

Debt relief is supported by a worldwide movement known as Jubilee 2000. This movement was begun by Christians who believe that the year 2000, the two-thousandth anniversary of the coming of Christ, is a jubilee year.

According to the Bible, the Lord instructed the people of ancient Israel to celebrate a jubilee, a year of the Lord, every 50 years. During a jubilee year, debts are forgiven.

Supporters of Jubilee 2000 now include a diverse group of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religious groups, developmental specialists, labor unions, environmental groups, and other nongovernmental organizations.

These activists know that forgiving the debts of the world's most impoverished countries is simply the right and Christian thing to do. Supporters of Jubilee 2000 also know that debt relief is a moral imperative. Most of the debts owed by poor countries were accumulated during the Cold War, and many are the result of loans to corrupt dictators who are no longer in power.

The debt of the Congo was accumulated during the oppressive rule of Mobutu. Nicaragua's debt was accumulated under the dictatorship of the Samosa family and the subsequent civil war. It is unjust and immoral to expect the impoverished people of these countries to pay back these debts.

From June 18 to June 20, 1999, representatives of the United States and other creditor countries met at the G-8 summit in Cologne, Germany, and they knew the Jubilee 2000 movement was watching. These creditor governments agreed to provide faster and deeper debt relief to heavily-indebted poor countries, and required these countries to target the savings from debt relief to HIV-AIDS prevention, health care, education, child survival, and poverty reduction programs.

On September 24, 1999, Gordon Brown, the chairman of the IMF's Monetary and Financial Committee, and the chancellor of the United Kingdom made the following statement about the Cologne debt initiative:

"If we are successful, it will be a matter of not years or months but

weeks before the first country will benefit from debt relief."

Tragically, the promises of Cologne have not been fulfilled. The entire Cologne debt initiative is now in jeopardy because the United States Congress has failed to fund its contribution to the program. Last year, the administration proposed a multiyear package totalling \$920 million in appropriations for debt relief. For fiscal year 2001, the administration requested only \$225 million.

This relatively small investment could leverage millions more from other creditor governments and international financial institutions. However, without American leadership, debt relief will never become a reality.

Pope John II said, and I quote, "We have to ask . . . why progress in resolving the debt problem is still so slow. Why so many hesitations? Why the difficulty in providing the funds needed even for the already-agreed initiatives? It is the poor who pay the cost of indecision and delay."

Let us declare an end to the indecision and delay.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment being offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

While I support the thrust of her amendment in increasing funding available to the Heavily-Indebted Poor Country Trust Fund, I am troubled that it calls for a large reduction in our foreign military funding programs.

The proposed \$200 million reduction in this account could end up hurting some of the very countries we are trying to help in the important HIPC initiative. For example, there is a proposal for \$18 million in FMF funding for African regional stability, an effort which would be undercut and perhaps even zeroed out by the adoption of the gentlewoman's amendment.

Israel currently receives close to \$2 billion in FMF funding. Do we want to cut that program, possibly putting that program for Israel in jeopardy at the same time that the President is playing host to the leader of both the Palestinian Authority and Israel in an effort to achieve a comprehensive peace in the Middle East?

□ 2145

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that many of our colleagues would agree that the answers should be a resounding no. The cuts being proposed in this amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) would also impact the International Military Education Training account thereby cutting possible funding for many of the same HIPC beneficiaries.

Do we truly want to cut off support for military education training for countries such as Sierra Leone and Nigeria and South Africa at the same time that regional conflicts are threatening to engulf most of West Africa.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that that is a wise course of action. This amendment would also cut the administrative budget of the Export-Import

Bank thereby putting in jeopardy the small business programs of that agency and its ability to produce quick turnaround for business applicants.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly ask for the defeat of the Waters amendment. The gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) has put together a well-balanced bill, and I cannot support this effort to upset that balance.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on this debt relief issue. I think at this period of time in terms of our global economy when this House has voted so many times before to extend free trade around the world that it is about time that we also think about what the consequences of our global economy is on those who are most impoverished in this world.

