

upon being a reliable provider of assistance to the Egyptian military.

□ 1445

“A transfer of funds from the military assistance account to the economic account will damage the credibility of our bilateral relations at a very sensitive moment in the region, one that has witnessed Egyptian engagement in and support of our regional objectives.”

I include the full text of the letter for the RECORD.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2004.

Hon. JIM KOLBE,
Chairman, Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I ask for your support on the subject of a possible amendment to the Fiscal Year 2005 Foreign Operations Appropriation bill that proposes to reduce our annual military assistance to Egypt by 25 percent and to reprogram it for economic assistance. We understand that the House may consider this amendment July 15. This matter is of urgent concern, as I believe that any changes to the Egypt military assistance account would seriously undermine the strong U.S.-Egypt partnership that has been built since the 1979 Camp David Accords and that continues to be one of the foundations for achieving U.S. foreign policy goals in the Middle East.

As you know, U.S. military aid to Egypt is a cornerstone of the Camp David Accords. The Administration is opposed to any amendment that would modify our commitment to the parties as contained in that agreement. This commitment is the foundation of our efforts to promote peace in the region, to combat terrorism, and to advance interoperability with the Egyptian military. In addition, a \$325 million reduction in military assistance, as proposed, could lead to the cancellation of approximately \$2.2 billion in total contract value; these contracts all go towards the purchase of U.S. products.

Our military assistance to Egypt has contributed to regional stability in an area that had previously been the scene of military conflict against Israel. This calming of tensions has enabled us to develop a strategic partnership with Egypt that has contributed to a broad range of U.S. objectives in the region, including the Global War on Terrorism, the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq, and more recently, efforts to stop the humanitarian crisis in Darfur, Sudan. Egypt has also undertaken a critical initiative to work with Israel to support the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip through the reorganization and training of the Palestinian security services.

On a bilateral military-to-military level, our assistance has helped to modernize the Egyptian military, thereby creating a defensive force that is interoperable with, and capable of supporting, U.S. security goals in the region. We also continue to train Egyptian military officers through the International Military Education and Training Program and to conduct joint training exercises, thereby ensuring that our militaries both understand and support each other at critical moments. This Egyptian capacity has enabled the Egyptian military to participate in international peacekeeping operations, to help us successfully prosecute Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, to enable our craft to safely transit the Suez Canal, to enable our planes to traverse Egyptian airspace, and to provide our tankers with invaluable access to Egyptian facilities.

In Egypt we have an ally that can help us in war and peace. Our credibility in this relationship depends to a great degree upon being a reliable provider of assistance to the Egyptian military. A transfer of funds from the military assistance account to the economic account will damage the credibility of our bilateral relations at a very sensitive moment in the region, one that has witnessed Egyptian engagement in and support of our regional objectives. I hope you will oppose this amendment.

Sincerely,

COLIN L. POWELL.

Again, I have great respect for the author of the amendment. However, this is not the time to make a cut of more than 40 percent of military assistance. Even if we were so inclined, now is not the time to take that kind of action that would disrupt our ongoing efforts to facilitate the withdrawal of Israel from Gaza. I urge the House to reject this amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Since the 1978 Camp David accords, Egypt and the United States have shared a close relationship built around mutual strategic interests and common goals.

The U.S.-Egyptian military is both strong and important.

Our military assistance to Egypt has helped to build an Egyptian military that is interoperable with the United States, and actively supports U.S. security goals in the region. This Egyptian capacity has enabled our U.S. ships to safely traverse the Suez Canal, and enabled our planes to effectively traverse Egyptian airspace.

Let me be clear. I am not satisfied with the pace of economic and political reform in Egypt. I know many of the Egyptian people feel the same way. There are many issues the United States and Egypt will have to work through in the coming years. It is important for the United States to continue to press Egypt on these issues.

However, I believe this amendment would unwisely undermine the U.S.-Egyptian military relationship. This would be particularly damaging at a time when Egypt is providing important cooperation in the War on Terrorism and the peace process between Israel and the Palestinians. In addition, as we ask Egypt to take a more prominent role in the security of the Gaza strip, we should not undercut Egypt's ability to play the role we are asking them to play.

Mr. Chairman, for all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this amendment.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of my good friend from California Mr. LANTOS's amendment.

It is time for the United States to start redirecting aid to Egypt.

The United States has been providing military assistance to Egypt for over 20 years and Egypt has made peace with its neighbors.

Egypt no longer has to fear from any outside threats to its sovereignty and

it's now time this aid move toward helping Egyptian people not the military.

The real threat to Egypt comes from the poverty and lack of freedom that exists in the country today.

We cannot continue to fund the military while people live in squalor and do not have the freedoms they deserve.

Egypt must start focusing on its people and its economic reforms.

Moving towards economic aid will help to push this process forward.

Egypt is a consistent violator of human rights and our funding needs to address how to begin to respect these rights.

Even in the State Department human rights reports, they reported that there is “convincing evidence” the police regularly use torture to extract confessions, and detain suspects without charging people or bringing them to trial.

I continue to see Egypt's lack of respect for minority and religious rights.

Our funding should not be building up Egypt military but instead on building its society.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of this amendment and urge my colleagues to support the passage of this important amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) will be postponed.

The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR) assumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and with the chairman of the subcommittee.

I want to first thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) for his work in overseeing the critical rebuilding effort in Iraq.

A key element in our foreign policy is developing and strengthening local governmental institutions. It is my

privilege to represent an organization, the Research Triangle Institute, which is helping to fulfill this laudable goal. I joined the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) on a Congressional delegation trip he led to Iraq in November, and we saw firsthand evidence of RTI's good work in Kirkuk and elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina and I are coming together on the House floor today to discuss the important ongoing work which Congress supports and RTI conducts.

USAID's Local Governance Project has supported the establishment of 16 provincial councils and more than 700 local councils. The project staff of international experts in municipal government, supported by almost 3,000 Iraqi nationals, has worked to link local council leaders, citizens, and municipal service departments to improve service delivery to the citizens of Iraq. They have coached and trained 15 governors, 42 deputy governors, 420 department heads and more than 380 local service departments.

Working with USAID and RTI, Iraqis are building the capacity to deliver essential services, to develop transparent and participatory policy processes at the local level, and to develop civil society institutions that foster participation in political processes. USAID Administrator Andrew Natsios has remarked that local government will be the training ground for future national political leaders.

Mr. Chairman, that future is now.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) for such remarks on the local governance projects as he might want to make?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

Mr. BURR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and I appreciate my colleague including me in this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina is correct. This is an exciting and important work. With the Committee on Appropriations' financial and USAID's technical support, Iraqis have seized the opportunity to participate in government and have demonstrated an aptitude for local governance. They are working hard to restore services in their communities. They are drafting and approving procedures and policies to efficiently provide government services. They are prioritizing the needs of the people within their communities, and they are developing budgets to support those plans.

The Iraqi people have discovered government that operates with the consent of the governed, and they are enthusiastic about it. Their representative officials have discovered accountability to the people, and they are eager to demonstrate their fidelity.

There is still a long way to go in Iraq before the seeds of democracy that have been planted are fully established. We cannot be short-sighted with respect to these kinds of activities in our foreign operations agenda. We must make certain that the work started by such programs can be sustained as a partnership not only between the United States and Iraq but also through our foreign operations activities throughout the world.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank both the gentlemen for their comments.

For decades, the Iraqi people have labored under the brutal dictatorship of Saddam Hussein. In the last year, Iraqis have established local governments and representative councils. These entities represent a radical departure from past practice in which the central government made all of the decisions, including many that we believe are appropriate for the local level, such as education or municipal services.

As the gentleman remarked, we face significant challenges in Iraq that are going to require our continuing oversight. The United States' assistance to Iraq is well over \$21 billion thus far and is the largest single assistance program ever undertaken in the world.

The effective implementation of programs like the Local Governance Project is critical to American efforts to bring peace to the Middle East and to the successful withdrawal of American troops from Iraq, and I appreciate the gentlemen for bringing this to our attention today.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY
OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

In title II, in the item relating to "MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION", after the aggregate dollar amount insert "(increased by \$250,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "GLOBAL HIV/AIDS INITIATIVE", after the aggregate dollar amount insert "(increased by \$90,000,000)".

In title IV, in the item relating to "CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION", after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$425,000,000)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes on the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the distinguished chairman for his great work on foreign relations. I share his great concern with the fact that half the people in this world live

on less than \$2 a day, that half the people in this world have not made a phone call, that one-fifth of the people do not have safe drinking water, and that 115 million children do not have a school to go to.

We need to, with this crisis out there, have a razor-sharp focus on results, not dollars spent. We need to demand results from our aid programs, not try to comfort ourselves by saying that we spent some dollars on certain programs.

What this amendment does is it takes \$425 million out of our contribution for this year to the World Bank, which has a poor track record of delivering results. The World Bank is far too much focused on process, as opposed to performance. They might record how many schools they built, but they are not focusing on how many children we have really educated. They may focus on what water treatments they have helped fund but not on how many families are really getting clean water from them.

They already do have sufficient capital to expand their programs. We put this money, \$90 million of it, into the global AIDS initiative, which has a proven track record. It meets this year's commitment of our \$15 billion plan that we have approved as a Congress. There are millions of orphans throughout Africa because of the AIDS epidemic. This is a horrible pandemic. It threatens the stability of the continent. It must be addressed.

We also put \$215 million into the Millennium Challenge Account. Today in this bill only half of the President's request is funded. This gets us part of the way there. The Millennium Challenge Account has criteria that ensure results. They make sure that the countries that we are investing in rule justly, that they invest in their people, that they pursue free enterprise, economic freedom. There is substantial evidence that exists that shows that countries that do this have growing standard of livings, that they are more likely to eat better, live longer, have children in school rather than working in the fields, speak, assemble, worship more freely. They are three times more likely to elect their governments democratically, and they are less likely to fight wars.

It would be mistaken to say that this amendment reduced investments in aid. We indeed invest in a proven AIDS initiative. It is also mistaken to say that it is designated towards AIDS funds within IDA. IDA can continue their AIDS program with the capital they have already, and the MCA encourages health care spending. It is also mistaken to say that this reduces investment in Africa. The AIDS program is for Africa, and over half of the first 16 countries chosen for the Millennium Challenge Accounts were part of Sub-Saharan Africa.

So I encourage my colleagues to vote to support putting our dollars where the results are, in fighting AIDS, in

fighting other diseases, in fighting hunger and poverty.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I join the chairman in opposition to the amendment. Because what the amendment would do is cut \$250 million from the International Development Association and IDA funds, loans to the poorest countries in the world, mostly African countries, at low rates of interest and long-term repayment schedules.

IDA is the source of much of the capital that poor countries use to rebuild vital infrastructure and deal with the chronic problems of poor health and education systems. This amendment, if we had unlimited funds and we can do it all, it might make sense, but in light of the good work of the committee in trying to balance needs in all the accounts, I do not think we can possibly deal with cutting \$250 million from IDA, and, therefore, I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

President Kennedy used to say, to govern is to choose, and we all would like to do a lot of things, but we do not have the resources to do everything.

As we know, the World Bank is sitting on top of \$119 billion in equity, enough to make investments in the area that they need to make investments.

What we are talking about is an additional \$90 million towards the President's own AIDS initiative. Now, he did a big signing, big photograph, but we have got to put the resources towards that to fight the scourge of AIDS across Africa and the Caribbean and \$250 million towards the Millennium Challenge Corporation, another initiative by the President.

We cannot underfund these initiatives. They would go primarily to the countries that would also receive funding from the World Bank, but we do know by now that the World Bank has the resources. It is not shallow on resources. It has \$119 billion in equity to make the types of loans that they need to make.

We know today that dealing with the health care crisis faced in Africa and Caribbean countries, that we would be alleviating one of the greatest problems for their development. That is in the area of AIDS and other health care. The Millennium Project and the President's AIDS initiative would attack those problems head on, and we cannot continue to underfund the President's initiative in those areas, which is what has happened.

By increasing the funding on the global AIDS initiative, we are showing our strong commitment to fight against AIDS in Africa and the Caribbean nations; and in another rare moment of bipartisanship, we are even working to support the President's own AIDS initiative, underfunding the administration's promise by close to \$800 million this year.

Increasing funding for the Millennium Challenge Account is a good investment that gives impoverished families in the poorest countries access to health care, education and welfare. This is a policy we can all support over giving additional funds to the World Bank that has the capital that it needs now to continue to make the loans that are necessary for the World Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his leadership.

□ 1500

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Africa, I rise in strong opposition to the Kennedy amendment cutting funds for the International Development Association which is helping the Earth's poorest countries reduce poverty.

In 2005, a country with a gross national income per capita exceeding \$2.45 a day is not eligible for IDA loans. Imagine the poverty and the misery of nations impacted by IDA loans. IDA serves 38 nations in Africa that are among the world's 48 poorest nations.

This amendment is exceedingly harmful to people of the 29 African nations that currently receive IDA support, but are not included in the President's AIDS initiative. Millions of poor Africans are the losers.

It is foolish to fight HIV by cutting IDA funding for HIV in Chad or cutting support for children's health in Madagascar or by cutting the support for building peace in war-torn Sierra Leone or cutting educational assistance to Malawi.

People living in desperation and misery on \$1 or \$2 a day should be supported in this House and International Development Association, and we should not punish the planet's poorest people.

The amendment's author mentioned, where is the accountability? I would like to point out that two nations, Turkey and Korea who were once recipients to this aid, are now participants in IDA. This is a program which does have oversight, which does help the poorest of the poor in the world; and I would urge that the Members not support this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to respond to the distinguished ranking member and my distinguished fellow Member from Min-

nesota. This is not a debate as to whether we give to the poorest countries on Earth, whether we give to sub-Saharan Africa. In both cases IDA gives, yes, to the poorest countries but so does the Millennium Challenge Account. In fact, the Millennium Challenge Account is required to go to the 74 poorest countries. If you look at the 16 countries that were included in the initial allocation, Madagascar, one of the ones my fellow colleagues mentioned, is a recipient of the Millennium Challenge Account as is Benin and Cape Verde and Ghana and Lesotho and Mali and Mozambique and Senegal. So we are addressing sub-Saharan Africa. We are addressing AIDS. We are doing it again in a way that focuses on results, that focuses on making sure we are making a difference for the poorest people in the world.

I do encourage my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) for his amendment in the sense that the support that it gives the Millennium Challenge Corporation, I think as he knows, I am one of his biggest champions. Indeed, it is our bill last year that carried the authorization for Millennium Challenge Corporation. But I do have to rise to oppose this amendment, cutting IDA to pay for addition funds through the Millennium Challenge Corporation and for HIV/AIDS.

As I said at the very outset and as the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has said, this bill is a bipartisan one which means none of us could get everything we wanted. Given that the subcommittee had a budget allocation of \$1.9 billion that is below what the President requested for all his initiatives, we simply could not fund all of them. The Millennium Challenge Corporation is one that we were not able to fully fund. I wanted to. I would have liked to, but the dollars simply were not there. Already our legislation cuts the International Development Association which, of course, is known as IDA, by \$211 million below the President's request. And I can assure you this is already giving the Department of Treasury heartburn. So I feel compelled to resist further cuts to this funding.

Diverting these funds into bilateral programs denies six times as much as the gentleman's cuts to the poorest nations. Now, I made this point on the Sherman amendment earlier, because other countries put up for every U.S. taxpayer dollar that is put up, other countries and donors and resources provide \$6 for each of those. This means a cut of six times as much when we cut this money out of there.

Mr. Chairman, I think the ranking member and the subcommittee and I made a difficult decision to cut the World Bank funding by \$211 million

below the request, but another \$425 million would put U.S. leadership at risk at the bank, in addition to reducing billions of dollars of assistance for poor countries for Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

As an appropriations chairman, I have a responsibility to manage many requests and many priorities, Presidential and congressional. And I do think that in this bill we have found a good balance between the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the HIV/AIDS accounts, and the IDA. And I think we have met all of those requirements. And I look forward, let me just say, to working with the gentleman to support the Millennium Challenge Corporation in the years ahead.

I am excited about what it is going to do. We are at the very beginning of that, but I am very excited about the potential for the Millennium Challenge Corporation. I hope we can provide substantially more funding for it in the years ahead.

I can also say that if our committee receives a higher allocation in conference, which is possible if the Senate numbers are different, I will certainly work my hardest to ensure that more of that goes to the Millennium Challenge Corporation. But for now I am compelled to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) will be postponed.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I do so for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the great ape populations are declining at an alarming rate worldwide.

