

Pickering	Schiff	Terry
Pitts	Schrock	Thomas
Platts	Scott	Thompson (CA)
Pombo	Sensenbrenner	Thompson (MS)
Pomeroy	Serrano	Thune
Portman	Sessions	Thurman
Price (NC)	Shadegg	Tiahrt
Pryce (OH)	Shaw	Tiberi
Putnam	Shays	Tierney
Quinn	Sherman	Toomey
Radanovich	Sherwood	Trafficant
Rahall	Shimkus	Turner
Ramstad	Shows	Udall (CO)
Rangel	Simmons	Udall (NM)
Regula	Simpson	Upton
Rehberg	Sisisky	Velazquez
Reyes	Skeen	Visclosky
Reynolds	Skelton	Vitter
Riley	Smith (MI)	Walden
Rivers	Smith (NJ)	Walsh
Rodriguez	Smith (TX)	Wamp
Roemer	Smith (WA)	Waters
Rogers (KY)	Snyder	Watt (NC)
Rogers (MI)	Solis	Watts (OK)
Rohrabacher	Souder	Waxman
Ros-Lehtinen	Spence	Weiner
Ross	Spratt	Weldon (FL)
Rothman	Stark	Weldon (PA)
Roukema	Stearns	Weller
Roybal-Allard	Stenholm	Wexler
Rush	Strickland	Whitfield
Ryan (WI)	Stump	Wicker
Ryun (KS)	Stupak	Wilson
Sabo	Sununu	Wolf
Sanchez	Sweeney	Woolsey
Sanders	Tanner	Wu
Sandlin	Tauscher	Wynn
Saxton	Tauzin	Young (FL)
Scarborough	Taylor (MS)	
Schakowsky	Taylor (NC)	

NAYS—4

Flake	Schaffer
Paul	Tancredo

NOT VOTING—24

Ackerman	Foley	Royce
Bono	Fossella	Sawyer
Burton	Gilchrest	Slaughter
Capito	Gutierrez	Thornberry
Clyburn	Istook	Towns
Cooksey	Lewis (CA)	Watkins
Cubin	Meek (FL)	Young (AK)
Davis, Thomas M.	Mollohan	
	Ortiz	

□ 1257

Mr. FLAKE and Mr. SCHAFFER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TANCREDO changed his vote from "present" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes No. 14 and 15 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been here I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 14 and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 15.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 14 and 15, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to attend the recorded votes today, February 14, 2001. I was traveling with President George W. Bush on his visit to my

district in West Virginia. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on both rollcall No. 14 and 15.

AFFECTING REPRESENTATION OF MAJORITY AND MINORITY MEMBERSHIP OF SENATE MEMBERS OF JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 279) affecting the representation of the majority and minority membership of the Senate Members of the Joint Economic Committee, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 279

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, and specifically section 5(a) of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1024(a)), the Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate shall for the duration of the One Hundred Seventh Congress, for so long as the majority party and the minority party have equal representation in the Senate, be represented by five Members of the majority party and five Members of the minority party.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE FROM FEBRUARY 14, 2001, TO FEBRUARY 26, 2001, AND RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF SENATE FROM FEBRUARY 15, 2001, OR FEBRUARY 16, 2001, TO FEBRUARY 26, 2001

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 32), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 32

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Wednesday, February 14, 2001, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, February 26, 2001, and that when the House adjourns on Monday, February 26, 2001, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 27, 2001, for morning-hour debate, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, February 15, 2001, or Friday, February 16, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon Monday, February 26, 2001, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority

Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

□ 1300

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER, MAJORITY LEADER, AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS AUTHORIZED BY LAW OR BY THE HOUSE, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, February 26, 2001, the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INTERNATIONAL BASIC EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my colleagues that I, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), will this afternoon be briefly addressing the importance of an issue we care passionately about: children's education, children's basic education, girls' education, and our U.S. international assistance dollars in helping developing countries make schools and educational opportunities available.

Last Congress I had the privilege of serving on the House Committee on International Relations. From that position, I began to focus on identifying which foreign aid dollars could actually make a lasting difference and bring systemic changes in the areas that we are trying to help.

Too often we are just late to the crime scene. Whether it is famine, war,

epidemic, we are just trying to pick up after the catastrophe has already occurred. We need to commit our scarce foreign assistance dollars in ways that help bring lasting improvements, build better opportunities, and prevent these cycles of tragedy.

As I researched the question, I became convinced of the value of one development investment in particular: international basic education. I was intrigued to learn that educating children, particularly making a special effort to get girls into schools, because so often they are not allowed to participate, yields a higher rate of return than virtually any other effort we can make in the international developing world.

The data seemed almost too good to be true. With increased education, women live healthier lives. They marry later, live longer, have fewer children, and their children have vastly superior survival rates. The data compiled by the World Bank and other international organizations report that for every year of education a little girl receives beyond grade four, there is a 10 percent reduction in family size, a 15 percent drop in child malnutrition, a 10 percent reduction in infant mortality, and up to a 20 percent increase in wages and microenterprise development.