Mr. Chairman, the criticism of the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is that she takes money from military training and assistance and the hope that the former speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) was trying to convey in his remarks about the Waters amendment was the fact that by drawing away from these funds that we were, in essence, compromising our national security, because we would be taking away funds that would otherwise be going to the training and equipping of the military in these various countries.

The very fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of any issue more fundamental to our national security as a Nation, moreover than whatever we do with our national defense budget, which we just closed hearings on for the benefit of our conference committee, more so than any of this equipping and training of our military, is the fact that we are about to see a mass epidemic. In fact, we already have an epidemic. We have a pandemic.

We are going to see literally half the population of major countries in Africa die within the next year. We are going to see literally the life expectancy, the average life expectancy of people living in South Africa going down to below 30 years of age. My colleagues if we do not think this is a national security issue, if we think that the Waters amendment somehow compromises national security because we are taking away from the military to support debt relief, then I am sorry, the fact of the matter is, between the short funding of AIDS in this bill, in addition to the fact that we are not even providing these countries with the ability to dig themselves out of debt, those are two national security issues.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how this House could be so narrow-minded in its perspective that they can honestly think that we can pass a national security bill and think that we have the national security of our country

protected and yet, on the other hand, cut the kinds of funds necessary to provide debt relief to the poorest countries of the world and not think that we are not going to be in there in the next weeks or months or years in a military capacity trying to bring stability from a situation that has gone awry because we have not provided the stability there economically or healthwise.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is pound foolish, pennywise for us to be talking about national security and what we are going to do to preserve our national security when we are underfunding our debt relief obligations. This is what goes around comes around. There is no one who can convince me that it is not going to save us money tonight to put money into debt relief, it is going to save us money in our military accounts tomorrow, no one who can convince me of that.

Mr. Chairman, anybody who sees that we are in 182-plus different countries today with our military trying to provide stability in every other place in the world, because there is an eternal conflagration because of this economic instability, to think that we are somehow saving money by borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, by borrowing out of the debt relief monies that the World Bank has said that we need to provide these countries, is just incredible.

The fact of the matter is, this \$82 million in debt relief is a fraction of what is truly needed. So that is a national security issue.

The other national security issue is the fact that we have an AIDS epidemic that is literally destroying the continent of Africa, and it is threatening to destabilize lots of countries there. I might add, the two are intertwined, not only should we be providing debt relief but we should be providing the necessary AIDS money so that we also bolster these countries that are now suffering internally from two epidemics, one economic and another health.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise tonight in opposition to the proposed amendment by my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) but with some explanation. Also I rise to answer some of the questions that my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), just challenged us to answer.

Debt relief in and of itself is a very positive humane and honest goal and should be considered by this body, especially debt relief in Third World countries that are developing and struggling to build new societies. Yes, if debt relief was the only issue at hand and it was done correctly, then my colleagues would have my support.

Mr. Chairman, I, in fact, am very supportive of the idea that the Pope has suggested with the Jubilee 2000 concept reaching out to developing countries and Third World countries and alleviating that burden from them,

taking it off their shoulders, this debt burden. However, for this to be successful, and to answer the challenge of my good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), for this to be successful, we have to have more than transferring money from this pot to that pot.

We have to have more than just saying we are going to give these underdeveloped countries debt relief and expecting that is going to do them any good; it will not do them any good. It will do them no good at all if they are still being run by the same gangsters, the same corrupt dictators, the same hooligans and monsters that have been repressing the people in the Third World over the last two decades.

Mr. Chairman, one of my biggest gripes about the financial institutions, the World Bank and many of the financial institutions that are funded through this body is the fact that we do give money to corrupt administrations overseas. For example, the people of Indonesia right now are burdened with billions of dollars of debt.

The fact is, in Indonesia, they are struggling to create a democracy. By the way, let me add, our training of the Indonesian military has been one of the greatest forces for building a democracy in Indonesia. Let us admit that some of this military training, for example, in Indonesia permitted an evolution towards democracy and, perhaps, people like in Indonesia do deserve to have some of that debt relief taken off of their shoulders, unless there is a requirement saying that these countries be headed towards democracy or there be a certain amount of reform, we are just pouring money right down a rat hole.

