

Mr. Speaker, I thank all the colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have participated in this very interesting debate.

We are bringing forth the last of the appropriations bills with this rule. I think it is a remarkable achievement, and I think the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) really deserves commendation as do all on the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) has done a great job on this bill.

This particular bill that we are bringing forth with this rule is the Treasury and HUD, Transportation bill. I am not sure if it is the bill that increases the most from the current fiscal year, but it certainly has to be one of the most significant increases at 6 percent. We hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle requests and demands for further spending and for further government growth; and obviously, that is legitimate, that debate is very legitimate.

I think it is also important and legitimate to put in context that this bill which has caused so much angst in terms of it being categorized as insufficient in spending from the other side of the aisle includes 6 percent more than the current fiscal year.

□ 1330

So it not only is an important piece of legislation, but it is funded, obviously, at a very high level.

With regard, again, to points that were made, so many of them were made by colleagues who took the floor. It is an undeniable fact, Mr. Speaker, that the economic downturn began in the third quarter of the year 2000.

It is an undeniable fact that September 11 of 2001 this country suffered a tremendous, unprecedented and horrible criminal attack. That obviously contributed to the economic downturn.

It is also an undeniable fact that due to the policies, certainly it is an undeniable fact that there have been 3 million jobs created in the last 18 months, that the unemployment rate is about 5 percent, and I think we all should be proud of that.

It is important to put in context, in the context of what has happened in the economy, I think, the attacks which we have heard so repeatedly, as though we were living in a different reality. The reality we are living is one of 3 million jobs being created in the last 18 months. The reality we are living is one that reflects one of the lowest unemployment rates in history. It is fair to point that out.

And I think it is fair to point out, yes, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) talked about we will have a debate on the Cuban dictatorship. I am sure we will. There is a lot to report in terms of the repression and torture and the continuation in the local prisons and so much more. So, yes, we will probably see amendments to loosen sanctions on that dictator-

ship, amendments that, if passed and if they became law, would see flows of hard currency going to that dictatorship. We will have that debate, but at the end of the day, I am confident that this Congress will continue to stand with those who suffer and those who are repressed and not those who cause the repression.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, support the underlying legislation which I think, again, we owe a debt of gratitude to the entire Committee on Appropriations not only for having it brought it forth in such a timely way but especially the chairman who will now soon take the floor. We have much to commend, and I know that we have all of the chairmen we see here, the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) on the floor as well, so many who have worked so hard to make sure that all of these bills have come forth in really a remarkably timely way.

So, again, I am supporting the underlying legislation, as well as this very fair rule, which is an open rule and urging support for both by all of our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3057, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 341 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3057.

□ 1335

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3057) making appropriations for foreign op-

erations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

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

I am very pleased to present to the House H.R. 3057, the fiscal year 2006 appropriations bill for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs. This bill provides important funding for programs that support the global war on terror, the battle against HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases, and the national interests of the United States.

The bill includes a total of \$20.3 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2006. This represents a reduction of \$2.6 billion, or 11 percent, from the President's budget request. The bill is \$533 million above the fiscal year 2005-enacted level, not including the most recent supplemental appropriations of 2005. With all of the supplemental appropriations of last year included, the recommendation represents a decrease of \$2 billion from the 2005 level.

As to whether this amount is considered adequate, I quote from two headlines in Associated Press articles that appeared after the subcommittee markup of June 14. The first reads: "Lawmakers Propose U.S. Foreign Aid Boost," and less than an hour later the headline reads: "GOP-Led Panel Slashes Foreign Aid Program." Those were headlines an hour apart. So Members can lend their support to this bill because it increases foreign aid, or they can oppose it because it slashes foreign aid, or they can do either way with either one of those ideas.

It is important to state at the outset that the bill was developed in a bipartisan manner. I give enormous credit to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my ranking minority member, for engaging in a process that resulted in agreement on the basic components of this package, even if funding compromises had to be found on both sides.

We have made a focus of this year's proposal greater oversight of the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars. The report accompanying this bill includes language that requires more accountability of our foreign assistance dollars by urging the Department to set transparent goals and in tangible ways that measure progress toward these goals. Results, rather than resource levels, should be the yardstick for measuring U.S. assistance programs.

Furthermore, this bill and report include many requirements for the submission of financial plans, limiting expenditures until certain reforms are

implemented, and continuation of congressional notification requirements prior to the obligation or expenditure of funds.

With that, let me turn to some of the highlights of the bill.

First, the Millennium Challenge Corporation. The administration requests \$3 billion for MCC. That would have doubled our \$1.5 billion appropriation last year. We are funding it at \$1.75 billion, or an increase of \$250 million, 17 percent, over 2005, but \$1.25 billion less than the President asked for.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have made the MCC a priority in this bill. I believe in the President's vision for a new form of development assistance, where a country's commitment to fighting corruption, its commitment to reform, its commitment to investing in its people is complemented by an assistance package from the United States, negotiated by the country in the form of a signed compact.

On the Global Environmental Facility, the budget included a \$107 million request for the GEF, up from \$106 million last year. Our bill has no appropriation for GEF. As part of this multilateral agreement with donors in 2002, the GEF agreed to establish a performance-based allocation system for the disbursement of funds. Despite this agreement, GEF has resisted attempts to establish this performance-based allocation system, and I think our reduction, not including any funds for this, sends a clear message about the imperative of reform to GEF.

On Afghanistan, the budget included a \$430 million request for Economic Support Funds, ESF, for Afghanistan, an increase of \$205 million over the 2005 level. It also included a request for \$260 million for International Counter-narcotics and Law Enforcement, an increase of \$170 million over the 2005 level. This bill fully funds the \$430 million in ESF and \$211 million in INCLE for police and counternarcotics programs in Afghanistan. The bill also limits expenditures of about half of the ESF funds, or \$225 million, until the Secretary of State certifies to the committee that the government of Afghanistan, at both the national and the local level, is fully cooperating with the United States-funded narcotics eradication and interdiction efforts.

On the West Bank and Gaza, the budget included a \$150 million request in ESF for the West Bank. The bill funds the request and retains the fiscal year 2005 prohibitions and restrictions on the expenditure of these funds, including a GAO audit of U.S. assistance. Neither the request nor the bill includes any direct budgetary support of the Palestinian Authority.

On the Emergency Plan for Aids Relief, the bill includes \$2,695 billion for the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, the third year of this effort. This funding level is \$131 million over the President's request and \$502 million over the fiscal year 2005 level. The bill includes not less than \$400 million, twice the

amount requested by the President, for a U.S. contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Mr. Chairman, no one in this body, no one in this country, should doubt the commitment of this Congress to fighting the global AIDS battle.

Anti-corruption provisions. Following through on strengthening our oversight role, the bill includes a new anti-corruption measure, a provision that withholds 25 percent of the funds made available for the U.S. contribution to the World Bank's International Development Association, or IDA, until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that the World Bank has incorporated certain procurement guidelines, withdraws its proposals concerning increasing the use of country systems procurement, establishes a threshold for competitive bidding and, subjects competitive bidding provisions to public advertisement.