The continuing destruction of habitat, in combination with the growth in the commercial bushmeat trade in Africa and increased logging activities in Indonesia, has led scientists to suggest that the majority of the great ape populations will be extinct in the next 10 to 20 years.

To address this crisis, in May 2001, UNESCO and UNEP established the Great Apes Survival Project, known as GRASP.

GRASP is uniquely placed to mobilize resources and provide a communication platform to bring the dramatic decline of great ape population to a halt.

But, sadly, Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us includes no funding for the GRASP program.

While I recognize that assessed contributions to UNESCO are part of the CJS appropriations bill, voluntary contributions to UNESCO programs, like GRASP, are usually included in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill's International Organizations Account.

For fiscal year 2004, Congress appropriated almost \$1.9 million in voluntary contributions to UNESCO programs. It is my hope that, in the further deliberations of this bill, both here and in the conference, serious consideration can be given to the funding of GRASP programs to protect the great apes from total extinction.

Could I ask my friend from Arizona, the distinguished Chair, for his help and cooperation on this very important issue as we move to the conference on this legislation.

Mr. KOLBE. Let me say I appreciate the gentleman calling this to our attention, and I agree with the importance of this program. I certainly would be happy to work with my friend from California as the bill moves to conference.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman very much for that.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:

In title III, in the item relating to "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

In title IV, in the item relating to "GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY", after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$13,177,734)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

I rise today on an amendment dealing with the Global Environment Facility. It is the primary financing mechanism for important environmental work around the world. It helps developing countries address environmental challenges that may impact the United States as well as those countries. And as the world's largest donor to the institution, our country plays a critical leadership role.

The projects of the GEF fall into four major categories, conserving biodiversity, expanding clean energy production and its use, cleaning up international waters, and protecting its fisheries, and phasing out ozone depleting chemicals. All critical priorities for this country and citizens around the world.

Since 1991, the GEF has funded over 1,000 projects in 160 different countries. And it is not just the investment that the United States made. A key point I think that needs to be focused on here is that for every dollar spent by the United States the GEF leverages \$15 in funding from other sources.

I have a wide range of examples, but the committee is well aware of the good work; and I will conserve time by not going into that. But I do want to make the point that it is the United States as the largest shareholder that has a unique responsibility with this program. Two years ago, the Bush administration committed to increase its contribution to GEF for 4 years and to pay off our long-standing unpaid debt that was \$210 million in 3 years. This agreement served as a catalyst for other donor governments to also increase their donations.

Now, I appreciate and I referenced earlier on the floor the difficulty that this subcommittee has given the allocation that they were given. But that said, the subcommittee reported out a funding level of \$107 million with no arrearage payment. The amendment that I am offering here today would add \$13.2 million in order to at least fully fund the President's budget request of \$120.7 million and at least continue the commitment towards dealing with the arrearages even though it would put us behind schedule.

I appreciate this difficult situation the subcommittee is in. I am prepared to withdraw the amendment, but I would seek to ask either the Chair or the ranking member if there is some prospect that if we are able to work this through the process, if we might be able to continue meeting the commitment that the administration has made in the past to fund the arrearages.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the spirit of the gentleman's amendment and regret that I cannot support it in this context. We have worked hard to bring a bill to the floor under a requirement to reduce the President's request by \$1.9 billion. And so in order to accomplish this, we were forced to make, as you know, many tough choices, and reducing funding for the Global Environmental Facility of the World Bank, unfortunately, was one of them.

I have always worked hard to get adequate funding for the GEF because I

believe it provides a vital source of funds for environmentally sound lending. The bill does provide \$107.5 million for the GEF, which is the amount of our annual contribution. As you know, we did not include the additional \$13 million requested for arrears and that is reflected in the funding levels of other banks as well.

It would be my hope that we could find a way to make up these arrears either in conference on this year's bill or next year. I know of the gentleman's commitment to GEF. I share that commitment. And I want to assure you of my intention to work towards this goal. I thank you for bringing this issue to the attention of my colleagues.

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

I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for his dedication to environmental issues and raising the funding for the Global Environmental Facility today.

As my colleague knows, the bill before the House today is bipartisan, as the gentlewoman has indicated, and of course that means that we do not get everything we want here. Given the priorities of the President, the priorities of both sides of the House, we did cut funding for the Global Environmental Facility by \$13 million from the President's request.

□ 1515

But we did fund the entire regularly scheduled contribution of \$107.5 million to the GEF so that we do not go further into arrears.

Just so my colleague understands that the GEF was not the one that was targeted specifically. The International Development Association, or IDA, which we just discussed in the last amendment, the concessional arm of the World Bank was cut \$211 million from the administration's request.

So I appreciate my colleague raising the issue, and I appreciate his withdrawing the amendment and the bipartisan spirit within which the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and I have worked during the course of the year, and I thank the gentleman.

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

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

I appreciate both, again, the difficult situation that the subcommittee was facing and the comments from my friend the Chair and the ranking member.

I will withdraw the amendment, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that we could continue to focus on trying to keep this commitment. I appreciate that there were a number of other areas that we simply had to shut the door on in terms of paying arrears where we were in arrears, but this I hope, if we get to the point where there are additional resources, bears special attention because of the global impact of these environmental programs, how

they are targeted at some of the most desperately needy of countries and how this is an area, if we do not continue to make progress, we are going to slide back.

But I appreciate the work that has been done and look forward to working with my colleagues so that hopefully we will be able to restore it and gain the benefit of those important investments.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. PAUL:

Title II of the bill is amended by striking the item relating to "MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes the Millennium Challenge Account. When this program was put in place a year ago, it was originally thought to be a program that would replace old-fashioned foreign aid, but because the votes were not there, instead of a transition from one form of foreign aid to another, it was just added on. That is the way we do things here. We keep adding on in order to satisfy everybody.

So the foreign aid bill now is up to nearly \$20 billion, and that represents \$1.25 billion for the Millennium Challenge Account, and it is a \$266 million increase from 1 year ago. So we are making "progress", if one is a strong supporter of such programs.

The strongest argument of those who endorse foreign aid is a humanitarian argument: We are rich, they are poor, we have empathy, we must help, it is our moral obligation. For the most part, people go along with that. But I have a humanitarian argument, also. Mine is that it does not work and that, if we indeed care about people, we ought to be encouraging free markets and individual liberty, and that is when countries become more prosperous.

But the idea that we can promote humanitarian programs by taking literally money from poor people in this country and giving it to rich, influential leaders in other countries and we

are going to have this miraculous success I think is a myth. It does not work that way, and there are people who are not benefitted.

Now, it may be said by those who have promoted the Millennium Challenge Account, that is exactly what we are trying to address. We want to reward countries that are moving in the direction of free markets. Now, that is a nice notion, but it cannot work. It is impossible because when we give money to a government, it is politicized. It becomes bureaucratic, and it has to be handed out to special interests.

When Paul Applegarth, the chairman of the corporation for the Millennium Challenge Account was before our committee, I asked him a question. I said, are there any American companies that will benefit by this type of program? I actually was pretty shocked with his answer, because he was very blunt. He said, I certainly hope so. In other words, even our American corporations benefit from programs like this.

So it would be nice to think that the poor people of these other countries are going to benefit, but I think it is a greater injury to the poor people of this country. My colleagues say the poor people of this country do not pay taxes. Well, that is incorrect, because the inflation tax is borne by the poor and the middle class, and that occurs when we spend too much money. And this is too much money spent the wrong way, and we do not have the authority to do it. Besides, how many of us ever get calls from our constituents saying please vote for more foreign aid? No, they are asking for more help here, and this distracts from it.

When we do not have the money, we run up the debt. Then we go and we literally print the money to pay the bills. We create the inflation and the higher cost of living, and it injures the low and middle income people the most, and they are the ones who are losing jobs.

So this is literally money coming out of our pockets for programs that could help us in this country.

My suggestion is, since I am a moderate here in the Congress, my moderate approach would be when we have a program like this, whether it is 1.25 or the whole \$20 billion, my suggestion is cut it, cut the whole thing. Let us say we cut the \$20 billion of foreign aid. I would take \$10 billion and put it toward the deficit, and I would join my colleagues on the left and say, look, let us fund some of these programs that are needed or are coming up short. Why are we cutting veterans benefits at the same time? Why do we cut the Corps of Engineers? Why do we not fully fund our infrastructure?

This type of spending does not make any economic sense, and it does not make any moral sense.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and claim the time in opposition.

Because I am going to close, unless the gentlewoman from New York wishes to say something on this amendment, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support the amendment and in opposition to the 2005 Foreign Operations appropriations bill. At a time when our country is facing record budget deficits, I cannot justify voting for the largest foreign aid bill in history. We should not give away billions of dollars in foreign aid in the name of friendship when everybody knows that friendship cannot be bought.

Over the past four sessions of the U.N. General Assembly, 86 percent of the U.S. foreign aid recipients voted against the United States a majority of the time. Now, let me give my colleagues five specific examples.

Egypt is slated to get \$1.836 billion in foreign aid in this bill, even though they voted against us at the U.N. 86 percent of the time.

Indonesia will get \$151 million in foreign aid. They voted against us 83 percent of the time.

Nigeria will get \$68 million in foreign aid. They voted against us at the U.N. 76 percent of the time.

Kenya will get \$67 million. They voted against us at the U.N. 81 percent of the time.

Bangladesh will get \$63 million in foreign aid. They voted against us 82 percent of the time.

Not one of these five countries contributed any money or troops to the war effort or reconstruction of Iraq.

Now, some might say, but what about the money we are giving Israel? Well, I fully and completely support 100 percent of the \$2.58 billion in aid to Israel. They are, by far, our best ally in the Middle East. They are the only democracy in the Middle East, and they face increasing terrorist threats.

But I cannot in good conscience vote for a \$19.4 billion foreign aid bill when only a tiny portion of it goes to support our valuable ally Israel.

I cannot go home to Orlando, Florida, and look waitresses and secretaries in the eye and tell them that we took taxpayer dollars from their paychecks and gave it in foreign aid to countries that do not even support the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and vote "no" on the bill.

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

Let me follow up on the point I made earlier about the good intentions of a program like this to promote free market changes in certain countries, but, unfortunately, this backfires because once the money gets in the hands of

the government we then require them to develop partnerships or alliances with businesses, which is exactly the opposite of free markets. This is closer to crony capitalism or fascism when we combine government money with business interests.

At the same time, we know that our corporations will also participate in these programs. So the money once again leaves the people of this country, many times the poor, and goes to these foreign aid programs which subsidize certain governments, solidifying powers of certain politicians, which then allows fungibility of their other funds to do other things and then encourage business partnerships between government and business which is not free markets, which literally is undermining the move that I think is intended and that is to improve the conditions of other countries.

If the conditions of a country are amenable to capitalism and investment, there is never a problem of a lack of investors. The fact that we have to do this, that means there are flaws in the system. This will not improve it. It actually makes it worse. Just because you have partnership with businesses does not mean you are moving toward free enterprise. That means you are moving toward a system of interventionism, or crony capitalism. It is not true reform.

So a program like this actually does the reverse. It has unintended consequences. It makes our problems worse. And, besides, we do not have the right to do it. We do not have the constitutional authority to do it, and we certainly do not have a moral authority to undermine the poor people of this country by making the conditions worse here.

For this reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

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

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

I do rise in opposition to this amendment.

I find it ironic that a few moments ago we had an amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota to take money out of IDA and put it into the Millennium Challenge Corporation. Now we are having an amendment to take everything out of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which suggests to me that maybe the subcommittee is just in the right place here in regards to the amount of the funds that we have.

I also find it ironic that the gentleman from Texas, who is a strong fiscal conservative, is offering this amendment. If ever there was anything in foreign assistance that made sense, it is the Millennium Challenge Corporation. I believe that it is the most dramatic departure from the way we have administered and provided foreign assistance since the Marshall Plan at the end of World War II, and I think it

has a real opportunity to make a difference in the way that countries approach foreign assistance. In fact, we are already finding that to be the case, that countries that are not on the list of those who are eligible yet for consideration for the Millennium Challenge grants are saying what do we have to do to get on that, what kind of reforms do we have to undertake, and this is exactly what this Millennium Challenge Corporation, which we carried in our bill last year, does.

It is different than any other foreign assistance account that we have. It is different for four essential reasons.

First, the MCC will act as an incentive for countries to govern justly, to invest in their own people and create the right policy framework for economic growth. In short, it rewards good governance. No other development or economic assistance administered by USAID or the Department of State currently provides that kind of incentive.

Second, the MCC will offer up a laser focus on economic growth and poverty reduction. That is unlike current development assistance efforts where the U.S. government and other donors try to do a little bit of everything.

Third, the MCC recognizes that successful reforms have to be internally led. As I said a moment ago, this goes to countries where they have made a commitment to rooting out corruption, where they have openness and transparency, where they have a commitment to the rule of law, where they have a commitment to the protection of property rights. So it has to come internally in order to make this work. These are incentive kinds of grants, technical kinds of grants, things that will help the country do exactly what they need in order to have sustainable, long-term economic growth.

Fourth, the Congress has given the program the flexibility to meet the needs of the MCC countries as presented by the countries themselves.

□ 1530

In other words, it offers countries the prospect of local ownership and accountability for their own development, and that is why I believe this is critically important. The MCC promises to be one of America's best tools to help us address poverty, and I hope we can defeat this amendment. I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a copy of the letter sent to me by the Board of Directors of the MCC:

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JIM KOLBE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the members of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, we greatly appreciate your leadership and support for the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), a key Presidential priority. The President's request will accelerate growth and opportunity

for countries that govern justly, invest in their people and encourage economic freedom.

We are concerned, however, that the limitations on your Subcommittee's appropriations allocation caused a reduction in MCA levels to \$1.25 billion, half of the President's \$2.5 billion request. This level of funding may compromise the Corporation's opportunity to commit to full multi-year support to all countries that qualified to compete for MCA assistance this year and could have an impact on the support for countries that may qualify in 2005. For this reason, we would strongly oppose any amendments which would impose additional reductions, and will work with you to achieve the necessary resources for this Presidential foreign assistance initiative. Such amendments could call into question our commitment to support those countries that have taken responsibility for their own development through adoption of sound policies.

We look forward to working with you to assure MCA is adequately funded as we proceed with our critical mission in the developing world.

Sincerely,

COLIN L. POWELL,
Chairman of the Board.

JOHN SNOW,
Vice Chairman of the Board.

ROBERT ZOELLICK,
U.S. Trade Representative.

PAUL V. APPLGARTH,
CEO, Millennium Challenge Corporation.

ANDREW S. NATSIOS,
Administrator, U.S. Agency of International Development.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be postponed.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to enter into a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona, the subcommittee chairman, for entering into this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I am seeking at least \$3 million from the State Department's Nonproliferation Anti-terrorism Demining and Related Programs Account to fund demining activities in Laos.

A persistent and deadly legacy of our country's involvement in the Vietnam War continues to kill and maim thou-

sands of children, women, and men in the impoverished nation of Laos. I am speaking of the millions of unexploded cluster bombs left by a decade of bombing by the United States during the Vietnam War. This is a human rights tragedy for the people of Laos.

From 1964 to 1973, the U.S. flew 580,000 bombing runs over Laos, one every 9 minutes for 10 years. More than 2 million tons of ordnance were dropped on Laos, double the amount dropped on the European theater during the entirety of World War II. As many as 30 percent of these bombs dropped on Laos did not explode, leaving up to 20 million unexploded submunitions, known as bombies, litter throughout the country. These American bombies may be 30 years old, but they continue to kill and maim children as well as farmers clearing the land for farming.

In the first 5 months of 2004, 39 people died and 74 have been maimed by unexploded ordnance. In the 30 years since the end of the Vietnam War, an estimated 10,000 Laotian people, including thousands of children, have died. And yet while families struggle for food and survival, tens of thousands of acres of land cannot be put into agricultural production because the Earth is contaminated with this deadly cluster ordnance.

In today's dollars, our Nation spent \$9 million every day for 10 years dropping millions of tons of bombs on Laos. This year, fiscal year 2004, the State Department will spend only \$1.4 million helping to remove our Nation's deadly legacy.

We have a responsibility to help to end this ongoing human rights tragedy. I had intended to offer an amendment to more than double the level of the current funding in this account for Laos. However, I understand the chairman of the subcommittee has agreed he will seek to include language in conference with the other body that sufficient funds be found in the Nonproliferation Anti-terrorism Demining and Related Programs Account or from the Bilateral Assistance programs for Laos in order to continue this important work in fiscal year 2005; and, if possible, at \$3 million in order to help provide for the expeditious removal of the unexploded munitions from Laos.

Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman agree he will help to include such language in conference with the Senate?