Mr. Chairman, all the things that have been said here today about the horrors that are going on in a developing world will get no better if we simply transfer money to regimes that are controlled by dictators. This shift that is being proposed by this amendment is, as I say, being done with the best of motives. It cannot be done in this manner.

It has to be done as part of a reform and a comprehensive authorization project in which we will look at how monies are dispersed throughout the Third World, not simply throwing money from one pot to another, which will result in corrupt dictators getting their hands on the money and all the problems that we talk about being exacerbated rather than being solved.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) often advocates that we reduce the commitment of America in its overseas obligations. The fact of the matter is the gentleman cannot reduce America's commitments militarily unless we are prepared to help those countries make it,

and they cannot make it if you are squeezing every last penny out of them. In addition to that, we do not support them addressing their health epidemics.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, none of that makes any sense at all unless we have a government in that country that is willing to seek out those goals and try to implement them. Simply by changing money from this pot to their pot is not going to make those things better.

Again, I am in favor of debt relief for these Third World countries, but let us not give money to countries that are not democratizing, not going through reform. Talk about pouring good money after bad, talk about pouring money down a rat hole, that is the way to waste more money.

The money the gentleman is talking about will go straight in Swiss banks, unless we require a certain amount of reform and democratization to go forward with this.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of military training, again, I would agree we need to put restrictions on our military training as well. The Waters amendment which I would like to address at this point, the lady from California (Ms. WATERS) has the right idea, we should not be spending money just like we should not be spending money without democratic reform.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have spent a long time discussing this issue and I hope that we will soon be able to move on. But before we do, I would simply like to make one observation about the comments of the last speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), we had some talk in the House tonight about the position of the Pope and the Catholic Church and various other churches. To me, what we ought to be asking ourselves is what we really believe our individual duties are both to our own citizens and to citizens of the world who do not reside next door.

□ 2200

Mr. Chairman, let me say that this debt relief that we are talking about tonight is not meant to aid a single illegitimate government. It is meant primarily to help the victims of previous illegitimate governments who have brought economic havoc on to countries and who in the process have ruined those countries' abilities to provide a decent future.

If they cannot provide a decent future for their citizens, they become very dangerous neighbors to us, not just politically and economically, but from the simple standpoint of public health. All one has to do is to look at the AIDS epidemic to understand that.

Before we get too arrogant about the other parts of the world, I think we ought to remember one simple thing. We are not in this Chamber tonight because we have any special value. We

were not born Americans because we were of special worth. We were lucky enough to be born in this country simply because God was good enough to put our soul in a body that was born in this part of the planet rather than some other.

Given the fact that we have won the luck of the draw, we owe it to our fellow creatures around the world to provide an element of justice for a people who had probably not had one whit of it from all of their own lives from their own governments.

So we can sit here and chuckle and make snide remarks and use an example of one foolish leader or even a handful of them as an excuse to avoid our moral responsibilities; but in the end, all we are being asked to do is to write off the books debt that will never be repaid anyway.

We have the concept of individual bankruptcy in every civilized country in the world. We have also had the concept of collective national bankruptcy for a number of countries throughout history. We have provided debt relief to many East European countries and Middle Eastern countries. This time we are being asked, at very little, at minuscule costs to our Treasury in comparison to some of the things we have had on this floor, we are being asked to take the one action that might enable some of these countries to edge their way just a bit out of misery. That is what these amendments are meant to development.

We are not permitted under the rules of the House to have a real debate on this or to prepare a real amendment. But before this bill is finished, that is exactly what we ought to do.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud this body because tonight we are talking about some issues that we ought to all address. We ought to address the issue, are we committed to the principles of liberty and justice? Do we stand against slavery? Do we stand against involuntary servitude? If we are against these things, if we are for justice, if we are for liberty, does our commitment stop at the shoreline, or does it extend beyond our country?

In dealing with other countries, should we extend those principles to them? Or should we be against involuntary servitude only in our country, but it is fine for us to impose it on the rest of the world? That is a question we should ask.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) said these countries are ruled by monsters, by hooligans. He had it half right. They were. It is those monsters and those hooligans that we loaned this money to. It actually was not money we loaned them. We financed the defense industry and allowed them to sell these monsters and these hooligans weapons. These monsters and these hooligans bombed their people. They napalmed their people as

their people fought for democracy like we did 2 centuries ago.