On Iraq, the budget included a request for a total of \$485 million for Iraq. Our bill includes no new appropriation for this request. We are not slighting Iraq. Instead, we assume these requirements can be financed from the nearly \$5 billion that remains in unobligated funds previously appropriated in the November 2003 Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund in the emergency supplemental bill.

On the Andean Counterdrug Initiative, or ACI, the bill fully funds the budget of \$734 million for the multiyear Andean Counterdrug Initiative, ACI. That is an increase of \$9.3 million over the current fiscal year. The United States leads the international fight against coca and poppy cultivation overseas. The narcotics industry has become a source of funding for terrorists, especially in countries like Colombia and Afghanistan. As part of the war on terror, the bill funds the President's counterdrug initiatives for eradication, narcotics interdiction and alternative livelihood programs.

On the Conflict Response Fund, the bill does not include the administration's request for \$100 million for a Conflict Response Fund, but it does have a new provision that allows the Secretary of State to reprogram and transfer funds as necessary for the purposes identified for the fund; and in other legislation, funds for the administration of that office and that program are included.

On Sudan, the bill includes \$391 million, as requested, for assistance to Sudan, including \$69 million for the terrible tragedy occurring in the western part of that country known as Darfur; but the assistance may only be given to the coalition government if it is in direct support of the comprehensive peace agreement with the southern part of Sudan. Development assistance to the government in the south and our humanitarian assistance in Darfur will continue unabated.

In preparing this bill, we were also faced with decreases in some areas of the budget, including for some key

non-HIV/AIDS health programs and in the development assistance account. We have restored most of those reductions, and in the case of development assistance, added funds for basic education. I believe our development assistance program is a key component of our national security strategy and is critical to a positive U.S. image in foreign countries.

Basic education has become a signature issue for my ranking minority member, and I salute her for her commitment to this; but I will leave it to her to describe the details of our recommendation in this regard. Suffice it to say that I fully support her efforts to provide more educational opportunities to the impoverished youth of the world, especially women and girls.

□ 1345

This bill recommends \$465 million for basic education activities, and that is an increase of \$65 million over the amount provided last year.

The bill also fully supports USAID's work to support the microenterprise lending. Report language accompanying the bill expresses the committee's expectation that USAID programs reach the largest possible number of microenterprises and recommends \$200 million for this program.

We continue an emphasis in this bill on helping developing countries build their capacity to participate in the international trading system. We have \$214 million for trade capacity building efforts, an increase of \$15 million over last year. Of this amount, \$40 million is made available for labor and environmental capacity building activities related to the free trade agreement with the countries of Central America and the Dominican Republic.

The bill fully funds the export finance agencies to promote U.S. investment overseas and create jobs in the United States' export sectors. The committee bill provides \$311 million for these agencies, including the Eximbank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and the Trade and Development Agency, and \$275 million of that is offset by collections.

The bill provides \$791 million for migration and refugee assistance programs, continuing the United States' leadership in the world for providing humanitarian responses to refugee crises. This amount is \$27 million over the 2005 level but \$102 million less than the request.

Finally, the bill mostly restores the large proposed reduction to the child survival and health program, providing \$1.5 billion for these programs, an increase of \$246 million over the President's request.

We have had to reduce sums by almost \$2.6 billion from the President's request to meet our allocation for this bill. Therefore, we could not provide funding for a number of new and expanded initiatives, though requested by the President or brought to this committee's attention by committee members and other Members of Congress and outside groups.

The major reductions to the President's budget includes a cut of \$1.25 billion for the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which I have already spoken of, \$458 million from various programs in Iraq, and \$300 million from the President's proposed local food purchases. This latter recognizes the decision to maintain U.S. food purchases through the PL-480 program funded in the agricultural appropriations bill. And, finally, the \$100 million I spoke of from the President's proposed conflict are a transfer of funds instead of a new appropriation.

I believe this is a balanced bill, one that provides important support for our most critical national security needs while substantially increasing funding to respond to the global HIV/AIDS pandemic. It also embraces our support for overseas development assistance and humanitarian assistance activities. It meets the high priority needs of the President in these areas and accommodates congressional concerns as well.

As I said, this bill was developed in a bipartisan manner and it should have the bipartisan support of this House. So, Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on this important legislation.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3057, the fiscal year 2006 foreign operations appropriations bill, and I want to thank the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his hard work in putting together this bill. The good working relationship we share is evident in the product we present to the House today.

The President's fiscal year 2006 request, when compared with the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation, presented us with an array of difficult choices. Our allocation is a full \$2.55 billion below the request level, and into this reduced allocation we had to fit increases in administration priorities, such as the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the President's emergency plan for AIDS relief.

While I do believe that the bill reflects, for the most part, a bipartisan compromise on the distribution of resources, I feel that this allocation fails to meet our overall foreign policy and national security needs at a time when the world is facing greater instability due to disease, deprivation and conflict.

The world's attention is focused on the upcoming G-8 Summit, in which wealthy nations will announce new commitments to achieve development progress. It is in this context that we must consider the bill before us today. We must ask if it is sufficient to lead the community of developed nations in creating a new compact for global development; if it will make the United States the standard bearer in a renewed effort to lift the least fortunate

among us out of poverty; if it represents the commitment we must make to achieving the good governance and adequate financial resources to address the world's challenges.

My colleagues, we did the best we could with what we had, and I commend the chairman for that, but it is not enough. We are missing an opportunity today to demonstrate that the United States understands not just the need but the urgency of beating back the AIDS pandemic, getting children in school, encouraging reformers and oppressive societies, an opportunity to show that we understand business as usual simply will not do the job and that we are willing to take dramatic steps to bring the rest of the world on board.

This bill will do a great deal of good for a lot of people. It will address many of the challenges around the world that most directly affect U.S. national security, but it is not the bold statement that we all know it could be. Nevertheless, I generally agree with my chairman on the spending levels recommended within the reduced allocation. We worked closely together to ensure that in the face of these devastating cuts, we at least level-funded child survival and health and development assistance priorities.

We provided an increase over the President's request for HIV/AIDS, doubling his request for the Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB and malaria. Although I wish we could have done more for the Global Fund, I believe we are doing the best we can with the resources we have. We provided \$465 million for basic education. We continued the U.S. reconstruction program in Afghanistan, and we fully funded our commitments in the Middle East, a powerful statement at such a critical time in the peace process.

The message we have sent with this bill is clear: In contrast with the President's request, Congress will not increase funding for MCC and PEPFAR on the backs of our core development accounts.

I am pleased that we were also able to restore deep cuts the President requested in reproductive health programs. This bill provides \$432 million of bilateral funding, the fiscal year 2005 House-passed level, and earmarks an additional \$25 million in International Organizations and Program funds for the United Nations Population Fund. The bill further specifies that any funds for the UNFPA that cannot be spent should be transferred to USAID specifically for bilateral family planning programs, a provision we carried in the fiscal year 2004 bill as well.

As I said, I am also pleased that this bill provides a total of \$465 million for basic education, \$65 million more than the fiscal year 2005 level. And, once again, we provide \$15 million for a pilot program to eliminate school fees and, for the first time, require a GAO study on our education programs to ensure that we maximize the effectiveness of our aid dollars.