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is correct in her characterization. Assuming the availability of funds, we will seek to include report language that, at a minimum, would continue the program in Laos at the fiscal year 2004 level; but, if possible, at a higher level of \$3 million.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I sincerely thank him for his courtesy and also for pursuing this. I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs.

LOWEY), for her support on this matter. I look forward to working with both of them to address this important issue.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the intent of the gentlewoman's amendment, and I appreciate her thoughtful comments.

The problem of unexploded ordnance in Laos is real and will be addressed immediately. I would strongly urge a significant portion of the funds already in the bill for demining be used to address this problem in Laos, and I want to thank the gentlewoman for bringing this important issue to the attention of the committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ATTENDANCE AT CONFERENCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 Federal employees at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, while those on both sides of the aisle may disagree exactly how we got here today, I think most of us, myself included, would say that, as far as the Federal budget is concerned, we are spending too much and the deficit is too high. That is why I am offering an amendment that is, I think, a commonsense approach to help limit spending and the abuse that our constituents at home complain about.

I will say this: when I go home to my town hall meetings, so many times constituents ask me, why in the world is Congress spending so much money on this or that particular program. In short, my amendment will limit the number of Federal employees that are able to be sent to international conferences to 50.

Recently, there has been a trend in our government to send far in excess of the amount of staff to these international conferences, costing our taxpayers millions and millions of extra dollars. This amendment would simply put a cap on that number.

Now, like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on this, I understand

the importance of staff in our daily routines. I am simply saying that we should send the essential staff, those necessary in order to get the job done. Let me just give a couple of quick examples here why I bring up this amendment.

In this year, 2004, in a conference that was in Thailand for an AIDS conference, over 130 Federal employees of the U.S. Government were sent to this conference. Had my amendment been in place at that time, and been able to limit the amount of employees, Federal employees that went over there, we would have saved millions of dollars.

To put it in the context of dollars and cents, we could have provided a dose of nevirapine, which is an AIDS preventive medicine which provides benefits to babies, to over 216,616 newborns in Africa. Over almost a quarter of a million dosages could have been provided had we had a cap on people going there.

Another example, 2002: the U.S. sent 236 people to a conference in Barcelona, Spain. These employees were sent at a cost of \$3.6 million. Again, my people at home, the constituents at home, ask why do we spend so much money.

Due to the limited amount of time I have right now on this amendment, I cannot go into more of the examples we have seen in past experience as far as excessive numbers of Federal employees going overseas to Federal conferences. I would simply urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense and important amendment to make a limit as to the amount of people we send over.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I will not take 5 minutes, but just want to say that I would have serious concerns about this amendment. I think it is something that we can work with and perhaps solve in conference, but I would have severe heartburn about an amendment that is as arbitrary as this.

Let us say we were, for example, to have a major conference, like the Camp David Accords, or what we had in the Sinai a few years ago, where we came very close to a settlement on the peace accords. Obviously, hundreds of people were involved in that. This would arbitrarily limit any of the funding here from being spent to send people to a conference of that nature.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, briefly.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Just very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I do not be-

lieve that the amendment would address those concerns, or the points the gentleman raises, and I share his concerns there. This applies to those that would come under this act, and that such conferences as those could very well conceivably be coming under the other act, like State Department and the like.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I realize they could be coming under State Department, the White House and others that are not funded under this bill; but there are a number from USAID, Treasury, and others that would be funded and could be affected as a result of this. So I just have real concerns about that, and we will try to work that out.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment No. 20 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), amendment No. 13 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), amendment No. 11 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), and amendment No. 17 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

□ 1545

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 111, noes 312, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—111

Ackerman	Cardoza	Diaz-Balart, L.	Fossella	McNulty	Sánchez, Linda
Andrews	Chabot	Diaz-Balart, M.	Franks (AZ)	Meehan	T.
Bachus	Chandler	Duncan	Gingrey	Moran (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Barrett (SC)	Clyburn	Edwards	Goodlatte	Nadler	Sherman
Bartlett (MD)	Coble	Emanuel	Gordon	Napolitano	Shinkus
Bass	Costello	Engel	Graves	Norwood	Smith (MI)
Berkley	Cox	English	Gutknecht	Oberstar	Smith (NJ)
Bilirakis	Crowley	Feeney	Hall	Owens	Souder
Bishop (NY)	Davis, Jo Ann	Ferguson	Hastings (FL)	Pallone	Stearns
Biswell	Deal (GA)	Filner	Hayes	Paul	Stenholm
Brown (OH)	DeFazio	Flake	Hefley	Payne	Strickland
Burton (IN)	DeMint	Forbes	Hooley (OR)	Pence	Sweeney
			Hostettler	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
			Israel	Petri	Tauzin
			Jones (NC)	Pitts	Taylor (MS)
			Kennedy (MN)	Platts	Toomey
			King (NY)	Porter	Vitter
			Kucinich	Rahall	Wamp
			Lantos	Ramstad	Waters
			Lewis (KY)	Rodriguez	Waxman
			LoBiondo	Rohrabacher	Weiner
			Lofgren	Ros-Lehtinen	Wexler
			Manzullo	Rothman	Woolsey
			Markey	Royce	Wu
			Matheson	Rush	
			McIntyre	Ryan (OH)	

NOES—312

Abercrombie	DeGette	Johnson, E. B.
Aderholt	Delahunt	Johnson, Sam
Akin	DeLauro	Jones (OH)
Alexander	DeLay	Kanjorski
Allen	Dicks	Kaptur
Baca	Dingell	Keller
Baird	Dooley (CA)	Kelly
Baker	Doolittle	Kennedy (RI)
Baldwin	Doyle	Kildee
Ballenger	Dreier	Kilpatrick
Barton (TX)	Dunn	Kind
Beauprez	Ehlers	King (IA)
Becerra	Emerson	Kingston
Bell	Eshoo	Kirk
Bereuter	Etheridge	Klecza
Berman	Evans	Kline
Berry	Everett	Knollenberg
Biggart	Farr	Kolbe
Bishop (GA)	Fattah	LaHood
Bishop (UT)	Foley	Lampson
Blackburn	Ford	Langevin
Blumenauer	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	Larson (CT)
Boehlert	Frost	Latham
Boehner	Galleghy	LaTourette
Bonilla	Garrett (NJ)	Leach
Bonner	Gephardt	Lee
Bono	Gerlach	Levin
Boozman	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Boucher	Gilchrest	Lewis (GA)
Boyd	Gillmor	Linder
Bradley (NH)	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Brady (PA)	Goode	Lowe
Brady (TX)	Goss	Lucas (KY)
Brown (SC)	Granger	Lucas (OK)
Brown, Corrine	Green (TX)	Lynch
Brown-Waite,	Green (WI)	Maloney
Ginny	Grijalva	Marshall
Burgess	Gutierrez	Matsui
Burns	Harman	McCarthy (MO)
Burr	Harris	McCarthy (NY)
Buyer	Hart	McCollum
Calvert	Hastings (WA)	McCotter
Camp	Hayworth	McCrery
Cannon	Hensarling	McDermott
Cantor	Herger	McGovern
Capito	Herseth	McHugh
Capps	Hill	McInnis
Capuano	Hinchey	McKeon
Cardin	Hinojosa	Meek (FL)
Carson (OK)	Hobson	Meeks (NY)
Carter	Hoeffel	Menendez
Case	Hoekstra	Mica
Castle	Holt	Michaud
Chocola	Honda	Millender-
Clay	Houghton	McDonald
Cole	Hoyer	Miller (FL)
Conyers	Hulshof	Miller (MI)
Cooper	Hunter	Miller (NC)
Cramer	Hyde	Miller, Gary
Crane	Inslee	Miller, George
Crenshaw	Issa	Mollohan
Cubin	Istook	Moore
Culberson	Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)
Cunningham	Jackson-Lee	Murphy
Davis (AL)	(TX)	Murtha
Davis (CA)	Jefferson	Musgrave
Davis (FL)	Jenkins	Myrick
Davis (IL)	John	Neal (MA)
Davis (TN)	Johnson (CT)	Nethercutt
Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)	Neugebauer

Ney
Northup
Nunes
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ross

Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo

Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Watson
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Carson (IN)
Collins
Cummings
Deutsch

Doggett
Greenwood
Holden
Isakson

Majette
Quinn

□ 1611

Messrs. CANTOR, BERRY, CARTER, HOFFEL, MICHAUD, ALEXANDER, and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. LEWIS of Kentucky, VITTER, LANTOS, DEMINT, BARRETT of South Carolina, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, HOSTETTTLER, COX, LOBIONDO, MORAN of Kansas, COSTELLO, FERGUSON, BISHOP of New York, GINGREY, PAYNE, OWENS, FOSSELLA, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Ms. WOOLSEY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 287, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

AYES—131

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brown (OH)
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Cardin
Cardoza
Chabot
Chandler
Choccola
Coble
Cooper
Crane
Crowley
Davis (AL)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Evans
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fossella

Frank (MA)
Frost
Gingrey
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hoeffel
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hyde
Israel
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Leach
LoBiondo
Lynch
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McNulty
Meehan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar

Otter
Pallone
Payne
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Saxton
Schrock
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Soudier
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—287

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bell
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Clay
Clyburn

Cole
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeGette
DeLauro
DeMint
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)

Gutknecht
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inlee
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Kirk
Klecza
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham

LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney
Manzullo
Marshall
Matsui
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Oliver

Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabó
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus

Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Buyer
Carson (IN)
Collins
Conyers
Deutsch

Doggett
Greenwood
Holden
Isakson
Jones (NC)

Keller
Majette
Peterson (PA)
Quinn
Stenholm

□ 1619

Mr. TIAHRT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

Mr. SHAYS and Mr. UDALL of Colorado changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 288, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—133

Abercrombie Franks (AZ) Pickering
Ackerman Gallegly Pitts
Akin Garrett (NJ) Platts
Andrews Gibbons Pombo
Bachus Gingrey Porter
Bartlett (MD) Goode Ramstad
Bass Goodlatte Rogers (MI)
Becerra Green (TX) Rohrabacher
Berkley Green (WI) Ros-Lehtinen
Berry Gutierrez Rothman
Bilirakis Gutknecht Royce
Bishop (NY) Harris Rush
Boehner Hart Ryan (OH)
Bradley (NH) Hayworth Ryan (WI)
Burns Hensarling Sanders
Burr Hostettler Schrock
Burton (IN) Hulshof Sensenbrenner
Cantor Inslee Sessions
Capito Israel Shadegg
Cardoza Kennedy (MN) Kind Sherman
Chabot King (NY) Shimkus
Chandler Kind Kline Shuster
Chocola Kucinich Simmons
Clay Larson (CT) Simpson
Coble LaTourrette Snyder
Cox LoBiondo Souder
Crane Lofgren Stearns
Cubin Lofgren Strickland
Cummings Manzullo
Deal (GA) McCarthy (NY) Sullivan
DeFazio McCotter Tancred
Delahunt McInnis
DeMint McIntyre Tauzin
Diaz-Balart, L. McNulty Terry
Diaz-Balart, M. Mica Thornberry
Doolittle Moore Toomey
Emanuel Myrick Turner (TX)
Emerson Nadler Udall (NM)
Engel Nethercutt Walden (OR)
English Neugebauer Watt
Feeney Northup Weiner
Ferguson Weldon (FL)
Filner Weller
Flake Paul Woolsey
Fossella Pence Wu

NOES—288

Aderholt Conyers Hall
Alexander Cooper Harman
Allen Costello Hastings (FL)
Baca Cramer Hastings (WA)
Baird Crenshaw Hayes
Baker Crowley Hefley
Baldwin Culberson Herger
Ballenger Cunningham Herseth
Barrett (SC) Davis (AL) Hill
Barton (TX) Davis (CA) Hinchey
Beauprez Davis (FL) Hinojosa
Bell Davis (IL) Hobson
Bereuter Davis (TN) Hoeffel
Berman Davis, Jo Ann Hoeckstra
Biggart Davis, Tom Holt
Bishop (GA) DeGette Honda
Bishop (UT) DeLauro Hooley (OR)
Blackburn Dicks Houghton
Blumenauer Dingell Hoyer
Blunt Dingell Hunter
Boehlert Dooley (CA) Hyde
Bonilla Doyle Issa
Bonner Dreier Istook
Bono Duncan Jackson (IL)
Boozman Dunn Jackson-Lee
Boswell Edwards (TX)
Boucher Ehlers Jefferson
Boyd Eshoo Jenkins
Brady (PA) Etheridge John
Brady (TX) Evans Johnson (CT)
Brown (OH) Everett Johnson (IL)
Brown (SC) Farr Johnson, E. B.
Brown, Corrine Fattah Johnson, Sam
Brown-Waite, Foley Jones (NC)
Ginny Forbes Jones (OH)
Burgess Ford Kanjorski
Buyer Frank (MA) Kaptur
Calvert Frelinghuysen Keller
Camp Frost Kelly
Cannon Gephardt Kennedy (RI)
Capps Gerlach Kildee
Capuano Gilchrist Kilpatrick
Cardin Gillmor King (IA)
Carson (OK) Gonzalez Kingston
Carter Gordon Kirk
Case Goss Kleczka
Castle Granger Knollenberg
Clyburn Graves Kolbe
Cole Grijalva LaHood

Lampson Ney
Langevin Nunes
Lantos Nussle
Larsen (WA) Oberstar
Latham Obey
Leach Oliver
Lee Ortiz
Levin Osborne
Lewis (CA) Ose
Lewis (GA) Otter
Lewis (KY) Owens
Linder Oxley
Lipinski Pascarell
Lowey Pastor
Lucas (KY) Payne
Lucas (OK) Pearce
Lynch Pelosi
Maloney Peterson (MN)
Markley Petri
Marshall Pomeroy
Matheson Portman
Matsui Price (NC)
McCarthy (MO) Pryce (OH)
McCollum Putnam
McCrery Radanovich
McDermott Rahall
McGovern Rangel
McHugh Regula
McKeon Rehberg
Meehan Renzi
Meek (FL) Reyes
Meeks (NY) Reynolds
Menendez Rodriguez
Michaud Rogers (AL)
Millender Rogers (KY)
Tauzin Ross
McDonald Roybal-Allard
Miller (FL) Rumpert
Miller (MI) Ruyun (KS)
Miller (NC) Sabo
Miller, Gary Sanchez, Linda
Miller, George T.
Mollohan Moran (KS)
Moran (VA) Sandlin
Murphy Saxton
Murtha Schakowsky
Musgrave Schiff
Napolitano Scott (GA)
Neal (MA) Scott (VA)

Carson (IN)
Collins
Deutsch
Doggett

NOT VOTING—12

Greenwood Peterson (PA)
Holden Quinn
Isakson Stenholm
Majette Waters

□ 1627

Mr. ROSS changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 41, noes 379, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—41

Bartlett (MD) Cox
Burgess Davis, Jo Ann
Chabot Duncan
Coble Everett

Feeney
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)

Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hayes
Hefley
Hostettler
Jones (NC)
Keller
King (IA)

Kingston
Kucinich
McInnis
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Otter
Paul
Peterson (MN)

NOES—379

Abercrombie Deal (GA)
Ackerman DeFazio
Aderholt DeGette
Akin Delahunt
Alexander DeLauro
Allen DeLay
Andrews DeMint
Baca Diaz-Balart, L.
Bachus Diaz-Balart, M.
Baird Dicks
Baker Dingell
Baldwin Dooley (CA)
Ballenger Doolittle
Barrett (SC) Doyle
Barton (TX) Dreier
Bass Kolbe
Beauprez Edwards
Becerra Ehlers
Bell Emanuel
Bereuter Emerson
Berkley Engel
Berman English
Berry Eshoo
Biggart Etheridge
Bilirakis Evans
Bishop (GA) Farr
Bishop (NY) Fattah
Bishop (UT) Ferguson
Blackburn Filner
Blumenauer Foley
Blunt Forbes
Boehlert Ford
Boehner Fossella
Bonilla Frank (MA)
Bonner Frelinghuysen
Bono Frost
Boozman Gallegly
Boswell Gephardt
Boucher Gerlach
Boyd Gilchrist
Bradley (NH) Gillmor
Brady (PA) Gingrey
Brady (TX) Gonzalez
Brown (OH) Gordon
Brown (SC) Goss
Brown, Corrine Granger
Brown-Waite, Green (TX)
Ginny Green (WI)
Burns Grijalva
Burr Gutierrez
Burton (IN) Gutknecht
Buyer Hall
Calvert Harman
Camp Harris
Cannon Hart
Cantor Hastings (FL)
Capito Hastings (WA)
Capps Hayworth
Capuano Hensarling
Cardin Herger
Cardoza Herseth
Carson (OK) Hill
Carter Hinchey
Case Hinojosa
Castle Hobson
Chandler Hoeffel
Chocola Hoeckstra
Clay Holt
Clyburn Honda
Cole Hooley (OR)
Conyers Houghton
Cooper Hoyer
Costello Hulshof
Cramer Hunter
Crane Hyde
Crenshaw Inslee
Crowley Israel
Cubin Issa
Culberson Jackson (IL)
Cummings Jackson-Lee
Cunningham (TX)
Davis (AL) Jefferson
Davis (CA) Jenkins
Davis (FL) John
Davis (IL) Johnson (CT)
Davis (TN) Johnson (IL)
Davis, Tom Johnson, E. B.