The statistics support what economists and development experts already know: educating children, again especially girls, creates a powerful impact, improving the lives of little children, subsequently improving the lives of their families, and improving the lives resulting later in the villages and the entire communities.

After hearing all this, I had a strong desire to actually see some of these schools, see our U.S. assistance dollars in action; and so along with my colleague, the gentleman from Green Bay, Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), we made a bipartisan effort sponsored by some of the NGOs that are implementing these assistance dollars to look firsthand to see how this was working.

Our trip left me with a rock-solid conviction that the data on girls education is correct. In both Ghana and Mali, our taxpayer dollars have made a significant difference in the lives of children and families. And even more effectively than the dollars that are used, we were struck by the deep commitment in terms of USAID officials, the professionals in the NGO community implementing these programs, the families and the personnel from the countries making these little schools run themselves. This is driving systemic change in these areas.

We visited many classrooms, spoke to parents and community leaders and learned firsthand of the changes being made. This picture reflects a meeting with parents we had in a very small rural village. This individual, the village hunter, the one responsible for bagging the game to feed the village, told us that with the children even get-

ting basic primary education, the cotton traders buying their products can no longer cheat them by the scales. They use the children to make certain they get a fair deal. Time and time again we heard of this kind of change.

We heard from parents that now children can help them find when they are buying medicine that has already got expiration dates; they will help them watch for expiration dates on foods and help them write letters; that schools are a safe place for them to be. They no longer have to worry about the children when they go to market.

We heard from the village chief and president of a parents' association tell us that educating a little girl is like lighting a dark room. He said that their school is giving priority to girls' participation in enrollment, making a difference for the first time in bringing girls into primary education and the opportunities that flow from that. The parents told us that once the girls learn to read and write they teach others in the family and they become better mothers. Even in a young teenager's years, they are doing it.

I just want to, in closing, show you one of the little girls participating in one of the schools that we observed. This little girl wants to be a doctor and help others in her community. Her chances without our assistance dollars would be a million to one. But with our assistance dollars, this dream is possible.

We need to continue our commitment in this area, and I am very pleased to work with the gentleman from Wisconsin and others in a bipartisan effort to continue to support this work.

U.S. DOLLARS ARE WORKING IN INTERNATIONAL BASIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, what I want to do is to build a little bit on some of the comments that we have just heard from my companion and good friend, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

We did travel together for 7 days in Ghana and Mali and did see some very good things and got some great news from a continent that, quite honestly, has seen less of good news and more of sobering news in recent months and years. The purpose of our brief time there was to measure education reform in general in those countries, but also, more importantly, to deal with the issues my good friend has pointed to of the role of girls' education in those countries and the pace of reform in that area.

We looked at a project called SAGE, Strategies for Advancing Girls Education, as it was being implemented in those two countries. That is a partnership involving USAID dollars and the expertise of the Academy for Edu-

cational Development and some wonderful other NGOs in the area and, of course, local leaders.

Now, I am quick to admit to my colleagues, as I was to my traveling companions, that I am a skeptic in this area. Twelve years ago, my wife, Sue, and I taught high school in east Africa, and we were very much aware of the institutional and cultural barriers that exist, particularly in the developing world, barriers which all too often prevent girls from going to school and finishing their education. I readily admit today that I came out a true believer, a great believer in the progress that our dollars are making in those countries.

There are so many heroes that the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and I can point to in these educational reforms. Of course, the local leaders and the parents' groups, who have to embrace these reforms in order for them to have a chance. Also wonderful organizations like Save the Children and Oxfam. But in the brief time that I have, I would like to focus in particular on one program, a program involving USAID dollars and the Academy for Educational Development and something called the Life Skills Curriculum in the country of Mali.

Through this wonderful program, educators are able to weave throughout their curriculum valuable life skills, especially in the area of preventable health. My colleague and I watched with great interest as teachers would use lessons on, for example, how to prevent dysentery as part of their instruction on grammar so that these lessons truly were a part of the curriculum at every stage and at every level.

As I said, I was a skeptic. Those of us who have taught in the developing world are often struck by how irrelevant our lessons can often be, especially in countries that have an education system which is a holdover from a colonial power. Where I taught, we had the old English system, the English style, rote learning. But what we are seeing in countries like Mali is a new style of education, a new style that involves practical lessons day in and day out, and involves students talking to each other and building upon their own experience.

My colleagues can see to my left here a picture. This shows a young lady in Ghana. What she is using, because of the shortage of paper, she is using a little chalkboard, a little slate board to help her get through her lessons. That shows some of the material disadvantages that these students often have.

My next chart shows something which may appear very reasonable and normal and everyday to those of us in the West but is a quite remarkable characteristic of reform in education in Mali and Ghana, and that is having breakout groups, where students are no longer stuck in that old rote-learning pattern that is a holdover from the colonial days. Instead, they talk about lessons in a very real way, and they