This bill fully funds Israel's annual economic and military aid package, including early disbursal of these funds within 30 days of the bill's passage. It also includes language carried in previous years, placing conditions on U.S. support for any future Palestinian state. This year, the bill includes an additional provision requiring a GAO audit of the fiscal year 2006 West Bank and Gaza program, as well as a project-by-project plan from the State Department on how these funds are being spent. And it extends a reporting requirement included in the fiscal year 2005 supplemental on the Palestinians' progress in reforming their security services, dismantling terrorist groups, and ending incitement against Israel. I agree with the chairman that these provisions are critical to monitoring the results we achieve as well as the money we disburse.

I am proud that the bill and report carry a number of provisions aimed at increasing the U.S. commitment to fighting gender-based violence around the world, including in areas with high HIV infection rates and in areas undergoing conflict and civil strife. I want to thank the chairman for including a provision requiring police, judicial, and military training programs funded in the bill to develop training curricula on how to prevent and deal with victims of gender-based violence. And I am pleased that we were able to increase funding for UNIFEM and the UNIFEM Trust Fund to a total of \$5 million.

I want to point out a few specific concerns, however, I have with the bill. First, it provides no funding to the Global Environmental Facility, GEF. The GEF is the largest single funder of projects to improve the global environment, and every dollar invested by the U.S. in the GEF leverages \$14 from other sources.

I do understand why the chairman has proposed this cut. The GEF has dragged its feet in implementing a performance-based allocation system. And while I agree with the chairman's desire to send a message that we are serious about reform, I do believe cutting funding is not the right way to accomplish this. I hope we will have the opportunity to restore funding to the GEF as this bill moves to the Senate and through conference.

I am also concerned that the bill places no conditionality whatsoever on U.S. military assistance to Indonesia and international military education and training for Guatemala. For the first time since Indonesian military-backed militias laid waste to East Timor in the wake of its August 1999 independence referendum, we will provide FMF to Indonesia free of any conditions. And despite the Guatemalan government's noncompliance with military reform stipulated in the Peace Accords, we have removed IMET restrictions on that country as well.

I regret that we were not able to fully fund the President's request for

refugees and peacekeeping. The reduced allocation simply made it impossible. I am pleased that we were able to provide additional funding as part of the fiscal year 2005 supplemental, and I am optimistic we can increase funding for these accounts in conference.

Let me also say that even though this bill provides no funding for Iraq reconstruction, I take seriously the role this committee plays in exercising oversight over this effort. Reports of wasted money and poor accounting for taxpayer funds are certainly alarming. Congress, and particularly this subcommittee, has a responsibility to ensure that these funds are used properly and efficiently, and the chairman and I will continue to make this a priority.

Finally, I would like to point out that the Senate's allocation for foreign operations is a full \$1.6 billion above the House. It is my hope that this allocation will enable us to significantly increase funding for a number of critical priorities in the final conference measure.

I want to thank the chairman once again for being such a good partner in the process. I particularly want to thank him and wish him a very happy birthday from all of us. With few exceptions, I believe we have put together a good bill within the context of our difficult allocation.

I appreciate the gentleman's help and the work of the staff, Nisha, Betsy, Alice, Rodney, Rob, Lori, Sean, and Beth, in bringing this bill to the floor and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona yielding to me for the purposes of a colloquy on an issue of report language that accompanies H.R. 3057, the foreign ops appropriation bill, and for his willingness to work with me through conference on this report language.

Mr. Chairman, report language appears for a reason. It is meant to send a strong message to Federal agencies; in this case, the Export-Import Bank. I am greatly concerned about the message this report language sends. I am worried it has the appearance of trying to encourage the approval of a loan that does not meet the statutory requirements.

Before a loan should be brought before the board for a vote, it must meet the congressionally-mandated test for export additionality, foreign competition, and net benefit to the U.S. economy. If we want to consider changes to the statutory requirements, those changes should be addressed during the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank that is scheduled to occur next year.

I look forward to working with the chairman and the Senate in conference

regarding the committee's intent of any report language addressing this issue.

□ 1400

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that I sympathize with his statement. He makes his case with passion and knowledge. I want to clarify my intent with respect to the language in the committee report referring to applications from the U.S. Export-Import Bank.

The report language urged the Export-Import Bank to act promptly on requests for assistance. It also asked for the bank to report on the status of pending applications.

The report further noted the committee's request for "an explanation for any rejection of any requests for assistance, specifically applications affecting the semiconductor industry." This sentence could be misconstrued as prejudicing or prejudging possible applications for bank assistance.

Let me be clear. It was not and is not my intention to prejudice or prejudge the outcome of any pending application at the bank. This language is not intended to influence in any way any matter that is pending before the bank or reflect negatively on any decision made by the chairman or any other board member regarding any pending or past matter.

Loans brought before the bank must meet the bank's criteria for export additionality, foreign competition, and net benefit for the American economy. The Export-Import Bank has five full-time board members whose job it is to assess whether applications meet the bank's criteria for export additionality, foreign competition, and net benefit to the U.S. economy.

They are the ones who should make the judgments about which transactions the bank will support and those it would turn down. The committee report language in no way is intended to influence those judgments. I understand the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) still has some concerns with the language, and I will be happy to work with the gentleman and the Senate in conference regarding the committee's intent.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, the fiscal year 2006 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act.

Let me begin by commending the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. Every year he puts a great deal of effort into examining the issues thoroughly and giving sincere consideration to Members' requests. Thanks to his efforts, we have before us today an excellent bill.

I also commend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member. She and I have worked together on a number of issues over the years, and together we have achieved some important results.

I also want to thank all of the staff for their hard work and the research they have done over the weeks and months to address the many issues in this bill. Their organization and discipline has made this year's process move more smoothly.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to exercise our oversight to ensure taxpayer dollars are spent as effectively as possible. Oversight has been a primary focus of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations this year, and there are important provisions in this bill to help make our foreign assistance programs more accountable.

This bill requires the administration and international organizations to set transparent goals and measure progress towards these goals in tangible ways. The bill also limits spending until certain reforms are implemented. Because of this oversight, the committee has been able to produce a bill that is \$2.5 billion below the administration's request and still focuses on the important priorities.

Assistance to the Middle East is always a central part of this bill. For fiscal year 2006, Israel will receive \$2.28 billion in military assistance, \$240 million in economic assistance, and \$40 million to help resettle Jewish refugees in Israel. I strongly support all of this funding.

I am also pleased that the bill provides \$40 million for assistance to Lebanon, which is an increase of \$5 million from last year. With Syria's military withdrawal from Lebanon and the recent elections, there is an opportunity for positive change. This extra funding will give the State Department and USAID some flexibility to take advantage of this opportunity.

There are also a variety of important programs in the bill that provide support to reform efforts within the countries of the broader Middle East, including \$85 million for the Middle East Partnership Initiative.

Regarding Armenia, the bill provides \$67.5 million in economic assistance. Unfortunately, Turkey and Azerbaijan continue to seal the transportation routes into and out of Armenia, so this funding is important to offset this economic blockade.

The bill also maintains parity in military assistance to Armenia and Azerbaijan, which is critical to our overall policy toward the South Caucasus.