Pombo
Rahall
Royce
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Tancred
Taylor (MS)
Toomey
Wamp

Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolle
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourrette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markley
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose

Owens	Sabo	Taylor (NC)
Oxley	Sánchez, Linda	Terry
Pallone	T.	Thomas
Pascarell	Sanchez, Loretta	Thompson (CA)
Pastor	Sanders	Thompson (MS)
Payne	Sandlin	Thornberry
Pearce	Saxton	Tiahrt
Pelosi	Schakowsky	Tiberi
Pence	Schiff	Tierney
Petri	Schrock	Towns
Pickering	Scott (GA)	Turner (OH)
Pitts	Scott (VA)	Turner (TX)
Platts	Sensenbrenner	Udall (CO)
Pomeroy	Serrano	Udall (NM)
Porter	Sessions	Upton
Portman	Shadegg	Van Hollen
Price (NC)	Shaw	Velázquez
Pryce (OH)	Shays	Visclosky
Putnam	Sherman	Vitter
Radanovich	Sherwood	Walden (OR)
Ramstad	Shimkus	Walsh
Rangel	Simmons	Waters
Regula	Simpson	Watson
Rehberg	Skelton	Watt
Renzi	Slaughter	Waxman
Reyes	Smith (NJ)	Weiner
Reynolds	Smith (TX)	Weldon (FL)
Rodriguez	Smith (VA)	Weldon (PA)
Rogers (AL)	Snyder	Weller
Rogers (KY)	Solis	Wexler
Rohrabacher	Souder	Whitfield
Ros-Lehtinen	Spratt	Wicker
Ross	Stark	Wilson (NM)
Rothman	Stearns	Wilson (SC)
Roybal-Allard	Strickland	Wolf
Ruppersberger	Stupak	Woolsey
Rush	Sullivan	Wu
Ryan (OH)	Sweeney	Wynn
Ryan (WI)	Tanner	Young (AK)
Ryun (KS)	Tauscher	Young (FL)
	Tauzin	

NOT VOTING—13

Carson (IN)	Holden	Peterson (PA)
Collins	Isakson	Quinn
Deutsch	Istook	Stenholm
Doggett	Lantos	
Greenwood	Majette	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1635

Mr. BURGESS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I missed several votes so that I could travel back to Pennsylvania to survey damage from a tornado strike yesterday afternoon in my Congressional District.

I respectfully request the RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted: "Yea" on rollcall vote 377 on agreeing to House Resolution 615;

"Yea" on rollcall vote 378 on agreeing to House Resolution 713;

"Yea" on rollcall vote 379 on agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 462;

"No" on rollcall vote 380 on agreeing to the Sherman amendment to H.R. 4818;

"No" on rollcall vote 381 on agreeing to the Lantos amendment to H.R. 4818;

"No" on rollcall vote 382 on agreeing to the Kennedy (of Minnesota) amendment to H.R. 4818; and

"No" on rollcall vote 383 on agreeing to the Paul amendment to H.R. 4818.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to simply point out to the Members that by the calculation of the majority, a calculation with which I concur, that if

everyone entitled to offer amendments uses the full time available to them under the unanimous consent agreement, we will finish voting sometime around 11 o'clock tonight. If Members would like another outcome, I would ask them to see whether or not they can assist us in limiting the time taken by Members on some of these amendments, if Members would like to get out of here before 11 o'clock.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. KILPATRICK

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Ms. KILPATRICK:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON CONTRACTS

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to fund any contract in contravention of section 8(d)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(6)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

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

I first want to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), as well as our ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for working with us as we put together what we consider the best bill under the circumstances of our 302(b) allocation.

The amendment before us deals with small businesses in America. Currently, the procedure of the Federal Government is that they work with small businesses to get them into the procurement process so that they can grow their business and hire the people of America. This amendment today that will be a part of the Foreign Operations bill, and my chairman has accepted it, and I thank him very much, and I know that he will protect it as it goes through the process, will allow the small businesses of America to also procure government contracts for the international assistance that we give.

I recently met with my truck and bus owners and those who do parts on those buses and trucks, and what they said to me was they need assistance in getting some of the foreign contracts where we are buying trucks and buses and the like. This is an attempt to help those businesses and other small businesses in America who can and will assist as we rebuild communities around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member on the Committee on Small Business.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering the \$19 billion Foreign Operations appropriation bill. Billions of dollars of this funding will be spent on Federal contracts performed overseas. This amendment ensures that U.S. small businesses have an opportunity to compete for this work.

Large contractors in the United States are currently required to submit subcontracting plans for work performed in the United States. These plans must simply identify small business goals and demonstrate that small companies have a reasonable opportunity to compete for these subcontracts. The Kilpatrick amendment merely extends this requirement to overseas contracts.

I cannot overstate the important role of small businesses in our economy. Whether domestic projects or overseas work, our Nation's small businesses deserve access to Federal contract opportunities. The Kilpatrick amendment eliminates these double standards and gives United States small businesses a chance to compete.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, a similar amendment like this was included in last year's appropriation bill, only to see it stripped out in conference. I hope that this is not the case this year. I urge its adoption.

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

We do believe that the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) will protect the amendment. It is a stimulant that our small businesses need so that they can grow their businesses and hire more of our American citizens as well as refund their lost taxes from local communities around the country.

With that, I again would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, and I do not rise in opposition to it. I think we all support the promotion of small business. We certainly need to have small enterprises get a fair shot at getting contracts and getting every business opportunity. And one of the things we have been pushing through AID is to do more with small businesses, both here and abroad.

The agency says that it has been essentially following the requirements of the proposed amendment now; and since it does simply restate current law, and in the interest of expediting business here in the House, I would accept this amendment and ask that we

review it in conference. So I am prepared to vote right now.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUYER

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUYER:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO REQUEST THE UNITED NATIONS TO ASSESS THE VALIDITY OF ELECTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by any official of the United States Government to request the United Nations to assess the validity of elections in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will be recognized.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) for 10 minutes.

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

My amendment seeks to end any possible form of manipulation of our elections in November. Article I of section 4 of the Constitution specifies that elections, including those for Federal offices in the United States, will be conducted by the States and the Congress, and the States and the Congress can only regulate and oversee the electoral process in this country.

For over 200 years this Nation has conducted elections fairly and impartially, ensuring that each person's vote will count. When problems have arisen over the years, by Constitution, authority was granted to Congress and the States to address them, and we have.

Congress passed the Voting Rights Act in 1965, and we have subsequently amended that act over the years. Just this last Congress, we enacted the Help America Vote Act to strengthen the election process.

Recently, nearly a dozen Members of this House have written United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan requesting "to have election observers to monitor the Presidential election in the United States" on November 2.

I suppose that through this letter, Members of this body were suggesting that we, the United States, need help, that the States cannot ensure the integrity of the election process and, therefore, we need the United Nations monitors to look over our shoulders to

make sure we do it right in the United States.

Now, if my colleagues can imagine on Election Day, you get up, you have your breakfast, you grab your coffee and your Danish, and you are going to go to the voting booth. When you show up, you are curious because you see a white van out there that says the U.N. beside it and little blue helmets. The United Nations has arrived; we are going to ensure the integrity of the American electoral process.

The United Nations has sent monitors to Haiti, Nicaragua, Angola, Mozambique, and now what, the United States? I do not think so.

This request by Democratic Members to have the U.N. supervise United States elections is rather foolish, nonsense, and silly. If anybody wants to come here to learn how to conduct a proper election, let them come to the United States. We are happy to teach anybody the foundations of our Republic and democratic values.

This amendment prohibits Federal executive officials from asking the United Nations to come in and have any authority of our election process to assess the validity of the United States Federal elections. The authority to ensure the integrity of the United States elections rests with the States and the Congress by constitutional authority, and this amendment merely seeks to keep it that way.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

I would say to my friend, and he is my friend, that I think he is very wrong in offering this particular measure. We in the United States go all over the world telling people about free and fair elections and about transparency in that regard. I, along with other Members of this Congress, have traveled throughout the world monitoring elections on behalf of a variety of organizations that do not necessarily come under the aegis of the United Nations.

I would say to the gentleman, I was last week elected as president of the Organization For Security and Cooperation in Europe. That organization is one of the lead organizations in the world on election monitoring. Members from this body under the aegis of that body have gone to the Ukraine, to Belarus. Soon we will be going to Kazakhstan. I have gone to Russia.

□ 1645

I was welcomed, when Russians awakened on that morning and had their Danish and their coffee, at the election polling place; and, surprisingly, I found that a great deal fairer in some respects than what I saw in my own county when you were there in 2000. I suggest that if one were not there for any other reason other than

to observe an election, it would be foolhardy for us to not take into consideration the importance of encouraging free and fair and transparent elections, and what better way than to tell the world we are wide open for your peerage into the freest and fairest system in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back and am prepared at the appropriate time to yield to additional Members.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in strong support of the Buyer amendment. It saddens me, Mr. Chairman, that some members of the body seem to think that we need the U.N. election monitors here in the United States. I was pleased to work with the Members on both sides of the aisle to secure passage of the Help America Vote Act, which passed overwhelmingly in the previous Congress. That bill is being implemented today as we speak and is addressing many of the problems referenced in the letter to the U.N.

Three billion dollars have already been provided and been appropriated pursuant to the bill, which provides for better voting machines, better registration systems and for more poll worker training. I have faith in the commissioners of the EAC Elections Commission to carry this out.

Mr. Chairman, the U.N. has its hands full helping countries around the world that have problems far beyond anything we have experienced here in the U.S. For example, just a few weeks ago in Afghanistan, Taliban forces determined to prevent the onset of democracy in that country killed 16 Afghans, simply because they had voter registration cards.

In India, Reuters reports that militants in Kashmir set off mines and fired at polling stations as voting began to elect a new parliament, killing at least seven people and wounding dozens.

In Myanmar, separatist guerrillas killed four soldiers, burned electoral rolls and destroyed voting machines.

In Turkey, a candidate for village headman was gunned down and others injured.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, the problems in other parts of the world far surpass anything we face in this country. The U.N. needs to focus its attention on situations like these where people cannot even register to vote without fear of being killed.

Of course, one of the biggest hurdles facing the U.N. election monitors will be assisting and setting up the framework for democratic elections in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the U.N. is helping other countries with their elections, and I hope they will continue to do so. We do not need them here in the United States, however.

I thank the gentleman from Indiana for offering the amendment, and I strongly support its adoption.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the distinguished chair of the Black Caucus.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) say we say that we need to end possible core manipulations with regard to our elections. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) may not be familiar, although he visited Florida right after the 2000 catastrophe, where so many African-American people and so many others were not allowed to vote, and their votes were simply not counted.

Our last speaker talked about how the U.N. had all this work to do all around the world. Let me tell you something. This is a democracy in the United States. The way this democracy is built, it is built upon the individual's right to vote and to have that vote counted, and basically that is what did not happen in Florida and in other places.

I would submit to you that this is not a Republican issue. This is not a Democratic issue. This is a red, white and blue issue. I cannot figure out anything that could be more important than making sure that every single person in your district and in my district have that right to vote and have that vote counted.

I do believe that if the gentleman, the sponsor of this amendment, were to have one of his constituents to come and say, "Mr. BUYER, I could not vote for you," I believe that you would tear down walls, build bridges, do everything you could to make sure that that person could vote.

Just this weekend when I was down in Miami, there was a headline in the Miami Herald talking about things that Jeb Bush is doing or had tried to do to stop folk from being able to have their votes cast and counted. And so the beat goes on.

That is why the gentleman thinks the Congressional Black Caucus likes coming and saying that we want monitoring? We want to make sure that all of our constituents have their vote.

So it is not about manipulation. It is about integrity in this system. That is what it is all about. We want to make sure that another person is not selected but elected.

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

The Miami Herald report, when they did their analysis and actually looked at the Civil Rights Commission, stated that in fact that report was overstated. They also in the Miami Herald's report analyzed and said there was no widespread evidence of what the gentleman just said in the well.

In fact, the evidence points just the opposite, that the election in Florida, the officials were mostly permissive, not obstructionists when unregistered voters presented themselves; and, in fact, during the 18 months of litigation that followed the election of 2000, only two people in the State of Florida testified that they were not able to vote.

Now, of the 176,000 votes that were discarded ballots in the State of Florida, there were 65,000 that were under-votes, meaning people who went to vote, but they did not vote in the Presidential column. They voted for maybe State rep or State senator or for sheriff, but they did not vote for President. Then there were 111,000 that were over-votes.

Yes, when I was in Florida, yes, I saw thousands of ballots whereby people actually in the Presidential column, for one reason or another, decided that they would forget the one person, one vote. What they actually did was vote for three, four, five, six, seven people in the Presidential column. So, by their own hand, they spoiled their very own ballots.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, when President Bush was campaigning for office, he said that if we were humble and treated our allies and other nations with respect, that they would relate well to us.

I chaired the Helsinki Commission of this Congress from 1985 to 1995 and have served as the ranking member until this past year when I became the whip. I will tell my friend from Indiana, I went to country after country after country and said to them, you need to accept election monitors, because you need to ensure that the world is confident that your elections are honest and aboveboard.

I will tell my friend from Indiana that I believe America's elections will be aboveboard, but our Nation, I tell my friend from Indiana, ought to be too big, too confident, too proud to say to somebody, you cannot come to the United States and see for yourself. Because if we ask of others that they accept monitors, are we too proud, too arrogant, too self-satisfied to say to the world, but you cannot come to America, the freest, most open, most democratic land on the face of the earth?

I say to my friend from Indiana, I hope my colleagues reject this amendment, not because as some here will assert there is wrongdoing in America but because America ought to be proud to invite all of the world to come to America and see how democracy works.

Do we make mistakes? We do. But are we proud of our democracy? We are.

Come to America. See us act. See our democracy. Be proud.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds, and I would just say to the gentleman, please do not mischaracterize the amendment. I agree with you. We welcome people to come to this country to observe. What this amendment says, we do not believe that the United Nations should be here to assess the validity of the United States election process as monitors.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I will not even take the 60 seconds. It seems to me there is a lot of misconceptions about this amendment here. Yes, we do welcome observers to our elections. We welcome people coming into this country. We have thousands of them come in every year. We invite them to come. They come under various plans, journalists, politicians, all kinds of people, who look at elections at the local level, at the State level, at the national level at our conventions. I have hosted those people in my district on election day, on primary day, on general election day. We should want those people to come here.

What we are talking about is whether we have people come here that have some kind of official capacity to determine the validity of our elections. We have a uniquely, unlike most other countries which have national elections, a National Elections Supervisory Board. Ours are so scattered. Every State has the responsibility for determining the elections.

So it would not be possible or not be wise to do that, and that is why this amendment is a very simple amendment that makes sense. Yes, come and observe, but you are not going to be here to determine the validity of the elections.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me first acknowledge the work that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) did on the election reform bill the last session. I was there every day attempting to help make it pass, but it has not been implemented. Forty-one States have asked to implement it in 2006; and then 27, including some of those, have asked to get a waiver. So we have not improved.

We had observers in Florida in November of 2002 requested by the Secretary of State. They came from Russia, Bosnia, Switzerland, United Kingdom and somewhere else; and we go all over the world observing elections. Why cannot we follow the same rules we insist on the world following? We write the rules. We enforce them everywhere but here. We want a fair election that is transparent, and we have not experienced it the last 4 years.

We are tired of making sure we vote and the votes do not get counted or getting intimidated to keep from voting. If we cannot do that as a democracy, we have no democracy. This is the very foundation of a democracy.

The first amendment right to freedom of speech, that is an expression of who they want in office, and they did not get the last one that was elected.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and wanted to stand in support of the Buyer amendment and say also I support this for two reasons.

Number one, I am very uncomfortable with the U.N., regardless of what their intentions could be. It is a political body. They are very, very anti-American and I think very ineffective. Just look at their record on human rights, their record on peace around the world, the records on democracy. The U.N. would not be who you want to come in and straighten out a problem.