At the end of the Revolutionary War, what if Britain had required us to pay them the cost of the war? What would we have said to Britain? These people that we are not imposing this debt on and requiring them to repay, they are the very people that were beaten down by the dictators and the monsters with arms and weapons that we sold them as "foreign aid." It is immoral to require them to repay this money.

Let me close by saying this: debt relief is not an end in itself; it is a means to an end. It is not a total solution to poverty, to hunger, to disease; but it is the first step. It is a necessary step. It is where the journey should begin to free these countries of the burden of debt, the chains of poverty, the shackles of despair, to enable them to minister to the economic and social needs of their people, of their children. It is the first step in raising the standard of living of those living in these impoverished nations, those in most need, those most vulnerable, the most helpless.

Without debt relief, these nations and their citizens are overwhelmed by debt, far exceeding their ability to pay. These nations do not have the ability to pay, to repay the debt and, at the same time, to offer necessary social and economic support to their people.

Here is the choice. We can continue to require the debt to be paid, and as long as we require the debt to be paid, children will not be fed. Require the debt to be paid and children will not be clothed. Continue to require the debt to be paid, and children will not go to school.

It is our decision. Let us make the decision. Let us not withhold from these poor children clothes on their backs, food in their stomachs, the right to attend school. The decision is ours.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes, but I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS). The world community is crying out for help. The people of the world all over this little planet that we call spaceship Earth are not crying out for bombs, for missiles, for more guns. They are crying out for food, for shelter, for medical assistance, for economic assistance. They are crying out tonight for debt relief.

This is the year of Jubilee. This is the year to help, to help our brothers and sisters in need. We have a moral obligation to help. We shall respond to the Macedonian call of old. There are people in need. They are hurting. They are suffering.

In Africa, a modern day Holocaust is in the making. Five thousand people will die every single day. We cannot stand solemnly by. If we fail to act and we fail to stand up and help, in the end, we are not worthy of a great people or great nation. The spirit of history will not be kind to us.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have a moral obligation, a mandate to do what we can to bring relief to our sisters and to our brothers in other lands. We do not live on this little island, on this little piece of real estate alone.

Just maybe, just maybe our foremothers and our forefathers all came to this great country in different ships. But we all are in the same boat now. If we want to live in a world at peace with itself, we must reach out and help those in need. It is Africa. It is a Third World today. We do not know who it will be tomorrow.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we had a 3-hour debate on this issue. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the sponsor of this amendment, made very eloquent statements, and her compassion was evident; and I support, I think, her cause.

But we have differences on whether or not there ought to be some restrictions on future borrowing, and that is to be expected. There will always be differences. But the difference between that debate and this debate is that, under the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), she was declaring an emergency and thus getting new money to provide for HPIC assistance.

Under the proposal of the gentlewoman of California (Ms. WATERS), as advocated by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) just a few minutes ago, she is advocating that they take the money away, or a great portion of it, from the FMF fund, the military financing fund that goes to Israel and to Egypt and to even Africa, \$15 million for countries south of Egypt.

So the question here that we have on the gentlewoman's amendment is do we want to take the money away from Israel and Egypt? Maybe there is some logic to that. Do we want to take it away from Africa?

But I am just surprised that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) is standing up and telling us that he supports the gentlewoman from California, yet he is such a strong advocate of assistance to Israel, that he would be supporting an amendment that takes money away from Israel. I just am surprised at that.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama. Does he know where this money comes from?

Mr. BACHUS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Let me say this to the gentleman, the bill that reached this floor should have had this money in it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time.

Mr. BACHUS. It is not we that had chosen one or the other.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not yielding to the gentleman for that type of conversation.

The CHAIRMAN. Both gentlemen will suspend. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. No, I will not yield.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) because it is her amendment. I am rising simply to say that, if we are going to do it, we ought to do it at a time when there is an opportunity to either increase the budget allocations or have it declared an emergency.