There are other valuable programs in this bill, including the Millennium Challenge Corporation and funding to fight the scourge of HIV/AIDS.

But in addition to what this bill does include, what is equally important is what this bill does not include.

Specifically, this bill does not include any funding for the Global Environmental Facility. Plain and simple,

this is a matter of accountability, and we cannot afford to waste money on organizations that refuse to implement good-government reforms.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsive bill. It is the result of significant oversight. It is fiscally sound, and it focuses on priorities that will advance our interests. For all of these reasons, I strongly support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it on the floor today.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a distinguished member of the subcommittee.

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

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for yielding me this time and wish a happy birthday to our chairman and thank the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership as we work for the world right here in this Chamber.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for helping us to fashion a bill that is fair. Yes, we could use more money. Our 302(b) allocations limit what we can do, but I think it is a perfect start. The Senate has \$1.5 billion more to spend than we have in our bill, and I believe in conference we will see a better bill.

I want to highlight a few things about why I strongly support this bill. Everyone says it is not enough. It is never enough. HIV/AIDS is funded at the highest level it has been. I want to commend the leadership of the subcommittee. We are over a billion dollars more than the President requested for HIV and AIDS.

The Sudan and peacekeeping operations there, we are going in the right direction. We believe with this money to help Sudan we will be able to see some stability in that region soon.

I want to speak about the Middle East. I am a strong proponent of peace in the Middle East. We must have that, and our partners there are working for that.

I recently visited Egypt on my second visit there, and found that Egypt, which I already knew, some 70-plus million people, is our strongest military ally in the region. Egypt purchases our weapons and does our training and also stabilizes the other countries: Israel, with 3 to 4 million people; Jordan with 7 or 8 million people; Lebanon, Syria. The government of Egypt and President Mubarak are the peacekeepers and have been very instrumental in the Abbas-Sharon talks, as well as the Lebanon and Syria talks. So I would hope we continue to fund Egypt to work with Egypt to make sure that they keep their commitments to the Middle East as well as to this government. I am very confident that as we work together with Egypt and with the Middle East, we will hope to see peace as we work there.

This bill also provides educational opportunities for thousands of young people all over the world who are unable to fund their own education. We know education is the difference between success and failure in young people's lives; and the better the education, the more options young people have.

Mr. Chairman, let us continue to work to build a better, stronger world. The U.S. is the largest country, the strongest country in the world. I would not want to be anywhere else. We have a responsibility to build, to grow, and to be good foreign partners. I believe this foreign ops bill for 2006 continues that effort. I urge a "yes" vote on the foreign operations bill. It is not perfect, but it is certainly a good piece of legislation as it moves through Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3057, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for FY 2006. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, subcommittee on foreign operations, I want to commend subcommittee Chairman JIM KOLBE and Ranking Member NITA LOWEY, Appropriations Committee Chairman JERRY LEWIS and Ranking Member DAVID OBEY for fashioning a bill that reflects consensus and a commitment to supporting the needs of the global community.

Our work on this bill was difficult given the limited 302(b) allocation that was imposed on the subcommittee. Despite the allocation constraints, the subcommittee members developed a bill that was roughly \$2.5 billion below the president's request of \$22.8 billion. Our bill recommends a funding level of \$20.3 billion and includes a number of strong provisions.

Our bill provides substantial funding for HIV/AIDS, including a plus up of \$131 million above the president's request. The Global Fund is funded at \$400 million, and is an increase of \$200 million above the president's request. The President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) is funded at \$1.72 billion which is \$150 million less than the president's request, and HIV/AIDS in the Child, Survival and Health (CSH) account is funded at \$350 million, including \$20 million in bilateral assistance to non-focus countries. Other HIV/AIDS funding totals \$55 million. The level of funding in the bill reflects an awareness of the dimensions of the global pandemic and the necessity to commit resources to global communities that are being ravaged by the disease.

I am also pleased that my colleagues recognized the importance of funding peacekeeping operations (PKO) in Sudan. The conflicts in the north/south and Darfur necessitate a financial and peacekeeping commitment to mitigate the proliferating violence, despair and disease that is rampant in Sudan.

Given the prevailing tensions in the Middle East, particularly as those tensions relate to peace negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, I am pleased about the level of funding provided to support the Palestinian Authority (PA) and for our allies in Egypt and Jordan. Our funding to the region reflects the importance the committee attaches to supporting countries that are committed to the goals of democratization and fighting terrorism. I also want to remind my colleagues that it is imperative that we continue to send

the message to our allies in the Middle East and the Gulf region that their efforts to aggressively support democratization and to provide military security are greatly appreciated and reflected in our ongoing financial support.

Despite the good news in this bill, I want to stress my concern that U.S. foreign assistance comprises only 1 percent of our Federal budget. I believe more could be done around the world if our Nation did not have to contend with a spiraling deficit that continues to balloon because we are entrenched in a military engagement in Iraq that costs roughly \$150 million per day, \$5 billion per month and \$60 billion per year. I am very dismayed by these figures because they highlight the reality that there is no prospect for the removal of our troops from harm's way in the near term.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, I believe, represents a good faith effort to address the foreign assistance needs of our global neighbors. And while I wish that more resources were available to support worthy programs, we were limited in our allocation. Given current economic realities, this bill represents a good faith effort to fund essential programs around the world. The Senate allocation for foreign assistance is \$1.5 billion higher than the House figure, so I am hopeful that perhaps even greater levels of funding will be provided for other critical areas of need. I am pleased to support this bill and encourage my colleagues to vote "aye" on H.R. 3057.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), an outstanding member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Arizona on his birthday, rise in support of this bill, and compliment the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for her work.

This bill is vital to winning the war on terror. I am particularly happy that we have focused the soft power of the United States, USAID, the Board for International Broadcasting, et cetera, on key parts of Pakistan where the leaders of al Qaeda are hiding.

I do want to strike one note of warning, though. In the last 2 years, we have witnessed an explosion of heroin production in Afghanistan. Last year, drug lords in Afghanistan made over \$6 billion in drug profits with some of the proceeds supporting terrorist groups. Al Qaeda and the Taliban now depend on the sale of heroin to wage their war on terror. Two years ago, drug profits sustained just two terror groups. Today, drug profits sustain four terror groups.

Last year, more drug money arrived in Afghanistan than it had in any other country, including Colombia, in history. Two years ago, only 8 percent of Afghan heroin arrived in the United States; now it is up to 12 percent, a 50 percent increase. Two months ago, the United States arrested Osama bin Laden's banker, Haji Bashir Noorzai, for attempting to smuggle \$50 million of heroin into the United States. His attempt provides a stark warning that if Afghan drug dealers can smuggle heroin into the United States, they can also smuggle terrorists.

To date, our program to reduce the Afghan heroin crop has failed. From a low of only a few hundred acres in 2001, the Afghan heroin crop topped over 200,000 acres last year.

Alternative development programs for Afghan farmers are key, and we fully fund such programs to help farmers switch from poppies to the traditional products of Afghanistan, like wheat. But even the best legal crop can only command one-twelfth the price of heroin, so we also must fund enforcement programs.