Secondly, let us go under the assumption there was a problem and what did we do about it. One thing to remember, and I went down to Florida. Twenty-five of the counties in Florida that had the highest percentage of vote spoilage, or they were accused of it, how many were controlled by a Republican? Zero. All of the 25 had Democrat chief election officials.

Now, as a Republican who was asked to go down there and monitor the recount, I was expecting the worst. I went in there, as I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) did, and we sat in kind of bleachers and watched Theresa LePore and Judge Burton, two of the Democrats. Ironically, I forget the Republican's name. And they would hold the ballots up and look at the chads.

I expected the worst, but I want to say to my Democrat friends, they did the right thing. They were looking it in the eye. They were resisting all the political pressure from the outside. They were running Palm Beach and Broward and Dade County the way it should be run, on a local level. The Democrats were doing it, and the Democrats I think were doing a dog-gone good job. I went back and told my friends, you know what, that process is fair.

Key point being is we handled the problem, we handled it locally. We do not need a lot of outsiders from the U.N. to come in.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

□ 1700

Ms. WATSON. We need observing. I observed the election in 2000 from Micronesia. I was ashamed. I was embarrassed because I had to go out and interpret what had happened. I did not find those elections to be free or fair. The spaghetti ballot, the hanging chad, and the Supreme Court's decision, cutting off the counting of votes, so the person who had the largest number of votes did not win. And so we need the world to see how our elections are run because Florida cheated, and we are not going to allow it to cheat again.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) has 45 seconds remaining. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

I would say to the gentlewoman who spoke, who used the word "cheating," I hope she would choose another word because she is definitely impugning the integrity of a lot of her Democratic colleagues in the State of Florida who supervised the election.

Number two, I think I must infer from that sense of outrage I am hearing from the other side that you are just as concerned about the systemic design to disenfranchise the absentee military vote, which I hope you are just as outraged about. But what this amendment is about is we welcome America to observe the integrity of our electoral process. We do not ask, though, for the United Nations to come as monitors at our polling stations in this country. That is what this amendment is about.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time and for her leadership on so many issues.

What in the world are we worried about? If we have nothing to hide, then we should not have any concern whatsoever. Yet, today's New York Times in their article on the front page cites "election troubles already descending on Florida."

I truly expect that our elections will be well maintained and done in an honest and fair way, but no American should be ashamed or scared to have our democratic system observed and monitored by an international agency if voters are truly not being disenfranchised in the United States.

We have all served as monitors elsewhere. Why not have the same standard in our own country?

[From the New York Times, July 15, 2004]

ELECTION TROUBLES ALREADY DESCENDING ON FLORIDA

(By Abby Goodnough)

MIAMI, July 14.—Three years after Gov. Jeb Bush announced a new voting system that he called "a model for the rest of the nation," Florida is grappling with some of the same problems that threw the 2000 presidential election into chaos, as well as new ones that critics say could cause even more confusion this November.

The touch-screen voting machines intended to cure many of the ills of 2000 have raised a host of other concerns here just four months before the election. A new state rule excludes the machines from manual recounts, and the integrity of the machines was questioned after a problem was discovered in the audit process of some of them. Voting rights groups filed a lawsuit last week challenging the recount ban, and a Democratic congressman has also sued to request a printed record of every touch-screen vote.

The controversy over the new equipment is just one of Florida's challenges, which also include confirming which voters are ineligible, training poll workers on new policies and processing a flood of new registrations.

State officials announced on Saturday that they would throw out a controversial list used to remove felons from the voting rolls, acknowledging that Hispanic felons were absent from the list. Secretary of State Glenda E. Hood, appointed by Governor Bush last year, had earlier dismissed concerns from lawmakers and advocacy groups about the list of 48,000 suspected felons, which the state made public only after a judge's order.

The United States Civil Rights Commission, which issued a scathing report on the last election here in 2001, will examine problems with the list of felons in a hearing Thursday in Washington.

"The most important thing is to really show the voters that there are reasons to have confidence in these systems," said Bobbie Brinegar, president of the League of Women Voters of Miami-Dade County. "But the mantra has been 'trust us.' And that is not good enough."

Jacob DiPietro, a spokesman for Governor Bush, said the governor was "taking full responsibility" for the problem with the list, adding: "His No. 1 priority is to have a seamless election and an election where people have confidence that their vote will be counted."

The state, whose 36-day recount after the 2000 election stunned and divided the nation, is expected to be a major battleground again this year, with President Bush (the governor's brother) and Senator John Kerry, his probable Democratic opponent, fighting fiercely for its 27 electoral votes. Mr. Bush won Florida by 537 votes last time, but thousands of votes were discarded because of voter error on poorly designed ballots and other problems.

The Republican-led Legislature quickly passed an overhaul of the voting system in 2001, banning the punch-card ballots that caused so much trouble in 2000, giving counties money for new voting equipment and setting recount guidelines. It adopted two-thirds of the recommendations from a bipartisan task force that Governor Bush appointed after the 2000 election, but stayed away from some of the more contentious issues.

Most notably, lawmakers passed over recommendations to make the positions of county elections supervisors nonpartisan and to review the state's policy of permanently stripping felons of voting rights. The package that the Legislature adopted has played a role in the new turmoil. Tucked into the law was a provision keeping registration records secret. A state judge struck it down on July 2, opening the way for a close examination of the list of suspected felons to purge from the rolls.

Newspapers then reported that the list had a simple but glaring flaw: it guaranteed that no Hispanics, who tend to vote Republican here, would be purged, while thousands of blacks, who tend to vote Democratic, might be purged. Governor Bush moved quickly to drop it, but he was too late to avoid accusations from Democratic lawmakers and groups. The critics have denounced the effort to keep the list secret, the touch-screen problems and other troubles as purposeful efforts by Florida's Republican leadership to give President Bush an advantage here.

Unlike her predecessor Katherine Harris, who was co-chairwoman of President Bush's 2000 campaign in Florida even as she oversaw elections, Ms. Hood has publicly stayed away from politics. But critics say that Ms. Hood, a Republican and former Orlando mayor whom Governor Bush appointed, has sown doubt by dismissing criticism of the electoral system and by not answering questions sufficiently.

The abrupt resignation of Ed Kast, the state's director of elections, last month—he

said he wanted to pursue other interests—only deepened public distrust, said Sandy Wayland, a member of the Miami-Dade Elections Reform Coalition.

While previous secretaries of state were elected, Ms. Hood was the first appointed by the governor, the result of a 2003 change in the State Constitution. She reports to Governor Bush, who is therefore more directly responsible for her office's successes and failures.

"She is dealing with some really sophisticated, aggressive partisans," said Lance deHaven-Smith, a political science professor at Florida State University, speaking of the Jeb Bush administration. "She has been a good soldier, getting up and saying, 'Everything is fine, not to worry.' And come to find out, some of the problems that people feared were actually there."

The coalition asked Ms. Hood's office last month to allow an independent review of the touch-screen machines now used by 15 of 67 counties, including Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach. The office said that only counties were authorized to seek such audits, and told reporters that the request was an effort to undermine voter confidence.

Through a public-records request, the coalition obtained e-mail messages and other documents from Miami-Dade election officials who referred to a flaw in the touch-screen equipment's ability to audit elections results, a backup way of recording votes. The e-mail messages date back as far as June 2003.

Constance Kaplan, the Miami-Dade County elections supervisor, publicly acknowledged the problem this spring. This month, the company that makes the machines, Elections Systems and Software, provided software to correct the flaw, which the county and state say will not affect the machines' accuracy.

"It is important to note that the anomaly was rare, and all votes were counted as the anomaly did not affect the vote itself but rather the audit after," Ms. Hood's office wrote in a statement Tuesday.

Nicole de Lara, Ms. Hood's communications director, said that Ms. Kaplan's office had "unfortunately" not alerted Ms. Hood to the problem, and that she first learned of it from an article in *The Daily Business Review* in late May. Some critics suspect that Mr. Kast's resignation was related to the malfunction, but Mr. Kast said in an interview it was not.

Ms. Wayland is among many here who contend that counties like Miami-Dade and Broward adopted touch-screen technology too soon, swayed by aggressive lobbyists. The 52 counties that do not use touch-screen equipment use optional-scan machines, which produce records that can be manually recounted.

A recent analysis by *The Sun-Sentinel* found that touch-screen machines in South Florida failed to record votes eight times more often than optical-scan machines in the March presidential primary.

Nonetheless, Ms. de Lara said touch-screen machines were wholly reliable for tabulating votes. She added that they would never require a recount because under State law the only reason for a manual recount is "voter intent" when a voter makes too many or too few choices. Touch-screen machines do not allow people to vote for more than one candidate, she said. And if people do not choose any candidate for a given office, that is their prerogative, she said.

The rule says no manual recounts will be conducted when votes are cast by touch-screen machine.

The election reform coalition and other groups have also expressed concerns about a new policy on provisional ballots, used by

Floridians if poll workers cannot verify their registration on the spot. The Legislature decided that provisional ballots cast outside a voter's home precinct can be thrown out, which voting-rights groups call unfair.

Florida is one of several States where people are questioning touch-screen technology. California's Secretary of State, Kevin Shelley, has prohibited the use of machines from Diebold Election Systems in four counties for the November election, and has ordered that touch-screen systems bought after July 1, 2005, produce a paper record that is verifiable by the voter.

"There's no question in my mind that ultimately there will be paper trails in every county in Florida," said Representative Robert Wexler, a Florida Democrat whose suits challenging paperless voting systems are on appeal. "The only question is when."

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds 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, for those of us who were here in this House on January 6, 2001, to challenge the election, this is, I guess, a matter of urgency. Monitoring elections is not punishment, it only helps our democracy. This is not a punishment. This is to say to all of the people, thousands who did not have their vote counted in 2000, that we care and this country is a democracy. Sweet land of liberty, that is what we know America to be. And no one should be ashamed or afraid, including the United States military, to have international monitors. All of us will demand that all votes are counted, civilians and the military. None of us should be afraid to have our election system scrutinized. Again, it is not a punishment, it is only to provide for a consistent, fair election. It is for the protection of the democracy that we believe in.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to turn in a copy of the Certified Vote Organization. Over 1,700 people, that is technologists, lawyers, political scientists, says that the technology that we are using in the upcoming election is flawed.

I come from Florida * * * No, we are not going to get over it. And we want verification from the world.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentlewoman's words be taken down. She said that "you stole an election."

The CHAIRMAN. All Members will suspend.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) asked that the gentlewoman's words be taken down.

The Clerk will report the words.

In the meantime, all Members will cease from conversation. The gentlewoman will be seated.

□ 1715

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

I come from Florida where you and others participated in what I call the United States coup d'etat. We need to make sure that it does not happen again. Over and over again, after the election, when you stole the election, you came back here and said get over it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4818) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, when certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

I come from Florida where you and others participated in what I call the United States coup d'etat. We need to make sure that it does not happen again. Over and over again, after the election, when you stole the election, you came back here and said get over it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As stated by the Chair in response to a parliamentary inquiry on February 27, 1985, Members should not accuse other Members of committing a crime, such as "stealing" an election. By accusing an identifiable Member of stealing an election, the gentlewoman's words are not in order.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the chair. I ask unanimous consent to clarify my words.

Mr. BUYER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

□ 1730

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The question is: Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BUYER

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 187, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—219

Aderholt	Gibbons	Otter
Akin	Gilchrest	Oxley
Bachus	Gillmor	Pearce
Baker	Gingrey	Pence
Ballenger	Goode	Peterson (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Petri
Bartlett (MD)	Goss	Pickering
Barton (TX)	Granger	Pitts
Bass	Graves	Platts
Beauprez	Green (WI)	Pombo
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Porter
Biggert	Hall	Portman
Bilirakis	Harris	Pryce (OH)
Bishop (UT)	Hart	Putnam
Blackburn	Hastert	Radanovich
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Boehlert	Hayworth	Regula
Boehner	Hefley	Rehberg
Bonilla	Hensarling	Renzi
Bonner	Herger	Reynolds
Bono	Hobson	Rogers (AL)
Boozman	Hoekstra	Rogers (KY)
Bradley (NH)	Hostettler	Rogers (MI)
Brady (TX)	Hulshof	Rohrabacher
Brown (SC)	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown-Waite,	Hyde	Royce
Ginny	Issa	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Istook	Ryan (KS)
Burns	Jenkins	Saxton
Burr	Johnson (CT)	Schrock
Burton (IN)	Johnson (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Buyer	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Calvert	Jones (NC)	Shadegg
Camp	Keller	Shaw
Cannon	Kelly	Shays
Cantor	Kennedy (MN)	Sherwood
Capito	King (IA)	Shimkus
Carter	King (NY)	Shuster
Castle	Kingston	Simmons
Chabot	Kirk	Simpson
Chocola	Kline	Smith (MI)
Coble	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Cole	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Cox	LaHood	Souder
Crane	Latham	Stearns
Crenshaw	LaTourette	Sullivan
Cubin	Leach	Sweeney
Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Tancred
Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Taylor (NC)
Davis, Tom	LoBiondo	Terry
Deal (GA)	Lucas (OK)	Thomas
DeLay	Manzullo	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCotter	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCrery	Tiberi
Doolittle	McHugh	Toomey
Dreier	McKeon	Turner (OH)
Duncan	Mica	Upton
Dunn	Miller (FL)	Vitter
Ehlers	Miller (MI)	Walden (OR)
Emerson	Miller, Gary	Walsh
English	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Everett	Murphy	Weldon (FL)
Feeney	Musgrave	Weldon (PA)
Ferguson	Myrick	Weller
Flake	Nethercutt	Whitfield
Foley	Neugebauer	Wicker
Forbes	Ney	Wilson (NM)
Fossella	Northup	Wilson (SC)
Franks (AZ)	Norwood	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Nunes	Young (AK)
Gallely	Nussle	Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Osborne	
Gerlach	Ose	

NOES—187

Abercrombie	Boyd	Cramer
Ackerman	Brady (PA)	Crowley
Allen	Brown, Corrine	Cummings
Andrews	Capps	Davis (AL)
Baca	Capuano	Davis (CA)
Baird	Cardin	Davis (FL)
Baldwin	Cardoza	Davis (IL)
Becerra	Carson (OK)	DeFazio
Berkley	Case	DeGette
Berman	Chandler	Delahunt
Berry	Clay	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Dicks
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Dingell
Blumenauer	Cooper	Doyle
Boswell	Costello	Edwards

Emanuel	Levin	Ross
Engel	Lewis (GA)	Rothman
Eshoo	Lipinski	Ruppersberger
Etheridge	Loftgren	Rush
Evans	Lowe	Ryan (OH)
Farr	Lucas (KY)	Sabo
Fattah	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda
Filner	Maloney	T.
Frank (MA)	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta
Frost	Marshall	Sanders
Gonzalez	Matheson	Sandlin
Gordon	Matsui	Schakowsky
Green (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff
Grijalva	McCollum	Scott (GA)
Gutierrez	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Harman	McGovern	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	McIntyre	Sherman
Herseh	McNulty	Skelton
Hill	Meehan	Slaughter
Hinchey	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hinojosa	Menendez	Snyder
Hoefel	Michael	Solis
Holden	Millender-	Spratt
Holt	McDonald	Stark
Honda	Miller (NC)	Strickland
Hooley (OR)	Miller, George	Stupak
Hoyer	Mollohan	Tanner
Inslee	Moore	Tauscher
Israel	Moran (VA)	Taylor (MS)
Jackson (IL)	Murtha	Thompson (CA)
Jackson-Lee	Nadler	Thompson (MS)
(TX)	Napolitano	Tierney
Jefferson	Neal (MA)	Towns
John	Oberstar	Turner (TX)
Johnson, E. B.	Obey	Udall (CO)
Jones (OH)	Olver	Udall (NM)
Kanjorski	Ortiz	Van Hollen
Kaptur	Owens	Velázquez
Kennedy (RI)	Pallone	Visclosky
Kildee	Pascarell	Waters
Kilpatrick	Pastor	Watson
Kleczka	Payne	Watt
Kucinich	Pelosi	Weiner
Lampson	Pomeroy	Wexler
Langevin	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Lantos	Rahall	Wu
Larsen (WA)	Rangel	Wynn
Larson (CT)	Reyes	
Lee	Rodriguez	

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander	Dooley (CA)	McInnis
Bell	Ford	Meeks (NY)
Boucher	Gephardt	Paul
Brown (OH)	Greenwood	Peterson (MN)
Carson (IN)	Hayes	Quinn
Collins	Houghton	Roybal-Allard
Davis (TN)	Isakson	Stenholm
DeMint	Kind	Waxman
Deutsch	Majette	
Doggett	McCarthy (MO)	

□ 1814

Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. LIPINSKI changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. PICKERING, LEWIS of California, THOMAS, and BURR changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 384, tabling the appeal of the ruling of the Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Without objection, the words are stricken from the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman may proceed in order this day.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

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.