I had a conversation with the gentlewoman earlier before this discussion. I think there is going to be an opportunity before we leave this session, as a result of the debates taking place at Camp David, to discuss emergency supplemental appropriations; and that would be the appropriate time, I think, for her to bring this message to the House.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that, certainly, if the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for an emergency appropriation had been honored, and maybe that is the appropriate way or the better way to do it, I would not have come with this amendment that would have to find offsets in other places. But given that it was not, I have come with this amendment.

However, we have had a conversation where the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has indicated a sincere desire to work with us and to find money in light of the fact there will be some continuing negotiations about money as the whole peace agreement is being discussed.

But what I would like to say is this, I would not like to have my amendment cast as an amendment that is for or against Israel.

□ 2215

I do not think that gets us anywhere in doing that.

And I want to say something to my colleague about the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS). The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and I serve on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and we disagree on a lot of things and over the years we have disagreed. I believe that debt relief was our finest moment. I think it was a superb moment for the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the leadership that he provided in the most honest and sincere way. And I want to tell my colleague that it softened my real concerns about what and who I thought the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) was.

This has been a learning experience for all of us, and so he is not opposed to Israel and I do not want it cast that way.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would tell the gen-

tlewoman that of a total \$3.5 billion in the bill for FMF, such a huge percentage, right or wrong, goes to Egypt and Israel that the only way we could get the money would be to take it from those funds. So maybe it all could come from Egypt. That might be the best way to do it. Maybe it all could come from Israel. Maybe there would be no need. Maybe they could use the balance of the \$200 million and not give financing to anyone else in the world.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken at length on support for international debt relief earlier and was not going to seek time now, but I do want to set the record straight. My distinguished chairman represents that support for the legislation of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), and implied in that that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) in his support of that amendment, is taking money from Israel or the Middle East peace, and that is not so. The offset in the Waters bill is \$200 million. The non-Middle East foreign military financing money in the bill is \$230 million.

So it is possible to take this \$200 million from FMF without touching the Middle East peace money, and it is really, I am sad to say, disingenuous to say that if we support this bill the money is coming out of the Middle East. It is coming out of the FMF account which has \$230 million beyond the Middle East peace money and \$200 of that is what the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is drawing upon.

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

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

Mr. BACHUS. Well, I would like to approach it in a different way, and I think a consensus has been built on the floor of this House from everyone.

I have heard no one stand up and say that this is something that should not be done. I have heard the gentleman from California, and the gentleman from California obviously has not read the legislation because he says that it will go to monsters in countries who abuse human rights. In the legislation it restricts money for those countries. So I would simply say to you, when you speak on this legislation, have some understanding of it. Do not claim that we need things in the legislation which are already there and have been since the beginning of this legislation.

But despite that, let me simply say this. A consensus is building here tonight, and whether it is on the floor of this House tonight or it is 2 weeks from tonight, if everyone has spoken the truth on the floor of this House tonight, with some exception, some are not supporting debt relief, some do not believe that it is a good idea, and I applaud their honesty, I applaud their honesty to say \$1.20 is too much to

spend to save 40,000 people a day. If my colleagues believe that, say it and we will have a vote. But sometime before we go home this year, we should fund this, if we believe that we should do something about 40,000 people a day, that we could save a number of those people. No one that has looked at this issue believes that it will not help. There is no one that has looked at this issue that has said it is not the first step.

If we are not concerned enough for children, half the children in these countries who never go to school, not attend one day in school; if we are not concerned that children in these countries are not vaccinated, a 50 cent shot, and as a result they are dying every day; if \$1.20 a year is too much, then vote against debt relief. But I would say that the majority of this body recognizes that it is not only in their interest, it is in our interest, it is in our best interest.

If my colleagues have looked at this, if they have looked at this issue, far more than anything else they are convinced that this is in our national interest. We have diseases that were thought to be extinct that are now spreading across the globe because of conditions in these countries. They are reaching our shores. They are killing our people. We cannot turn our backs on these conditions without them spilling over our shores. We spend \$400 billion and \$500 billion making the world safe through arms, yet we turn our back on \$1 billion for food, for security and peace.