Congress approved \$92 million in the fiscal year 2005 supplemental to provide helicopters for the Afghan police to catch drug lords. The program inside the administration is now adrift, and we have wasted 6 months in designing a helicopter program to help Afghan police officers. Repeatedly, some in the administration have proposed cutting this program by half to fund other programs, proposing that we largely ignore the narcoterror threat in Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, Afghanistan now teeters on the brink of becoming a failed narco-state. Violence against American and other NATO peacekeepers is picking up, much of it funded by narcoterrorists. As our full committee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), advised Secretary Zoellick, Congress is looking for strong action against Afghan heroin; and we want the fiscal year 2005 funding for the helicopter program to move forward, and an end to rumors that the administration is cutting the fiscal year 2007 budget for this activity.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), a distinguished new member of the committee.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY). In working on this bill, we found agreement on an initiative that is very important to me, and I think important to our efforts in Africa in terms of combating some of the difficulties there, particularly related to HIV and the growing threat of AIDS.

We have report language that accompanies this bill that the chairman and his staff were willing to agree to that would bring together a number of our more capable agencies, including the Centers for Disease Control, the USAID and others, and have them develop a plan to take a nonincremental approach at creating a healthier blood supply in Africa. In Africa, millions of people who have contracted AIDS have done so through tainted blood transfusions, particularly pediatric AIDS cases. The ranking member and the chairman and the staff have helped us move forward an initiative to focus on this problem. I rise to thank them.

Secondly, the bill also talks about creating a more coordinated and comprehensive effort on infectious diseases and health challenges on the continent

of Africa, particularly in the sub-Saharan region.

Also, I have had a chance to speak to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and his top staffer, Frank Cushing, on this matter; and I really appreciate the majority's willingness to look anew at some of these issues and think through how we can approach this matter in a creative way. I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and his staff and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and her staff.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of a colloquy.

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

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has done well to craft a bill in a very difficult budgetary environment. It prioritizes funding for important programs. I believe his and the ranking member's efforts are appreciated.

□ 1415

I do, however, rise to express concerns about the Global Environment Facility, or GEF, whose funding is eliminated in this bill. As co-chair of the House International Conservation Caucus, I am keenly interested in conservation programs because I believe that how nations of the world manage their natural resources is a vital U.S. interest, impacting our efforts to help create a more secure and prosperous world.

The GEF is the largest international funding source for programs and support good natural resource management around the world. In the roughly 15 years since its creation, the GEF has implemented 1,500 projects in 140 countries, with biodiversity and habitat conservation being the largest single area of focus. Importantly, U.S. funding has leveraged at least \$14 for every \$1 we have contributed. I believe this model where our resources are matched many times over by other public and private donors is a good approach. However, I strongly agree with the chairman's push for reform at the GEF. The United States should always be pushing for transparency and accountability at multilateral institutions, and the GEF is no exception. As the chairman knows, at the request of the U.S. Treasury and other donor nations, the GEF has been working to implement a variety of management improvements. Currently, the GEF is in the final stages of adopting a major element in this reform process, a system of prioritizing its funding decisions called the Resource Allocation Framework.

The Council of the GEF is meeting in late August in a special session to finalize the structure of this framework. The GEF Council recognizes the need for reform and is meeting in less than 2 months to complete work on the re-

form element most important to the U.S. Government.

And I would respectfully inquire whether the gentleman agrees that the GEF's programs and projects are beneficial to conservation worldwide and to the United States, and assuming that a framework is finalized at the upcoming special meeting of the GEF, would that constitute sufficient progress on reform to have the gentleman revisit GEF funding in the conference?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California for raising this important issue. I also support international conservation efforts, and I applaud the gentleman for his leadership as co-chair of the International Conservation Caucus.

I believe that the Global Environment Facility has done good work over the years to help conserve the environment and to address some of the more difficult international environmental problems that require international cooperation to be solved. Nevertheless, I have been concerned about the pace of reform within this organization.

My purpose in eliminating its funding is to ensure that the limited amount of resources in this bill are used in the most efficient possible way. My goal is not to definitively end U.S. contributions to the GEF this year or in the future. However, until the final GEF reforms are in place, I am concerned that GEF funding is not being used optimally.

I appreciate the unique role that GEF can play in international conservation, and I believe that a reformed and functioning GEF is worthy of support. If the GEF agrees to implement a performance-based allocation system at the August-September, 2005, Special Meeting of the GEF Council, then I would be willing and will be willing to work with the gentleman and the other body to help restore the U.S. contribution to the GEF during conference.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his response.

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

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

I want to thank the gentleman from California for raising this important issue. As I have said repeatedly throughout the process of moving this bill to the House floor, I am deeply disappointed that this bill does not fulfill the U.S. commitment to the Global Environmental Facility.

Since its establishment in 1991, the GEF has provided \$5 billion in grants, leveraged \$16 billion in co-financing for projects in 140 countries around the world, has provided more than 4,000 grants directly to smaller organizations. The U.S. has provided close to \$1 billion to the GEF over this same time frame.

The GEF is unique in its laser-like focus on environmental sustainability. It is the most effective way for the United States and other donor nations

to support biodiversity and prevent climate change.

House passage of the bill with no funding for the GEF will send a strong message, but I hope not the wrong message. I agree with the chairman that the U.S. should encourage transparency, responsibility, and accountability of the institution. And I hope that is what the international community takes away from today's debate.

However, I do believe that in cutting off all funding to the GEF, we run the risk of sending the message that the United States no longer supports the good work of the organization. I am pleased that today's discussion will clarify that this is not true, and I join the chairman and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) in looking forward to the August GEF Council meeting, which will hopefully include the adoption of a performance-based Resource Allocation Framework. I am optimistic that the Senate will do the right thing by the GEF and that we will be able to provide the requested levels in conference. I look forward to working with the chairman and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) to see that this happens.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who has been a real advocate for the environment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

I rise today to speak on an issue that is probably best spelled out in The Los Angeles Times today by Sonni Efron, who is a writer for the Times. The Times article is entitled "Drug War Fails to Dent U.S. Supply."

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their commitment to international development and improving our national security by attacking the culture of poverty and injustice, which I think are the root causes of terrorism in this world. I would also like to thank the chairman for engaging in a debate with me during the full committee markup regarding the increased funding for alternative development in Colombia.

I had offered an amendment in committee that would have shifted funding from the military and fumigation side of the Andean CounterDrug Initiative to funding more alternative development programs. My amendment would have shifted funds in five of the departments, which are like "states" in Colombia that are receiving little or no alternative development assistance; yet they are being heavily fumigated. While we are using all stick and no carrot in these regions, only spraying a farmer's crop but not providing for an alternative livelihood is not a sustainable solution to a coca growing problem in the Andean region.

Given the chairman's commitment to work in conference to increase the funding for alternative development programs in Colombia and the Andean region as a whole, I withdrew my amendment in committee.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind the chairman of his commitment and thank him again for his efforts regarding the alternative development in Colombia, and I know the chairman has been a tireless supporter of development and security in Latin America. I look forward to working with him and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), ranking member, on these important issues and hope in conference that they can restore the funding that I am sure the Senate side will add to.