4818, 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, all time for debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) had expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. FARR

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. FARR:

At the end (before the short title), add the following:

UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL IN
COLOMBIA

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be made available for the assignment of any United States military personnel for temporary or permanent duty in Colombia if that assignment would cause the number of United States military personnel so assigned to exceed 550.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for the opportunity to debate an important topic on foreign aid to Colombia under the Plan Colombia.

The amendment that I am going to offer today would cap the military personnel in Colombia. The gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) knows how much Colombia means to me as a former Peace Corps volunteer in that country, and I would like to debate this issue with my colleagues here on the floor.

In the original Plan Colombia, Congress placed caps on the number of personnel that would be allowed in Colombia, U.S. military personnel and U.S. civilian personnel. Those caps were put in place to prevent the growth of the U.S. military commitment in Colombia. I became very concerned when I

heard the administration had asked Congress to increase the manpower caps in Colombia to 800 U.S. military personnel and 600 contractors.

It has been pointed out to Congress just last week by General Richard Cody, who told the House Committee on Armed Services that the recent troop deployments in Iraq have taken a toll on U.S. readiness to deploy elsewhere and even to replace troops currently deployed in U.S.-led military combat in Iraq and in Afghanistan. To quote General Cody, "We are stretched thin with our active and reserve component forces right now. Absolutely." Yet the administration wants to double the number of troops allowed under the manpower caps from 400 to 800.

Even General Hill of SOUTHCOM recently said before the Committee on Government Reform that rebuilding the social and economic system is needed in order to solve the problems in Colombia.

But today the administration has been calling Members' offices to ask them to oppose the Farr-Schakowsky-McGovern amendment, because the administration is dead set on working to expand the military aid, not the economic aid to Colombia.

After 5 years of spending almost \$4 billion on Plan Colombia, is it not time that we reassess our policy? The Committee on Armed Services did that. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is to be commended for his work on the Committee on Armed Services, because he was able to get a reasonable ceiling on U.S. personnel in Colombia. He got bipartisan support and amended the defense bill to do just that. I am asking the same in the foreign ops bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Farr-Schakowsky-McGovern amendment. This amendment simply puts the House on record in support of language that the House has already agreed to as part of the defense authorization bill, and it is consistent with the Committee on Appropriation's report language on troop levels in Colombia.

The amendment allows for funds to support an increase in the number of U.S. military personnel in Colombia but continues the practice of this Congress to limit that number. The amendment allows for the current cap of 400 U.S. military personnel allowed in Colombia to be raised by 150, for a total of 550.

Mr. Speaker, when Plan Colombia was first presented during the 106th Congress, we were told it was strictly for the purpose of counternarcotics. In order to ensure that would be the case, the House placed strict prohibitions on funds being used for purposes other than counternarcotics.

Since enactment of Plan Colombia, the policy has changed. Now, as many of us have warned, the Bush administration is seeking to increase military

involvement by the United States in Colombia. The administration wants to double the number of U.S. soldiers that are permitted to be deployed to Colombia.

This House placed caps on the number of U.S. troops in Colombia for a reason, and we should stick to the caps. We have provided \$3 billion to Colombia over the last several years. This bill seeks to provide over \$700 million for the Andean Region, including Colombia, and now we are being asked to commit more of our Nation's sons and daughters to the violence in Colombia.

Make no mistake, this is no longer a counternarcotics mission, and it is not a fight against terrorism that has anything to do with 9/11. It is a war, and sending more troops to Colombia means risking the lives of more Americans.

My colleagues on the other side of this argument seem to see no limit to what is an acceptable cap on U.S. investment in Colombia in terms of dollars and lives. As justification, they seem comfortable to toss around terms like the "war on drugs" and "fighting terrorism" without really discussing what that means and what the implications are for our country.

Despite our investments in Colombia so far, there have been no improvements in the overall problem of drug consumption in this country, and there has been no reduction in the violence in Colombia.

I have seen firsthand what a beautiful country Colombia is. I have met people from all sectors of Colombian society and traveled throughout Colombia. It is a wonderful nation but one in the midst of a civil war.

I believe what the Colombian people want and need from the United States is support to help improve the lives of its people. Sending troops will not accomplish that goal. If we allow the administration to double the number of U.S. troops in Colombia this year, what will next year's request look like?

We have heard from numerous military and civilian experts about the strains being placed on our Armed Forces as a result of the military conflict in Afghanistan and Iraq and additional homeland security needs. Instead of sending another 400 of our service personnel to Colombia, we should look for ways to ease the burden on our forces.

Vote to affirm the House-passed defense authorization and in support of the Committee on Appropriations. Support the Farr-Schakowsky-McGovern amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in opposition to this amendment, which would limit the number of U.S. military and contractor personnel in Colombia. While I

certainly can and would debate this on policy grounds, let me instead debate it on process, which I think is just as important here. This is an issue, and Members ought to know this, being currently decided in conference by the House and Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Permanent law limits the number of U.S. military and contractor personnel in Colombia to 400 each. That was enacted in the fiscal year 2002 foreign operations appropriations bill. The House Committee on Armed Services in their 2005 defense authorization bill included an increase in the number of military personnel to 500 and left the cap of 400 on contractor personnel. The Senate included in their bill an increase in military personnel to 800 and contractor personnel to 600, as the administration requested. Then on the floor of the other body, an amendment to limit these increases failed by a 40 to 58 vote.

This Committee was consulted by the administration on the personnel cap increase, and the House leadership decided that the authorizers would take the lead, which I think is appropriate.

The number of personnel in Colombia ought to be an issue of authorization. We provide the funds, but they should decide how many personnel may be in that country.

While my colleague may say this will allow the United States to get more deeply involved in Colombia, if one looks at the appropriation levels, that is not true. The Andean Counterdrug Initiative is streamlined from last year's \$731 million.

So a vote in favor of this amendment would put this subcommittee right in the middle of the conference negotiations between the Armed Services Committees. I do not think we should be in that position.

Let me say a word on policy. Until recently, the agencies involved were able to work comfortably within the ceilings. The increased pace of implementation for all the programs we support being undertaken by the Uribe Administration offers an opportunity for real progress. The current cap levels have recently come to hurt management efficiency and planning and prevent full implementation of programs.

The average number of U.S. military and U.S. civilian contractors has grown as programs have been fully implemented or as new programs have started, such as the anti-kidnapping program started with the supplemental funds we appropriated last year.

During 2003, the number of U.S. military varied from 128 to 396; that of civilian contractors from 246 to 400. Requirements in our bill requiring human rights vetting and the prohibition on combat will be maintained.

Let me just say, in conclusion, that we have had some significant achievements in our efforts to eradicate coca in Colombia. Cultivation has been reduced by 21 percent in the last year on top of 15 percent in the year 2002. We

have reduced potential production of cocaine by over 20 percent. The number of communities that have voluntarily and manually eradicated cocaine is over 8,000 hectares in the year 2003.

So these are some of the reasons, but we will hear more in a little bit, why we ought to not support this amendment. I urge my colleagues not to do so.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I support the Farr amendment and would like to take this opportunity to raise another equally important and related issue.

Colombia is a nation that has been embroiled in a 40-year civil war. Despite this fact, as Members of Congress we must seriously question Colombia's commitment to winning that fight. I say this because, currently, Colombian law excludes from their military draft individuals who are high school graduates. In other words, if you graduate from high school in Colombia, you do not have to serve in their military.

Colombia is sending its least fortunate citizens off to fight its civil war, but it is unwilling to require the sons and daughters of the elite to fight. If the elite, educated Colombians will not send their sons and daughters to fight in their own civil war, why should American troops be sent to Colombia in their place?

Every year we hear that this issue is being addressed by the Colombian government, but over and over again, fact remains, it has not been corrected, and every year we get an increase for more and more U.S. troops to fight in that civil war.

The Bush administration is willing to involve more U.S. men and women in Colombia's civil war, while the elite of Colombia society is protected from military service. This administration now wants to increase the troops to 800 people, exposing more of our young men and women to harm.

Colombia needs to reform its conscription laws to make military service universal and fair. It needs to change its laws to do away with the existing discriminatory practices and create a universal military service obligation without distinction for economic, social or education conditions.

The Bush administration wants an open policy to send as many military troops and contractors to fight in Colombia's 40 year civil war, while Colombia's elite has exempted itself from military service. We should not be involved in Colombia's civil war at all.

At a time when our military is already stretched thin in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Bush administration should not be sending yet more American troops overseas to fight in a war that well-off Colombians seem unwilling to fight for. I ask and urge our

Members to support the Farr amendment and limit the U.S. involvement in this unjust civil war in Colombia.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is interesting, the United States does a lot of things around the world. Some things we do very well, some things we do so-so, and some things we do not do very well. But it seems to me, curiously, that in a political body our history is that those things we do very well, we end up saying, "Well, let's stop doing it." Those things we do so-so, we just kind of hold back. And those things we do very poorly, we end up saying, "Let's throw more money at it."

□ 1830

Well, I would share with the folks of this body that what we are doing in Colombia under Plan Colombia and have been doing under Plan Colombia for the last few years is working. We are helping a democracy in the Western Hemisphere get on its feet and protect its institutions with a minimum of investment.

Yes, we have spent \$3 billion or \$4 billion. Yes, we are going up incrementally, a very little bit, to 800 military personnel or as many as 600 civilian contractors under what is being discussed in the conference committee. But the net result, I say to my colleagues, is very positive. Let me just share a little with my colleagues.

Colombia, which has been a home for significant disruption in civil society over the past decade, let alone the 40 years that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) reported, homicides this year are down 16 percent from last year in the first 4 months of the year. Massacre events have dropped from 34 in the first 4 months of last year to 20 this year. Kidnappings have dropped from 820 to 447. Highway robberies have dropped from 445 to 336. Vehicle thefts have dropped from 4,859 to 3,489.

Mr. Chairman, the assistance we are giving our friends in Colombia is working. We are helping them protect their institutions and their civil society from encroachment by criminals and terrorists. It is absolutely important that we finish this job, that we help our friends protect their democratic institutions and come join us in the Western Hemisphere as a fully functioning democracy.

Now, I would just add that our efforts are not limited to law enforcement or military. We are also down in the despeje, helping the folks who used to do coca production learn other crops and alternatives. We are in there with the justice training, helping their justice system set up courts that function so that people have due process, so that we have fair trials. We are in there with USAID helping folks rebuild their country.

Now is not the time to pull the plug. Now is the time to pay attention to the effectiveness that we have clearly implemented in Colombia under Plan Colombia and move incrementally to improve their prospects.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Farr-Schakowsky-McGovern amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment about America, about us, and about the pressures placed on our uniformed men and women serving in the Armed Forces. In effect, this amendment matches what the House has already approved in the Defense authorization bill. In this sense, it is a conforming amendment. Everyone in this House knows that America's troops are stretched dangerously thin. Every day, there is a story in one of the major papers about the stresses facing American troops as more are deployed to Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere around the world. We are diverting troops from South Korea to Iraq, and we are placing burdens on our Guard and Reservists just to give some small amount of relief to our regular military units before they are redeployed into combat once again.

Faced with these tremendous strains, the administration has come forward and asked Congress to double the number of troops in Colombia, offering no more compelling a rationale than Colombia needs more of our men and women for their civil war.

The Farr amendment, like the Taylor provision in the Defense authorization bill, offers a prudent alternative: provide a modest increase of 150 more troops, give the U.S. military in Colombia a bit more flexibility and relief, retain the private contractor cap at 400, and evaluate our global military situation over the next 12 months.

I do not want any Member of this House to be fooled. This latest bid to raise the military troop cap will not be the last. The administration has assured Congress repeatedly that no increase to the troop cap would be necessary; yet, now their story has changed. Will it change again in another year or two? Let us refresh our memories on what the administration has told Congress about the current troop cap.

On April 4, 2001, General Peter Pace, commander of the U.S. Southern Command said, "That troop cap, sir, is well within the limits that I need to do the job that I have been given, and I support it."

On October 4, 2002, Brigadier General Galen Jackman, J-3 Chief of Operations at the U.S. Southern Command testified, "We have a 400-person military cap in Colombia. We do not envision that that is going to change. Typically, we have maybe a couple of hundred people in the country at any given time."

On March 7, 2003, Mark Grossman, the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs stated, "There are caps on the number of people who can be in Colombia at any one time, and there is no one who is advocating the breaking of those caps."

And on August 19, 2003, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld declared, "I think it would be unlikely to be anything that would break that cap."

Mr. Chairman, when Plan Colombia was first launched and American troops first sent down to Colombia, Congress was told we were only going to fight the drug trade. Then we were asked to commit our troops to fight not only a drug war, but to join the campaign in a counterterrorist, a counterinsurgency civil war. Now we are being asked to double the number of our soldiers, boots on the ground in Colombia. There is a term for what is happening in Colombia. It is called "mission creep."

Mr. Chairman, Congress was right 4 years ago to impose military personnel caps in Colombia. It was a smart and prudent safeguard against any rapid escalation of U.S. involvement in Colombia's internal armed conflict. We did the right thing then. The Farr-Schakowsky-McGovern amendment is the right thing to do now.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment on U.S. troop caps in Colombia.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 13½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this is mission creep, this is more like Mission Success. But I want to say first before I get into it, and I appreciate that the gentleman from California has agreed to withdraw his amendment, as I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from California who has truly been committed to Colombia, who was in the Peace Corps in Colombia, and has worked through many of these problems. And the gentleman from Massachusetts has shown, through his personal visits to Colombia in a repeated way and in different areas that he is truly and deeply concerned, as is the gentlewoman from Illinois.

I think it is important that even when we have deep differences of philosophy on how to approach narcotics, how to approach things like sending our troops overseas, that we treat each other with respect here in this body and it is very important, even in these most contentious times, that we try to do that here; and we all need to work

towards that. But we do have some disagreements.

First, the reason I say that I believe it is Mission Success is that one way we measure this is whether we have succeeded in reducing the massacres which have gone down this year compared to last year by 41 percent, massacre victims by 55 percent, kidnappings by 46 percent, executive kidnappings by 60 percent, illegal roadblocks by 66 percent, roadblock kidnappings by 61 percent, bank robberies by 66 percent; in addition to the statistics we are getting on cocaine and heroin seizures which are substantially up, but which often, as we all know are fungible, because it seems like we always discover more but, in fact, at this point, we cannot even find in organized areas big plots of heroin, which has been a growing problem. They have moved it into higher altitudes; and, quite frankly, we did not understand how hard it was going to be to continue to make the reductions. Similar in coca. They have reconfigured. We are making progress. We believe we are at a critical tipping point.

We have an administration in Colombia that has finally understood a basic point, not only about the DMZ, but about going after, in a repeated way, the coca growers.

I am a strong supporter, as the gentleman from California knows, of alternative development. We have met down in Colombia with leaders there and understand unless we can rebuild their justice system, it is the oldest democracy in South America, but unless we can rebuild that justice system, we have deep problems, and we have worked to try to make sure funding goes both ways.

But, quite frankly, nobody will run for office if they think they are going to be assassinated. Businessmen are fleeing the country if they think they are going to be kidnapped. I went in Nelson Mandela Village with many of the displaced people, and they do not want to go home because, first, the FARC comes through and terrorizes them, then the paramilitaries come through and terrorize them; often the kidnappings, and what they need is some order.

We have an administration under President Uribe who is giving the order. And, to my view, and I think to most observers, this is the model for Iraq. By the way, we are not asking for 800; we are saying a cap, and that way we do not have to come back. The number there of advisors varies. These are not fighters, soldiers in the sense of them shooting bullets like in Afghanistan and Iraq. These are advisors. In my opinion, this is where we want to be in Iraq, this is where we want to be in Afghanistan, where we are arguing how many advisors we have there.

But the people on the ground in Colombia who are fighting and dying are Colombians, not Americans. And they are fighting, by the way, over something that is our drug habit and West-

ern Europe's drug habit. They did not have, and I heard them all the time here, a civil war. They have at different points in time, like many countries, had people who are displaced landowners or people who felt land distribution was unfair, which it generally is in South America, and had a civil war; but this is now a narcotics war with only a small pocket.