Why can we not do as Eisenhower did with the Marshall Plan? Why can we not give peace a chance? Do we have to change the world only through shipping arms around the world? And if we do it and it is necessary, is it necessary to the tune of \$400 billion, yet we cannot find a billion for this? Those are questions we will all have to answer.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, whereas my name has been used several times and I was not paid the courtesy of being yielded to by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); yet, when I was on the floor I was very happy to yield for a question, even when I had not used another Member's name, I think we should reexamine the courtesies that we are trying to pay to each other to maintain a debate on a very important issue. And I am very pleased and thank the gentleman from North Carolina very much for yielding to me.

There have been some very, very heartfelt points made here tonight. And this, of course, is an issue that tugs at our heart strings. But if we do not use our heads, none of the things that were just talked about that were

so important, immunizations, schooling for children, food for people who are starving, not one of those goals will be achieved. Because although the gentleman may think that I do not know about this bill, the gentleman may not know about this bill if he claims that there is a demand in this bill for democracy, for freedom of the press, for opposition parties, for everything that ensures that the countries that receive this type of debt relief will use the money honestly that they get and the resources that they have available; that they will use them honestly or for immunization or for these benevolent purposes.

No, the only thing in the bill that even touches on that says the money is not going to go to countries that have egregious human rights violations. All right, that is a step in the first direction, but that does not even go 10 percent of the way.

All the speeches we have heard tonight that have tugged at our heart strings, yes, the benevolent souls, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who has a wonderful motive in proposing this today, I will say that this does not achieve any of the ends that we heard about on the floor today because it ignores the central requirement that will achieve those ends, and that is that the countries that we are giving debt relief to have to be under the control of democratically elected governments, governments that have opposition parties, and freedom of the press, or all the resources that the gentlewoman is talking about that will be used for immunization will not go to those noble purposes. They will go, instead, to Swiss bank accounts, they will instead go to arms to repress their own people.

Because, yes, believe it or not there are gangsters in this world that control countries. Believe it or not there are monsters that are murdering people throughout this world. And the last thing we should do is give debt relief to regimes that are controlled by those kind of people. If my colleague wants the votes of people like myself, please add this into the bill.

I am on the Committee on International Relations. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and I, and the rest of the members of the committee, can work out an authorization bill that accomplishes the ends that we are talking about. Just like the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), who 3 years ago challenged us as to why we were sending so many weapons to all these countries in the developing world. And I said to her that I would support her, let us not send any weapons to dictatorships, and we came up with a code of conduct.

I challenge those of my colleagues who are speaking with their hearts tonight to work with us on this side of the aisle to put together legislation that will prevent money from going to these vicious dictatorships, prevent these loans to these vicious dictator-

ships, so that when they have democratic peoples on the ascendancy, they will not be burdened with these burdens like the people of Indonesia. We can do that.

I, in fact, have tried to propose that to Export-Import Bank loans and to other World Bank financial dealings. But, no, we have not gotten any support from this side of the aisle or that side of the aisle for something like that. Let us help the decent people of the world who are struggling to have the inoculations of their children, to teach their children. Let us make sure that the money is going to those regimes that have a chance.

What good would it have been to the people of Eastern Europe, for example, had we provided debt relief, which we did by the way to those countries, when they were still Communist dictatorships? That makes no sense at all. So let us make sure that we include the one element in the gentlewoman's proposal that will make it work rather than make it achieve just the opposite, and that is to put those type of requirements that we are dealing with countries that have democratic institutions in place.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, let me quickly make two points. Twenty-two nations under this legislation are eligible for debt relief. Not one of them is a dictatorship. Let me repeat that. Twenty-two nations are eligible for relief under this legislation. Not a one of them is a dictatorship.

Number two. Yes, we loaned much of this money, most of this money, to dictatorships. We never should have done it. We have loaned it to these monsters, and they did take it and they put it in Swiss bank accounts and that is where it went.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I also think that it is an abomination that out of the \$472 million requested that \$82 million has been approved. I heard earlier the chairman of the subcommittee talk about a person that bought a plane in Uganda. He said that it was really a horrible thing that was done. Well, let me just say a few things about Uganda.