I would like to close by referring everyone to this *L.A. Times* article today. I think it speaks to the point that America needs to focus on working itself out of jobs, not making people dependent upon American jobs to develop economic security in their own countries.

[From the *Los Angeles Times*, Jun. 28, 2005]

DRUG WAR FAILS TO DENT U.S. SUPPLY

(By Sonni Efron)

WASHINGTON.—The Bush administration and congressional allies are gearing up to renew a plan for drug eradication in Latin America despite some grim news: The \$5.4 billion spent on the plan since 2000 has made no dent in the availability of cocaine on American streets and prices are at all-time lows.

United Nations figures released this month show that coca cultivation in the Andean region increased by 2 percent in 2004 as declines in Colombia were swamped by massive increases in Peru and Bolivia. And the non-partisan Congressional Research Service said last week that the anti-drug effort had had "no effect" on the price or purity of drugs in the United States.

The findings have fueled skepticism in Congress, where conservative groups have joined efforts to lobby against continued funding. The National Taxpayers Union called the anti-drug program a "boondoggle."

Nonetheless, a House committee last week approved the administration's request for \$734.5 million for next year as part of a foreign aid bill. Debate on the bill could start as early as today. President Bush also may unveil a renewed multiyear commitment to South American anti-drug efforts this year when Colombian President Alvaro Uribe, a staunch U.S. ally, is expected to visit.

"We are heading in the right direction and we are winning," the federal drug czar, John P. Walters, told Congress last month.

"Plan Colombia"—a six-year effort by Washington and Bogota to eliminate drug trafficking, end more than 40 years of armed conflict with rebels and promote economic and legal reform in Colombia—expires this year. The Bush administration wants to continue it, a senior State Department official said.

"You adjust your tactics and you adjust your resources," the official said. "There's no inclination on the part of our administration to give up just because it's tough."

Negotiations with Bogota over details of a successor program to Plan Colombia will begin next month, the official said.

Administration and some congressional officials say Plan Colombia has had some striking success. Killings, massacres of villagers and other attacks blamed on drug trafficking all have fallen sharply since 2002, and kidnappings have fallen by half, according to Colombian Defense Ministry figures, even though this year has seen a resurgence of violence.

Drug crop eradication and drug interdictions are cutting into the profits of Colombia's right-wing paramilitaries and leftist rebels, Walters told Congress last month.

Walters testified that "cocaine production in the Andes has declined by 29% since 2001, and Colombia's opium crop was cut in half from 2003 to 2004." He said the reason that price and availability had not been affected was the lag of six months to a year between the time when the coca plant was harvested and when its cocaine was available on American streets.

The reports call the administration's assessment into question. Whereas cocaine production fell 11% in Colombia in 2004, it soared by 23% in Peru and 35% in Bolivia, according to the report by the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime. Overall, coca cultivation in the region increased 2%, the U.N. study said.

"The [U.N.] numbers are devastating," said Adam Isacson of the Center for International Policy, which has argued that eradication campaigns must be accompanied by large-scale development efforts that offer peasants alternative livelihoods.

"The spraying, when it isn't accompanied by any alternative development, doesn't seem to discourage [coca farmers] from trying again, because there just aren't a lot of other good choices out there," Isacson said.

Peasants have responded by planting even more coca, hiding it under trees and among other crops, and turning to varieties that produce a higher yield, the U.N. report said.

Whether or not the anti-drug effort is succeeding, the U.S. foreign aid budget is under new scrutiny, especially with the war in Iraq costing more than \$4 billion a month and a \$379-billion deficit looming for 2006. Colombia, the fifth-largest recipient of U.S. aid after Iraq, Israel, Egypt and Afghanistan, could be a target for cuts.

The Congressional Research Service tallied State Department and Defense Department spending on the Andean Counterdrug Initiative at \$5.4 billion since 2000. Though the anti-drug program aids Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Brazil, Panama and Venezuela, Colombia has received most of the money, about \$4.5 billion. "While there has been measurable progress in Colombia's internal security, as indicated by decreases in violence, and in the eradication of drug crops, no effect has been seen with regard to price, purity and availability of cocaine and heroin in the United States," the research agency report said.

The report said Colombia was no closer to ending its decades-long armed strife. The conservative National Taxpayers Union last week called for the program to be cut back or killed.

"By all measurable criteria, Plan Colombia's effectiveness is dubious," said Paul Gessing, governmental affairs director of the anti-tax group. "It's a big taxpayer boondoggle."

Liberals also contend that the program is wasteful. Rep. James P. McGovern (D-Mass.) plans to offer an amendment to the foreign aid bill that would slash \$100 million in U.S. military and security aid to Colombia.

One senior U.S. government policy advisor, who spoke on condition of anonymity out of fear he would be excluded from administration policy discussions, agreed with many of the critics.

"It's a complete waste of money," the advisor said. "You have to ask yourself, why are we in Colombia?"

He added: "The bottom line is not how much they produce or how much we eradicate, the bottom line is, is there enough supply to meet the demand [in the United States], and there always is. . . . The traffickers are always one step ahead of us."

Plan Colombia began under the Clinton administration primarily to fight drugs. But after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, the Bush administration has emphasized counter-terrorism and regional security.

While some conservatives wish to cut funding for Colombia, many Democrats want to spend less on its military and more on rural economic development. Democratic critics also wonder whether the U.S. has an exit strategy for Colombia.

Rep. Sam Farr (D-Carmel), a former Peace Corps volunteer in Colombia, said the U.S. effort there violates a key principle of international aid: "Work yourself out of a job."

After five years of U.S. funding, American military advisors are still training Colombian troops and American companies are still being paid to maintain expensive U.S. Black Hawk helicopters, Farr said.

"Look at how much attention is being paid to building local capacity in Iraq so we can leave," Farr said. "This is where we're failing in the war on drugs, because we're not developing the capacity of these countries to handle their own problems."

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a distinguished member of the full committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the ranking member and the chairman for this bill.

It is easy for some people to vote against foreign ops until they understand what it is. There are four legs of a table: the military foreign ops, intel, and homeland security; and probably a fifth now with the rising cost of fuel, energy.

Foreign ops is critical in that security table. Why? If we think about the position of the Palestinian-Israeli issue with Sharon, for the first time, I heard the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) speak that we have hope in the Middle East, hope. If we take a look, it is easy to think about cutting certain countries, but think of what a thin edge they are on right now. Look at Indonesia with its problems, how they help us. Look at Saudi Arabia that is moving more and more toward a moderate state. Do they have problems? Yes. Look at Egypt, and it would be easy for someone to come up and have an amendment to cut them. But in Saudi Arabia I sure do not want "King Osama bin Laden," or in Indonesia, if we look at the thin thread. Or Pakistan. In Pakistan take a look at Hamboli; KSM, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who was a guy who planned 9/11. We just caught Abu al-Libbi, who is the guy who took Khalid Sheikh Mohammed's position. And they have stopped major events and attacks within the United States because of our foreign operations bill.

Look at Sudan. They ethically cleansed probably as many people as Saddam Hussein or in Kosovo or Bosnia, and that brings world peace.