The total support for the FARC is less than the drug lords, terrorists, dealers, and other terrorists groups in the United States. We would not like it if Colombia referred to us as having a civil war because we have drug dealers in our country or we have terrorists in our country. The group that tried to negotiate the peace, and many of them have come out, may have at one time been there for altruistic, civil war motives; but this is a classic terrorism war at this point, and Uribe is going after it. He, as much as anybody. And we can see it in Medellin; we can see it in Putumayo and in other areas working for alternative development.

I believe this lifting of the cap which may be only 450, may be 500, hopefully will eliminate the need to come in, if there are times when we need a few more, of advisors to train the Colombians and to use the model where they are really turning the progress. Quite frankly, if we do not reach a tipping point, we have a problem, and we need to work together, that after these people start to move back into their villages, after they start to rebuild their communities, we absolutely have an obligation to help with the financial alternative development, to help them rebuild those institutions.

I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) working in this bill to allow, one group that I worked with was Kid Save where we have many of these older kids who are orphaned or who have been abandoned, and this bill now allows some money to be able through AID to help those kids in adoption in the United States and in Colombia; and that is the type of thing we need to be working towards. But to achieve that, we have to have order.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the ranking member of the committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Farr amendment.

As part of the fiscal year 2001 supplemental for Plan Colombia, Congress limited U.S. military and contractor presence in Colombia to 800 people. That bill, which first established our support for Plan Colombia, also strictly limited our assistance to Colombia for antinarcotic purposes.

As many of my colleagues may remember, that decision was made because Members were concerned that our involvement would increase as time went by and that the United States would expand the scope of its involvement from an antinarcotics campaign to an anti-insurgency campaign.

As the involvement of the Colombian terrorist organizations and drug trafficking increased, Congress approved an expansion of the authority governing our involvement in Colombia. Essentially, we allowed our resources and manpower to be used more broadly to pursue terrorist organizations involved in drug trafficking. The overall U.S. manpower caps remained in place, but were adjusted to allow 400 military and 400 contractor personnel, and this was done at the request of the administration in the 2002 Foreign Operations bill. The expanded authority was approved with those manpower limitations in mind; but this year, the administration has requested an expansion of our manpower cap to 800 military and 600 contractor personnel.

The House-passed Defense authorization bill partially grants this request, increasing the manpower cap to 500, while the Senate version of the bill grants the entire request to allow 800 military and 600 contractors. Today, the House should send a clear signal to the conferees in that bill by voting to limit our military presence to 550.

Our Armed Forces, and especially the Army and Special Forces, are stretched to the breaking point with our commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 1845

It will take years for us to recover. While an increase of 400 may not seem large, I view this as a manifestation of a long-term plan to ramp up U.S. involvement in Colombia. Who knows what expansion will be sought next year?

The request to increase manpower is clearly intended to expand U.S. troop involvement in the Colombian war against the FARC, that war that has been under way for 20 years. Solving Colombia's problems will not be accomplished with a few hundred additional U.S. soldiers. There must be a comprehensive effort that includes a plan for reintegration of former combatants back into Colombian society.

I respect the view of others. I certainly understand their point of view. I have always supported assistance for Colombia in the context of a plan that I thought made sense. The U.S. is now spending close to \$1 billion a year in Colombia, including ever-increasing amounts found in the DOD appropriations bill. I do not support this manpower increase, because I believe it continues to expand U.S. involvement, and a violent political struggle will only lead to an ever-increasing commitment of U.S. manpower.

The amendment grants a modest increase in military manpower, reflects the House position as contained in the House defense authorization bill, and it is the soundest policy, in my judgment.

I urge my colleagues to support the Farr amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to

speak, and I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) to put a cap on U.S. military and contract personnel assistance assigned to our friend, the Republic of Colombia.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment. It ties the hands of the President, our Commander in Chief, from making military and counterterrorism decisions. Specifically, this bill makes no exceptions to the cap, greatly limiting Presidential action. This can be a serious problem, should the President, Republican or Democrat, ever need to deploy U.S. personnel to safeguard American citizens or security, since the amendment would force all U.S. assistance under foreign operations to be cut off. This would mean that development programs, counternarcotics initiatives and U.S. security could be severely damaged under this amendment.

The increased pace of implementation for programs we support being undertaken by the Uribe administration in Colombia offers an opportunity for real progress towards our goals, but current cap levels hurt our efficiency, prevent full implementation of our programs.

Draft legislation to raise the military cap to 800 and the civilian cap to 600 was included in the fiscal year 2005 DOD authorization bill, as it was recognized it is necessary to increase the cap to ensure continued success in Colombia.

I think it is important to recognize that the Republic of Colombia is Latin America's oldest long-standing democracy, and it is important to recognize that Plan Colombia is working.

Let us take a closer look at the success in Colombia in fighting drugs in partnership with our friend, President Uribe. Coca cultivation has declined by 21 percent in Colombia and over 33 percent in the last 2 years. The Colombia coca crop has been reduced to 127,000 hectares from 169,000 hectares 2 years ago. Potential production has been reduced by 20 percent for export quality cocaine, and potential pure heroin production has been reduced by 10 percent just this past year in 2003.

Ladies and gentlemen, the elected government of Colombia is restoring basic protections to every Colombian community, because Plan Colombia is working. Police presence has been extended in all 158 municipalities in Colombia that had no police before, and 87 Colombian citizens have been extradited to the United States on narcotics-related charges. A government presence in all of Colombia's 1,098 municipalities has been established for the first time in the country's history.

Again, Plan Colombia is working, and Plan Colombia is a key component of our fight against terrorism.

We must also remember the strong link between terrorism and drug trafficking. The funds from drug sales are often funding worldwide terrorist activities. Specifically in Colombia, desertions among narco-trafficking ter-

rorist groups are up 80 percent, and child soldiers are increasingly being voluntarily repatriated.

In 2003, nearly 7,000 narcoterrorists were captured. Colombia's murder rate has dropped by 20 percent. Terrorist incidents have dropped by 49 percent. Terrorism cases in Colombia were down 48 percent in 2003; and in a July, 2003, poll, 65 percent of Colombians say they felt more secure in July of 2003 than they did one year before in July of 2002, which happened to be one month before President Uribe took office.

Again, Plan Colombia is working.

Finally, on the human rights front, kidnappings are down by 26 percent in 2003. Homicides reached their lowest level since 1987. Of 2,500 human rights allegations in Colombia over the past year, there have been no allegations of human right abuses filed against U.S.-trained units and only 2 percent against the Colombian military, compared with 40 or 50 percent just 7 years ago.

Again, Plan Colombia is working. Our partnership with President Uribe is working. It is strong. The eradication of narcotics and regional security is a priority. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes at this time.

I want to respond to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Indiana. They say that Plan Colombia is working, and it is working under the existing caps. My point is that, as a person who lived in that country and worked in the economic development and the community development as a Peace Corps volunteer, is that I believe that Colombia has the capacity with our help to win this war on terrorism, to win this war on drugs, and it is the obscene amount of money that drug cartels dumped into the country that is doing it.

But you are not going to win that by putting all of the emphasis on the military side, and that is where the mission creep is. We have the most amount of money being spent on the military than we ever have, and we are winning the war. Now we need to spend money on the civilian side, on the economic side.

You cannot win this war. What you have to do is win the peace, and the peace will not be won until the investment is in Colombians to do the job for themselves.

My job in the Peace Corps was to work myself out of a job, and I think what we have lost track of here or lost sight of is that we are not really emphasizing how do we get these countries to do the job themselves. How do we get the contractors that are being paid American dollars, how do we get military that is our military to work themselves out of a job? Until we answer that and see that we are moving in that direction, I think we are asking the wrong question and we are quoting the wrong facts here.

Yes, it is moving in the right direction. In fact, we would argue that, because of the way it is moving, there ought to be a greater emphasis, not a less emphasis, on local economic development, on fighting the war on poverty. There is only 20 percent of the budget that now goes to the economic side of it. That is the least amount of money since the war in Colombia, the Plan Colombia began. So the mission creep is on the military side, and I think the mission creep ought to be on the other side, on the economic side. Until we win the war on poverty, we will not win the peace, and until we win the peace, we will not have a stable country.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I basically agree with the gentleman from California that I am disappointed that as we need more dollars, if we do, for some military operations that they would come out of the domestic side. Long term, you are absolutely right. We have to win the hearts of the people, but, as the gentleman knows, we have two variables that have complicated the final kind of push over the top.

One, they moved the heroin up higher on the mountains; and it requires a different military capability with the helicopters and different training. And, secondly, they moved east, into the country, into the jungles, farther from our air bases; and we need the capability, at least at certain periods of time, to increase the number of advisers to address those two things.

But, long term, if we are not moving in the direction you are talking, we will never win this war and we will not accomplish it. But there are times when you have to have different strategies, and I believe that is essential at this point in time.

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

In conclusion, I would ask for unanimous consent that, at the end of this, we withdraw the amendment to keep this dialogue going. I think we can focus on really trying to do the right thing in Colombia, and I do not think that there is any difference on either side of the aisle that we want the Colombians to be able to have the capacity to govern themselves in a peaceful fashion.

They certainly, of all the countries that we are involved in, have a better infrastructure, a longer-running democracy, more communities established all over the country, have well-educated people, but they also have a massive amount of poverty. The biggest problem with the drug war is it has displaced millions of people who just do not have an adequate place to

live or a job or the social services or the health services and educational services that are necessary.

That is my concern, that if we are putting more emphasis essentially into the military, we are going to have less emphasis, because there is only so much money you can spend on what I think is so essential, to having a lasting peace in Colombia. And that is, we have got to provide for the infrastructure, the social, economic infrastructure of all of the people that have been displaced, and we are moving away from that, from the ability to have alternative crops.

Remember, the crops that are growing and are being destroyed are way out in the boonies in the middle of the jungles. You are not going to reestablish a market crop in the jungles. You are going to have to reestablish a market crop in the areas.

And, remember, Colombia has been one of the leading agricultural countries in the world. We have all been drinking its coffee forever, and the quality of that coffee is the highest there is. We could do more by paying more for Colombian coffee, would be the best help in economic aid to that country of anything that I can imagine.

But I would like to make sure that, as we go into conference on this bill and into the defense bill, that we keep in mind that the war in Colombia is not going to be won by mission creep of the military. It is going to be won when we start tipping the scale, as the gentleman from Indiana said, to put more emphasis in the peace effort and less in the war effort.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Farr amendment.

I am concerned about the use of U.S. funds in Colombia.

In particular, I am deeply concerned about four public statements by the President of Colombia in which he accused domestic and international human rights organizations of supporting armed groups and of being allied with terrorists.

These statements are not only unhelpful but are also deeply disturbing. Human rights organizations are working to assist with humanitarian aid and building civil society in local communities in Colombia that have been torn apart by the terrible violence.

The President's verbal assaults on human rights organizations do absolutely nothing to help the Colombian people or to help bring an end to the violence—instead his comments may cause a reverse in a recent trend of a decrease in politically motivated violence.

Despite the fact that the above violence has decreased, there are some areas of Colombia in which local communities continue to be victims of terrible violence and suffering.

For example, security in the special security areas, such as Arauca, has deteriorated under the current President.

According to Evangelical and Catholic church leaders, there have been dozens of cases in which pastors, priests, and lay leaders have been targeted by armed actors of the left and the right for refusing to take up arms. According to these reports, 37 Protestant pas-

tors were killed in the first 6 weeks of 2003 and four Catholic clerics were assassinated in 2003. Most of these cases were in the State of Arauca.

The numbers of politically motivated murders have not changed for the better—in 2003, over 3,000 civilians were killed for political motives and at least 600 “disappeared.”

Around 2,200 people were kidnapped, more than half by armed opposition groups and army-backed paramilitaries. Armed opposition groups such as the FARC and ELN were responsible for repeated and serious breaches of international humanitarian law, including hostage taking and the abduction and massacres. They carried out attacks using disproportionate and indiscriminate weapons that resulted in the death of numerous civilians.

The government and security forces increased their attempts to undermine the legitimacy of human rights defenders, peace activists and trade unionists. This coincided with paramilitary threats and attacks against human rights organizations. The attacks on these groups made it nearly impossible for many to continue documenting and reporting on human rights abuses by all armed actors—if the human rights organizations cannot do their work, the violations are largely under-reported.

Despite the declared cease-fire, paramilitaries were still responsible for massacres, targeted killings, “disappearances” torture, kidnappings and threats. They were allegedly responsible for the killing or “disappearance” of at least 1,300 people in 2003, over 70 of all attributable, non-combat, politically related killings and “disappearances.”

Even the United Nations has noted an increase in complaints of serious human rights violations which directly involve the security forces themselves.

I would urge President Uribe to cease his senseless attacks on human rights organizations that simply hurt those who are helping the people of Colombia—instead he should vigorously pursue those who commit horrifying atrocities and terrorize communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, as we consider the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill today, it is important to reaffirm our commitment to our counternarcotics efforts in Colombia, to the people of Colombia, and to American citizens. I led three congressional delegations to Colombia last year and can say first hand that our significant investment, after years of effort, is beginning to see returns on the time, money, and resources spent in Colombia. Together with the strong commitment of President Alvaro Uribe and historic levels of support from the Colombian people, U.S. involvement is beginning to hit narcoterrorists where it hurts.

This year, the Administration is seeking a modest increase in the number of U.S. support personnel in Colombia. The existing caps on the number of U.S. civilian and military personnel contractors allowed in Colombia at any given time are proving too restrictive and in some cases, the ceilings, have prevented full implementation of already funded programs and hurt management efficiency.

An increase in the military and civilian contractor support provided to the Government of Colombia during the next two years is essential to maintain the current progress being

made by our programs in Colombia. There are also new programs developed since the ceilings were established, such as the anti-kidnapping initiative and the training of prosecutors and judicial police in preparation for the constitutionally-mandated transition to an accusatorial criminal justice system with oral trials, as well as the re-started Air Bridge Denial program that need to be fully supported by personnel.

Last month, several senior Administration officials, including Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, Roger Noriega, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, Thomas O'Connell, Commander of U.S. Southern Command, General James Hill, and Assistant Secretary of State for Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Robert Charles testified before the Government Reform Committee and conveyed the need to reexamine military and civilian personnel caps if we are to continue in the right direction.

Accordingly, there is draft language included in the 2005 Defense Authorization bill that raises the number of military personnel permitted to 800 and the number of permitted civilian contractors to 600. The Administration's request to increase the number of troops and contractors deployable is critical to the continued success of U.S. policy in Colombia and to help President Uribe prosecute a unified campaign against terrorism and drug traffickers. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this request and urge all of my colleagues to continue their support of our unified campaign with Colombia to fight narcotics trafficking and terrorist activities.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I appreciate the opportunity. I am concerned, and I had an amendment that I originally drafted to restore development assistance and child survival and health money for Latin America to fiscal year 2004 levels. I will not be offering that amendment, and I would appreciate this chance to engage with you and hopefully as well as the chairman to discuss the issue.

As the ranking member on the Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere and a member of the Hispanic Caucus, I was outraged that the President's budget proposal slashed development funding to Latin America by an average of 11 percent. Latin America is the only region in the world to be cut in both total economic development aid and total narcotic and military aid.

So to make these cuts real beyond those percentages, let me just say that, as a result of the overall cuts to Latin America, the President's proposed

budget cut the child survival and health funding in Guatemala by almost 15 percent at a time when Guatemala's malnutrition rate for children is extremely high, one of the highest in the world.

As for the new Millennium Challenge Account, it does little for the over 40 percent of Latin Americans living in poverty who live in all of the Latin American countries; and, in fact, only three of those countries will actually benefit from MCA funding this fiscal year.

And the region is at a critical moment. Over just the past year, two democratically elected leaders were removed from office. The region is threatened by mob rule, from the lynching of a mayor in Peru to the ousting of a democratically elected president in Bolivia. These incidents only highlight the destabilizing impact of poverty, hunger and economic disenfranchisement.

Democracy means little if you cannot feed your family, your children, cannot get an education and you feel disenfranchised from your government. And in that regard, I think we are losing the battle for the hearts and minds of Latin American's democracy in that respect, losing the battle for the hearts and minds of Latin Americans, and that is why I asked the distinguished ranking member of this committee whether the gentlewoman can offer us any hope that we are going to get some relief from those cuts.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1900

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) for raising what I think is a very important point. Like he is, I am perplexed; I am disappointed with the administration's budget request for Latin America. I do not think it reflects the priorities or the national interests of the United States.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) summarized some of the statistics; but for all of the Western Hemisphere, the development assistance, the child survival and health accounts were cut by 10½ percent in this year's request. And Central American countries received an even more disproportionate share of those cuts, a decrease of 17.8 percent.