First of all, the President of Uganda reduced the military budget by 75 percent, and he put the money into working with the people. The President of Uganda has had the first country in Africa where the AIDS pandemic has been leveled off and is in the possibility of being decreased. The President of Uganda has started elementary education for girls in that country. The President of Uganda had to pay back money to Asians expelled on December 4 of 1972 by Idi Amin, and those people have been able to come back to Uganda and the World Bank said that President Museveni had to restore their property and pay them back the land,

which he did. President Museveni reduced the civil service by 50 percent in his country.

President Museveni of Uganda, the one that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) castigated earlier, went to Sudan on the border and fought the Lord's Resistance movement, who are people who were dealing with the terrorism in Sudan that went ahead to blow up U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania.

□ 2230

President Museveni has reduced crime in his area. President Museveni is looked at as a leader in the country. And I am not defending buying a plane. But we have ECOWAS, which is a West African group of countries, we have the OAU, we have SADAK in the south, we have other kinds of North African countries, we have people that have to get around.

They do not have commercial airlines like we have here. And so the worst thing that I have heard is that a president who has done magnificent things in his country bought a plane. Now, perhaps he should have bought maybe one of our used planes perhaps. But right now we have the former president of Botswana stuck in Istanbul trying to get to an OAU meeting because a meeting in Algiers was canceled.

I think that we take an issue where Russia, hundreds of millions of dollars have gone down into the Mediterranean where Russian people are very wealthy at this time. We have heard the reports of Bosnia, hundreds of millions of dollars. We have seen what is happening in Kosovo. But no one talks about that. I think it is racist to pick out one simple issue and put it in an appropriations bill because someone decided that they had to get a plane to move around the continent and, therefore, debt relief should not go on.

It is absolutely absurd. We take one simple issue and make that a magna issue. If people knew what was going on in some of these countries where debt relief takes 50 percent of the budget, where they have reduced the whole question of the military, where they have gone and fought AIDS, where they support the United States by fighting terrorism in Sudan, then we turn around and have people say, well, somebody bought a plane; and, therefore, our debt relief is being wasted. I think it is obscene; it does not make any sense.

When we look at what is going on in the Cold War, we gave Mobutu money, we said go and deal with South Africa with P.T. Bolton and the white regime in South Africa because they were against communism. We went to UNITA in Angola and said, here is all the money you need to fight against the Communists. We do not care how much you steal. And we supported them. We took President Doe who killed the first family in Liberia and sent him all the money in the world for

10 years because he was against Communism.

I was against Communism, too. But all those debts that we have is because the blood was shed in Africa for the Cold War. Nowhere else was there blood shed other than a country or two in South America. It was all on the continent of Africa where Communism was going to have its line in the sand.

What we did was we should not have supported Mobutu. That is why they need money to do away with the debt in the Congo. We should not have supported the people in UNITA that we said give them all the guns they want, we do not care what they do to their people, we know they are stealing the money, but you know what, they do like a Communist. Well, I do not like Communism either, but now we are going to sit back and pontificate about how we have this money that was owed. It was a disgrace that we gave the money in the first place.

It is absolutely wrong to sit back and talk about we are not putting the money in the right place. It is wrong. This money should be restored. I think it is absolutely unconscionable to think that with AIDS and all the other problems going on that we could sit around talking about we do not have a need for debt relief.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am a new member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services; and over this past session, I have had an opportunity to hear us debate the issue of debt relief.

More recently in Banking, we have had a discussion of a bill called Prohibiting Predatory Lending, where lenders have preyed upon low-income mostly inner-city minority senior women and caused them to put themselves deeper in debt than they were before the lending was had.

Tonight we have the opportunity to step up to get rid of the predatory lenders, to not be predatory lenders any more for the African nations. We have the right and the opportunity to make it right, to let these nations step away from these predatory loans and allow them the opportunity to begin anew, to provide relief so that African growth and opportunity can be had, so that African people can have jobs, so that African people can be relieved of unnecessary debt.

We want and we should as a country be prepared to step up to the plate because we all want to get into Africa and do business. We know how rich Africa is, what opportunities there are for growth not only for that country but for our country as well. So why not give them the opportunity to be relieved of debt?

And do not think that we can run through Africa and do business and not get AIDS. AIDS is a serious issue. It is an economic security issue that will affect us all. So it is time now for us to in fact do the right thing and give debt relief.