But even worse, look at the HIV threat. There are more deaths in HIV in Africa than during the plagues, and if we support that, A, it makes a safer America, but it also protects and stabilizes Africa itself.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from

Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished minority leader, who has been a strong advocate for the United States' increased role in the world today.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. This is an important bill. The United States is the leader of the free world, and, frankly, the United States is far behind many in the industrialized world in investing in the peace and security of the international community.

Mr. Chairman, for several years, however, I have expressed serious concerns about the amount of dollars that we give to Egypt. Egypt is a friend and an ally. Egypt is number two in terms of the dollars that we invest, both in military and economic aid. However, Egypt has one of the largest and most modern militaries in the Middle East, with approximately \$2.4 billion in annual defense spending. More than half of that funding, \$1.3 billion in this bill, is provided by the United States.

Notwithstanding that, however, I do not believe that Egypt and its leadership is conducting itself in a way consistent with its alliance with this country. Nearly one out of five Egyptians live in poverty; yet we give very little economic aid, relatively speaking. Roughly half of Egypt's adults are illiterate. Unemployment is in double figures, and the country has a per capita income of just \$700 per year.

In this context, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the United States provides almost three times the amount of military assistance to Egypt than we provide in economic assistance, \$1.3 billion to \$495 million in this bill.

That is not my principal concern. My principal concern is the relationship between the extraordinary investment that America makes in Egypt and the lack of cooperation as it relates to some of their policies not only on the military side, but on the human rights and discrimination side.

Regional stability and the efforts to stem the development of terrorist organizations are served not only by providing for Egypt's military strength, but also by ensuring prosperity and economic opportunities for the people of Egypt, and having Egypt cooperate in bringing down the level of hatred, discrimination, and prejudice in its own country and in the Middle East. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would make that message clear to our friends in Egypt.

I offered an amendment in committee. That amendment would have shifted \$40 million from military assistance to the economic assistance. That, in my opinion, would have had the effect of educating more Egyptian children, bringing more Egyptians out of poverty, perhaps investing greater amounts in the economic development and job creation seen in Egypt. That would, in my opinion, have been a very positive step forward.

My friend, the chairman of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and

Related Programs Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations urged me not to do that. And as a result of his urging, I withdrew that amendment.

One of the reasons I withdrew that amendment is because Egypt is an important ally. But I would hope that our Egyptian friends would address the issues of anti-Americanism, anti-Semitism, anti-Catholic/Christian, prejudice, and destabilization within their own country and within the Middle East. We need to continue to send that message.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), distinguished member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Let me just say at first that this bill is a well-crafted bill that I support within the confines of the amount of money that the majority has chosen to give us to work with.

□ 1430

I also want to acknowledge the extraordinary bipartisan work that has taken place here, and I want to thank our chairman and his staff for reaching out to us in the minority to include our priorities as well. I think this is a real bipartisan effort, and I am grateful for that.

I also want to acknowledge the support of our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I want to thank our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), for all their support of the foreign operations bill this year and over the years.

Mr. Chairman, most Americans believe that America spends 10 to 15 percent of its budget on foreign aid. That is simply not the case, though. We only spend about 1 percent of our budget on foreign aid, and that 1 percent is very well spent.

We use that money, that foreign assistance, to help fellow democracies stay strong and secure. We help struggling democracies who are undergoing tough times because of the neighborhood they live in or because of their own economies. We also help people who want to be free and live in a democracy help create democracies.

Why do we care about democracies, other than being Americans and we believe everyone has a right to live free? Because we know that democracies are good trading partners and they do not go to war against one another. So there is a very practical reason for our foreign assistance program.

Beyond that, of course, is the humanitarian obligation, the moral obligation that we have to help people in need. Virtually every major religion in the world acknowledges our moral obligation to help poor people and those in need of charity and compassion.

So for all those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I believe this foreign aid bill is important. I do regret that the Global Environmental Facility is not being funded under this bill, and I look forward, as the chairman suggests, to that money perhaps being included in conference. That would make this bill complete. Then, of course, if there were as much money as the other body is designating for this foreign assistance, that would be even better.

But this is a good, bipartisan bill, because foreign assistance is in America's vital national interest, and also because it is the right thing to do.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), who has been very active in a whole range of issues involving our foreign aid program.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me this time. I want to commend her and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for their fine work on this balanced and bipartisan bill.

Under tight budgetary restrictions, they have crafted an important bill which addresses the priorities that affect the developing world while also shoring up our global allies. I thank the chairman and ranking member for supporting priorities of mine, including the Asian University For Women that is located in Bangladesh and increased funding for Peace and Reconciliation programs in this legislation as well.

One of the groups included in the Peace and Reconciliation program is Project Children and Cooperation Ireland. Many of my colleagues have taken on interns from this program, and the young men and women from the north of Ireland have benefited greatly from these internships. As progress in the peace accord remains unsteady, we in the United States must continue to support programs that bring together the future leaders of the north of Ireland and show them that their differences are not insurmountable. I hope the House conferees will work with the Senate to see that this program is funded during the conference committee.

This bill also includes \$34 million for the U.N. Population Fund; but as has become a norm under this administration, the restrictions on providing this important funding will not be released by this administration. The administration seems determined to hinder the health of women around the world.

While I remain troubled that this detrimental policy continues there is much good in this bill, particularly when you look at the Middle East. I strongly support the increase of \$60 million to Israel, for a total of \$2.3 billion in foreign military financing and economic aid in this bill.

I strongly support the increase of \$60 million to the State of Israel for a total of \$2.3 billion in foreign military financing and economic aid in this bill. I believe the United States must do more, though, to combat the anti-

Israeli and Western stances taken by our supposed allies like Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia still has not lived up to the test of the President's "you are either with us or against us." It is time for this administration to start treating Saudi Arabia like the supporter of terrorists that they are. We must take a stand in this House and let the Saudis know that their time of extremism is over, because we will not stand for it anymore.

Mr. Chairman—I want to commend my colleague Chairman JIM KOLBE and my good friend NITA LOWEY for their work to craft a fair and balanced bipartisan bill.

Representing one of the most diverse Congressional districts, I know how important U.S. foreign assistance is to nations around the World and I have seen the success of our assistance firsthand.

Under tight budgetary restrictions they have crafted an important bill which addresses the priorities that affect the developing world while also shoring up our global allies.

I was proud to work with the Chairman and Ranking Member on several initiatives that are important to my constituents and their families overseas.

I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for supporting priorities of mine including the Asian University for Women that is located in Bangladesh and increased funding for the Peace and Reconciliation programs in this legislation.

One of the groups included in the Peace and Reconciliation program is Project Children and Cooperation Ireland.

Many of my colleagues have taken on interns from this program and the young men and woman of the north of Ireland have benefited greatly from these interns.

As progress in the peace accords remains unsteady we in the States must continue to support programs that bring together the future leaders of the north of Ireland and show them that their differences are not insurmountable.

I hope the House conferees will work with the Senate to see that this program is funded during the conference committee.

I believe these types of programs are a step in the right direction to help solve some of the problems that we face around the world.

This bill also includes \$34 million for the United Nations Population Fund, but, as has become a norm under this administration, the restrictions on providing this important funding will not be released by this Administration.