Central American countries are our strong allies. They have become increasingly democratic. They are conducting fair and safe elections while electing governments that I believe history will view as turning points in these nations' future. But they do face daunting problems of poverty and corruption.

In countries such as Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua, we are witnessing governments that are doing their best to tackle these problems head on. And we have of course re-

cently negotiated a trade agreement with them that is going to require a lot of technical assistance for them to implement that. Add to these issues the need to get economic growth generated in Central America to provide a decent standard of living for their people, people are looking northwards for employment if not given any opportunities in their own country. Under those circumstances, I think Americans would support increasing assistance to these countries.

We do have in our report language that accompanies our bill before the House today language that directs the administration to restore the funding levels to last year's levels. I would prefer to see an increase and hope that we can see that sometime in the near future. I will push this issue further as we enter conference negotiations with the Senate, and I thank my colleague for raising this important issue. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the chairman and I want to assure my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), that I share the gentleman's commitment to working with you to increase the dollars for Latin America because we realize how critical this is.

The committee's recommendation to increase both the Child Survival and Development Assistance accounts by a combined total of \$328 million above the President's request was in large part meant to restore cuts made to Latin American countries. In addition, the committee report as cited by the chairman contains specific directive language mandating that the Agency For International Development restore cuts made to Central American countries when the FY 2005 operating plans are developed.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Frankly, it is unclear to me why the administration would choose to reduce our commitment to our closest neighbors at a time when overall foreign aid is increasing. Additional funding would enable vital education, maternal and infant health, and democracy and agricultural programs to be restored.

It is my hope that the administration's fiscal year 2006 request will reflect the clear interests of Congress at a robust level of funding for Latin America, as evidenced by the gentleman's amendment.

I want to conclude by saying, I share our chairman's deep commitment to Latin America. We thank the gentleman for his comments on this issue, and we assure the gentleman that we are going to work together to make sure that Latin America gets the assistance that it rightly deserves.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the distinguished gentleman both for yielding as

well as for his work and commitment to the hemisphere. And I want to thank the ranking Democrat as well for her response to our concerns. I certainly hope and certainly agree with the chairman's comments that we want to see this funding increase in the future, because when we take in the consequences of inflation, the 2004 level is not enough. It is actually a decrease. And it should be a floor, not a ceiling; but we certainly need a floor to start with so we can build upon it. I appreciate the efforts in the report language.

I would just close by saying I hope that the chairman and the ranking member who have put some pretty strong report language in here, that the USAID understands that the committee and many Members here are serious, and that it will be followed, and that we will see these monies going for Latin America. Otherwise, next year we intend to pursue vigorously with the Hispanic Caucus and interested Members on both sides of the aisle the funding that is necessary for one of the most important parts of the world in terms of U.S. national interest on a variety of issues.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman for his engagement, his support and the ranking Democrat as well.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman with his comments. I am confident with his support and that of other Members of this body, we will get the attention of the administration on this issue.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OTTER

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OTTER:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY AND THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE

SEC. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) of the total amount of funds that are available in this Act for assistance for the Palestinian Authority (or any other Palestinian entity) or for the Palestinian people, not more than 25 percent of such amount may be obligated and expended during each quarter of fiscal year 2005; and

(2) none of the funds made available in this Act may be made available for assistance for the Palestinian Authority (or any other Palestinian entity) or for the Palestinian people during any quarter of fiscal year 2005 unless the Secretary of State determines that the Palestinian Authority has not provided support for acts of international terrorism during the 3-month period preceding the first day of that quarter.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to address what I believe to be a fatal flaw in the way we administer our foreign aid.

We cannot truly be effective either domestically or in our role on the world stage when our foreign policy forces us to support our friends while at the same time indiscriminately doling out money to our and their enemies.

All the efforts we put into promoting peace and cooperation is meaningless without requiring accountability from the recipients of our assistance. U.S. foreign aid should be based upon a recipient's demonstrated willingness to support our ideals and our aspirations for their region. When we provide aid to a country, we should be able to expect a marked change in that country's behavior in keeping with our goals.

Let me give a specific example of what I am talking about here. When they were much younger, I gave my children a monthly allowance. Unlike gifts of money or money that they earned themselves, this allowance came with some strings attached. It came with an understanding that I could expect certain behavior from them. On occasion they would forget about our bargain, and their behavior would not reflect the expectations that we had established. But when they did not receive their allowance, the next month they were quick to fix the problem so that we could peacefully live together.

Foreign aid is like an allowance which the United States is not obligated to offer and which should not come without certain strings attached. And yet we continue to treat it as if we are required to hand out money to nations and people who actively oppose the principles that we try to advance.

Today we have a golden opportunity to change the way we address the issues on foreign aid.

As part of his road map to peace, President Bush recommended giving foreign aid to the Palestine Authority for the first time in almost a decade. In light of that request, we should act now to infuse any aid with common sense and accountability so that we can advance the realistic goals that the President has set for the Middle East.

In a nutshell, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply require that any aid that we give to Palestine would only be given every quarter. In other words, it would be broken up into four payments over a year's period. And only 25 percent would be given in any one quarter. So January, February and March, at the end of March, the Palestine's would receive some aid. At the end of June, the Palestinians would receive some aid. At the end of September, same and just before Christmas once again.

The reason I approach it this way is because then the Secretary of State would be required to verify that in the previous quarter there had been no acts

of terrorism, no human bombs that had ventured into Israel or had ventured into some other area, that the Palestinians had indeed not engaged in any acts of terrorism anywhere in the world.

And so every quarter, once every 3 months, once that is verified by the Secretary of State, then the Palestinians would receive some money. More like an allowance instead of alimony, that we treat it today as though we owed it to folks. Such a commonsense approach to accountability is the first step to reforming our foreign policy. It will provide, I believe, a powerful incentive for the recipients of this money in order to promote the kind of democracy and the kinds of values that we have in hopes for them.

The President is working to achieve a lasting peace in this region, realistically and in good faith, and I applaud his efforts. But if we are to see a change in the Middle East, our approach to foreign aid must change as well. What better time than now to implement a policy based upon behavior and responsibility, with the expectations that we offer at the same time that we offer the money.

I encourage you to take advantage of this opportunity to assist in the peace process by making sure that our assistance carries with it the same weight as our principles would.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER). We certainly should not tolerate support for terrorism by any organization, that includes the Palestinian Authority. Indeed, the bill that is before you prohibits funds for the Authority, prohibits all funds for the Palestinian Authority, and includes a number of provisions affecting West Bank Gaza programs that would prohibit funds for any group or individual that supports terrorism.

This year the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and I strengthen the prohibition on funding for terrorist groups by banning funding through the West Bank/Gaza program for any individual, any individual or group that advocates terrorism. The new provision also requires an immediate cut-off of funds if any group currently receiving funds advocates or engages in terrorist activities.

On the other hand, it is important to continue the West Bank/Gaza programs because they provide important humanitarian and infrastructure assistance for the Palestinian people. It is important to stress that all of the funds in this program are provided through nongovernmental organizations or through American contractors, or in some cases, Israeli contractors for water and sewer infrastructure programs. Not one cent goes to the Palestinian Authority.

I appreciate the concerns that the gentleman has expressed. They are the concerns of this subcommittee, and they are, I can assure the gentleman, expressed in the bill here. I understand the gentleman is prepared to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I will try to take less than that if possible.

I rise in support of the Otter amendment. The question should be should we have any aid going to the West Bank and Gaza. That should be the question. Is it buying us pro-American values? No. Is it buying us less violence? No. Is it buying us a more transparent government? No. Is it buying us more democracy? No.

And to make matters worse those receiving the aid are refusing now to sign a declaration saying that the money will not go to terrorists. There is no reason in my eyes that we should be providing any aid at all.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman and I have discussed the case of the Berhane family, U.S. citizens who had their private businesses confiscated by the former Ethiopian government. While this occurred in 1977, the current government has not shown good faith in resolving this longstanding injustice. In 1999, the matter was nearly settled when the current Ethiopian government summarily deported Mr. Berhane to Eritrea.

Despite lip service since, the Ethiopian government has not settled this matter. It should have been resolved years ago. Additionally, as the distinguished chairman knows, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation has made a finding in support of the Berhane family claim and will not do business in Ethiopia until this issue has been settled. The CEO of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, Paul Applegarth, has indicated that the MCC may follow suit.

Mr. Chairman, Ethiopia is eligible for more than \$60 million of funding in this bill in its present form. The government of Ethiopia should understand that any government that refuses to deal with the legitimate claims of American citizens is jeopardizing its eligibility for assistance funded by the U.S. taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that until these legitimate property claims are dealt with fairly by the Ethiopian government that the economic assistance funds in this bill for Ethiopia in the ESF account should be reprogrammed to the Child Survival and Health Programs Fund, specifically to the account of the "communities severely affected by HIV/AIDS, including children displaced or orphaned by AIDS."

□ 1915

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I have to say that I find that these are very troubling charges, but we have only been recently informed of the issue. I intend to ask the State Department for further information regarding the situation, and I can assure the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) that I will give it serious consideration.

The way Ethiopia deals with this issue will weigh heavily in the decisions we make in terms of policy and levels of assistance. So I appreciate the gentleman bringing this to our attention, and I will ask my staff to work with the gentleman to move towards a resolution.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I thank the gentleman very much.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY Mr. SANDERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SANDERS:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON PROVISION BY EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF CREDIT TO ENTITIES REINCORPORATING OVERSEAS

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to approve an application for a master guarantee and political risk supplement where the applicant's charter or articles of incorporation show that the entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda, Barbados, the Cayman Islands, Antigua, or Panama.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this tripartisan amendment has widespread support across the ideological spectrum, from Democrats and Republicans, from progressives, conservatives to moderates. It is being cosponsored today by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut

(Ms. DELAURO). It also enjoys the support of the AFL-CIO, the Teamsters, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Citizen Works and other national organizations.

Mr. Chairman, in a very profound way this amendment deals with the issue of patriotism, love of country and respect for the American people. At a time when our country is at war and young Americans are dying almost every day, at a time when our country has a \$7 trillion national debt and when veterans are unable to get the health care that they need, this amendment asks a very simple question: Should the middle class of this country, people who work hard, love their country and pay their fair share of taxes, be asked to provide billions in loan guarantees to corporate expatriates, U.S. companies who set up phony headquarters abroad in order to avoid paying U.S. taxes? That is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. Chairman, enough is enough. The American people are growing sick and tired of large corporations throwing American workers out on the streets as they move to China, to India and to other low-wage countries; and they are equally outraged by companies who come begging to Washington for corporate welfare and taxpayer dollars while they move to tax-haven countries in order to avoid their tax obligations here.

Oh, they do not want to pay taxes in America, not them. That is for the suckers of this country. That is what they say, but they sure do want the taxpayers to help them out with corporate welfare. That is okay.

This amendment will begin the process of putting an end to that absurdity. I fully concede that this amendment is not going to solve this problem completely, no question about that, but its passage will be a shot across the bow to every corporation in America who thinks that they will be able to continue to rip off the taxpayers of this country with impunity. It will, in fact, make some companies think twice before they run to Bermuda or to Panama or to the Cayman Islands in order to avoid paying American taxes.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the Export-Import Bank from approving subsidized loan guarantees to corporate expatriates, companies who were formerly located in the United States but who have set up paper headquarters abroad in tax-haven countries in order to avoid paying taxes here.

Mr. Chairman, what every Member of Congress should know is that five out of the top 23 largest recipients of Export-Import Bank assistance since 2003 are corporate expatriates that have set up sham headquarters and post office boxes in places like Bermuda, Barbados and the Cayman Islands for the sole purpose of avoiding U.S. taxes.

Mr. Chairman, it is bad enough corporate expatriates are abandoning this country to dodge taxes, but it is unconscionable that these companies then

turn around and seek U.S. taxpayer assistance through the U.S. Export-Import Bank, forcing middle-class families to pick up the tab. Companies that dodge U.S. taxes should not be rewarded with taxpayer subsidies through the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about substantial dollars here. Let me give my colleagues some examples of what I am talking about.

Tyco International, everybody will remember Tyco International, one of the poster children for corporate greed, saved \$400 million in U.S. taxes by reincorporating in Bermuda in 1997. What was the response of the Export-Import Bank to this deliberate attempt to avoid paying their fair share of taxes? What did they do when Tyco moved to Bermuda? Well, they gave Tyco \$115 million in assistance since 1998. That is absurd.

In 2002, Ingersoll-Rand saved up to \$60 million in U.S. taxes by reincorporating in Bermuda. Since 2002, this tax-dodging company received over \$370 million in subsidized loans, loan guarantees and other financial assistance from the Export-Import Bank.

In 2002, Nabors Industry saved \$10 million in taxes by reincorporating in Bermuda. Since that year, it has received over \$300 million in taxpayer-backed financial assistance through the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Chairman, the time is now to say enough is enough. If corporations want to move to Bermuda and disown the United States, that is their right, but they do not have a right to then come back to the taxpayers of this country and ask the United States Congress and the Export-Import Bank to give them substantial sums of money.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, since I believe I will be the only one speaking here, I reserve my time.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Let me note that many of the companies that leave, and this is where I have a disagreement with the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), many of the companies that do leave our country leave because of high taxes, which I consider to be levels of taxation that are too high and levels of regulation that are too high in the United States of America.

We may have a fundamental disagreement on how high taxes should be and regulations should be on business, but where I do agree with the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is that businessmen have to make a decision. They are a part of the American family, and we have got to make a decision if we are going to stay part of the American family based on the rules and regulations that we are judged by and have to live by because we are part of the process.

If an American company does decide that taxes and regulation are too high and decide to change their status so they are no longer being treated and taxed or regulated as a domestic company, they should not expect then to receive the benefits of a company that is an American company. This makes all the common sense in the world.

I think it is a travesty, as the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has pointed out, there are some companies that have decided to leave this country and, thus, officially, in order not to pay the same tax load, then expect to receive and have received the benefit of such subsidies we are talking about tonight. This makes all the common sense in the world.

I would hope, however, that we would, number one, pass the Sanders amendment to make sure that companies that leave do not receive this subsidy, but, at the same time, I would hope that we pay close attention to our taxation and regulation policies that make it profitable or make the businessmen who are making these decisions feel it is profitable for them to leave this country.

We should want businesses to come here and do business because it is profitable, our taxes and regulations make it profitable for them to be here, create jobs, et cetera. In the meantime, let us not do the travesty of giving people subsidies who are not paying into the system and have gone overseas and changed their status in order to escape their tax obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, the author of the amendment, and I am a coauthor of it, mentioned that it has a broad spectrum of individuals supporting it. He mentioned progressives and liberals and conservatives and moderates, but he forgot the libertarians.

Libertarians support this as well and for a precise reason. A free market libertarian does not believe in welfare for anybody, let alone the rich, and it is particularly gnawing to see the subsidies go to the very wealthy.

I am in strong support of this amendment, but, like the gentleman from California, I do not support this for the purpose of collecting more taxes, but I do think it is a message to us here that if we do not revise our tax system and our regulatory system we will prompt more and more business to leave this country.

So there are two issues here, but corporate welfare and subsidies should have no part in this. There is no room for it. It is wrong.

Also, the beneficiaries outside the corporations we should not forget either, because the biggest country that benefits from this is China. Why do we subsidize China? People who receive the goods get a benefit as well as the people who get to sell the goods get a benefit? China is on the books right now currently with \$5.9 billion in outstanding loans. They receive more than anybody else. So there is something wrong with a system like that.

There are two economic points that I want to make on this. When we do this and we allow tax credit and special deals for some corporations, we assume, and we will hear this in the defense of the Ex-Im Bank, and say look at the good that we do. But what they fail to ask is, where did it come from, who was denied the credit? The fact that we do not finance it does not mean it would not happen. It would happen.

What it does is it distorts the market and causes people to do the wrong thing, and some individuals do not get the credit is obviously the case, but what we need to do is to have a much more oriented free market. When we direct it this way, even those companies may do more than they ordinarily would, and that participates in the economic bubble that occurs, of course, for other reasons as well. Then there has to be corrections. But if one is in a powerful position in a place where they can qualify, and 80 percent of this goes to the very, very large companies, although there are a lot of companies that receive the big bucks, and big countries like China.

This is corporate welfare. It should be defeated; and, ultimately, if we believe in liberty and freedom, we ought to get rid of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who has actually been one of the leaders on this issue in the Congress.

□ 1930

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to join with this diverse group of Members who may not always agree on many things, but we do agree that taxpayer dollars should never be used to subsidize companies who have incorporated on paper overseas in order to avoid living up to their responsibilities to the United States of America.

Corporate expatriates cost our country \$5 billion in lost tax revenue. Any reasonable person might assume that