And, see, I am not talking about heartstrings. The gentleman from California kept talking about my heartstrings are tugged, I feel sorry for the African people. It is not about heart. It is about money. We need money to relieve the African countries of the debt. Let us stop talking about heart. Let us stop talking about morality. Get them from under the debt.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Let me say I rise in support of the amendment by the gentlewoman from California. Let me say that the camera of history is now rolling on us and the camera of history will judge us and we will be judged by how we treat the least among us. We will be judged by how we treat the least among us.

This is a question about motivation. For sure, as my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), indicated, we had motivation to find some money when the Cold War existed. Where is the motivation to find money for humanitarian interests? Five thousand people are dying a day. Where is the motivation to find money?

Now, sometimes we forget our own history right here in this country. I hear my colleagues talking about all the things that are going wrong in Africa. Do we have to remember the history of this country, the wild wild West and all the crazy things that were going on here? Do we have to remember that many of the individuals who now are the upper echelon in this country, their families were crooks and did illegal activities? It was an evolving thing.

Many of the countries that we want to help, as my colleague from New Jersey so poignantly said, we, in order to fight against Communism, we financed it, we did not care what they did, and we gave them money; and now we have this debt.

We live in the greatest fiscal times of our lives; yet we are going to turn our back on people who have blood like we do, on people who have needs like we do. How can we turn our backs in this time and in this day and in this age?

We must never forget who we are and where we came from. This was not just given to us here in America. As I indicated earlier, those to whom much is given, much is required. Much is required of us now. We must not turn our backs on the least of us. We must support, we must pass this amendment by the gentlewoman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 546, further proceedings on

the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) will be postponed.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4811, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4811 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 546, no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except:

(1) pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

(2) the following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 60 minutes:

One of either the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 11 or the amendment numbered 15; and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), regarding Child Survival and Disease Program Fund;

(3) the following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes:

The amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 28; and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding Development Assistance;

(4) the following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes:

One of either the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 5 or the amendment numbered 6; the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) regarding conscription under the age of 18; and the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 18;

(5) the following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes:

The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) regarding North Korea; the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) regarding Panama; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) regarding biotechnology research; the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) regarding Child Survival and Disease Program Fund; the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN)

regarding the Tariff Act; the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) regarding peacekeeping operations; the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) regarding Economic Support Fund; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding Congo; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding sanctions against Angola; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding peacekeeping operations; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding Sudan; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding restrictions on assistance to governments destabilizing Angola; the gentleman from California (Mr. MENENDEZ) regarding Peru; the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) regarding Economic Support Fund; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) regarding section 558; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) regarding Armenia Azerbaijan peace and democracy initiative; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) regarding termination of unilateral agricultural or medical sanctions; the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) regarding honor crimes; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) regarding the African Development Bank; the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) regarding international financial institution loans; the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) regarding the Ukraine; the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) regarding Child Survival; and the amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 7, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25 and 26.

Each additional amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee, and shall be considered as read. Each additional amendment shall be debatable for the time specified equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I make the following announcement: that it is our intention if this unanimous consent request is agreed to that the Committee will reconvene and will continue working on this bill until 1 o'clock in the morning. However, any votes will be rolled until tomorrow. We would convene at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning and, hopefully, be able to finish this bill by 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon and be able to adjourn for the weekend.

So I just use the time to make that announcement.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS)

and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the chair of the Black Caucus, for their leadership in putting all this together.

□ 2245

I want to say to my distinguished chairman, at last we have found something to agree on this evening. So I support his unanimous consent request. I just want to make note that I am not certain in paragraph 3 whether the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD amendment is 27 or 28. Do we know what that is?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. It would be No. 28 in the printed unanimous consent request. We completed No. 27.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, but I do ask the gentleman for clarification so that the Members will understand. By continuing on until 1 o'clock in the morning, the amendments as printed will come up in that particular order. Is that our understanding?

Mr. CALLAHAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I then withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that it is the Chair's understanding that the amendments will be considered in the order in which they appear in the bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 546 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4811.

□ 2245

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today,