The administration seems determined to hinder the health of women around the world.

While I remain troubled that this detrimental policy continues there is much good in this bill, particularly when you look at the Middle East.

I strongly support the increase of \$60 million to Israel, for a total of \$2.3 billion in foreign military financing and economic aid in this bill.

As Prime Minister Sharon begins the courageous disengagement plan of removing Israeli settlers from the Gaza Strip, this funding is more needed than ever to help Israel's security and shore up civil society programs in the Palestinian Authority.

As we continue to support our friend Israel from outside threats, I believe it is time to start to rethink the way we provide aid to Egypt.

In the House International Relations Committee recent markup of the Foreign Relations

Authorization Act the way aid is given to Egypt was changed by our Chairman and Ranking Member.

Egypt is at peace with all of its neighbors and I see no external threats against them that warrant the need for keeping military assistance constant.

The real threat in Egypt is from within, the limited amount of freedom that exists for her people as the level of poverty increases is a dangerous mix.

The Government of President Mubarak has shown that it is quite quick to throw dissidents into jail, discriminate against the Catholic Minority, tolerate anti-Semitism and anti-Zionism in the official press, throw gay Egyptians into jail and some of my colleagues say this is ok, that the devil you know is better than the devil you don't know.

The United States must do more to help end this dangerous mix before the problem creates instability.

Egypt has been a strong friend and ally and has done much to help bring about a peaceful solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict but we cannot allow that to cloud our judgment.

I believe the United States must do more to combat the anti-Israeli and Western stances taken by our supposed allies like Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia has still not lived up to the test of the Presidents you are either with us or against us.

It is time for this administration to start treating Saudi Arabia like the supporter of terrorists they are.

We must take a stand in this House and let the Saudis know that their time of extremism is over because we will not stand for it anymore.

I also commend my colleagues for holding this Administration accountable on their lack of distribution of funds in the Millennium Challenge Account. The MCA created with great fanfare, has not lived up to the expectations set by this Administration.

I will hope that during the next few months of the Conference this Administration will work with Congress to insure that the MCA reaches the potential it was created under.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3057, the FY06 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act.

I am pleased that the bill includes \$55 million in funding for Afghan women, including \$5 million for the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission. This funding builds upon funding for Afghan women and girls included in an amendment that I offered to the FY04 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill.

Over the past four years, the United States has invested in the reconstruction and development of Afghanistan both because it is the right thing to do and because it is critical to our security.

Afghan women were brutally oppressed by the Taliban regime, but they have been reclaiming their role in society, in part because of critical U.S. assistance provided to Afghanistan. Millions of girls are attending primary schools, equal rights for women are guaranteed in the constitution, and approximately three million women voted in the election held last year. These victories are especially important given that women comprise 55–60 percent of the total Afghan population and should be a driving force in Afghanistan's economic and political viability.

However, while women are vastly better off than they were, many continue to endure many hardships including targeted violence, limited mobility, illiteracy, and the highest rate of maternal mortality in the world. By improving health care facilities and by giving women access to the skills and opportunities that they need to become partners in creating Afghanistan's future, we will ensure that women will no longer be second-class citizens.

While I hope that all the aid for Afghanistan will help women, I commend the Appropriations Committee for continuing to recognize the needs of Afghan women.

I also am pleased that the bill includes \$34 million for the life saving work of UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund. UNFPA is a global leader in providing reproductive health care, including family planning services to the world's poorest women. UNFPA helps women undergo pregnancy and childbirth safely and helps women and men to plan their families and avoid unintended pregnancies and protect themselves from HIV/AIDS infections.

UNFPA also is a leader in addressing the reproductive health care needs of women in emergencies. Humanitarian crises are often reproductive health disasters. Complications of pregnancy and childbirth are the leading causes of death for displaced women of childbearing age, and UNFPA takes the lead in providing supplies and services to protect the reproductive health of people in crisis. Most notably, UNFPA has played an instrumental role in helping to save the lives of women in Afghanistan by providing mobile health facilities as well as rebuilding maternity hospitals. The Afghan government was so grateful for this assistance they gave UNFPA a symbolic donation of \$100 to support their work.

As we are all aware, for each of the last three years, President Bush has refused to release the funding that Congress has appropriated for this vital program due to this Administration's unproven assertions that UNFPA supports coercive abortion in China. It has been estimated that the loss of each year's funding could prevent 2 million unintended pregnancies; nearly 800,000 abortions, 4,700 maternal deaths, nearly 60,000 cases of serious maternal illness; and more than 77,000 infant and child deaths. The Bush administration's refusal to release these funds puts at risk the very lives and health of women and children in the world's poorest regions.

It is my hope that this year, President Bush reconsiders the impact of his decision and releases the life-saving funding that this chamber is wisely approving today.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3057, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2005, which funds programs and activities carried out by the Departments of State, Treasury and Agriculture, the United States Agency for International Development, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the Export-Import Bank, among others.

This measure is the tenth appropriations bill to be considered under the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution, and provides for the foreign operations and export financing needs of our nation, clearly national priorities in a time of war.

I am pleased to report that it is consistent with the levels established by the conference report to H. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

H.R. 3057 provides \$20.3 billion in appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs for fiscal year 2006. The bill provides \$571 million in funding above fiscal year 2005, but it is \$2.6 billion below the President's request.

The bill provides \$1.25 billion less than requested for the Millennium Challenge Corporation, \$478 million less in Economic Support Funds and \$146 million less in Foreign Military Financing funding. In addition, the bill recommends no funding for Iraq—a reduction of \$459 million—as over \$5 billion in funds previously appropriated for Iraq relief and reconstruction remain unobligated and could be used to fund the requirements presented in the fiscal year 2006 request. H.R. 3057 also provides no funding for the World Bank's Global Environment Facility until it adopts a performance-based allocation system—a reduction of \$107 million from fiscal year 2005.

H.R. 3057 provides a record level of \$2.7 billion in funding to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria: \$131 million more than requested by the President and \$502 million, or 23 percent, more than provided in fiscal year 2005. Of this total, \$2.3 billion is provided specifically for HIV/AIDS programs. The bill also fully funds the President's request of \$2.5 billion in assistance for Israel, \$1.8 billion in assistance for Egypt, \$1 billion in assistance to support reconstruction and democratization activities in Afghanistan. In addition, \$437 million in funding is provided for International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement, an increase of \$111 million, or 34 percent, over fiscal year 2005.

H.R. 3057 does not contain any emergency-designated budget authority or advance appropriations, but it does include a rescission of \$64 million in previously enacted discretionary budget authority.

With total fiscal year 2006 appropriations equal to its allocation, the bill conforms with the budget resolution. Accordingly, the bill complies with section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of bills in excess of an Appropriations subcommittee's 302(b) allocation of budget authority and outlays established in the budget resolution.

In conclusion, I express my support for H.R. 3057.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I support H.R. 3057, and intend to vote for it in its current form. I also want to recognize the majority and minority subcommittee staff for their dedicated and professional work in meeting the demands of all subcommittee members despite scarce resources.

However, in a forum such as this, I would be remiss if I did not raise the following issues that I have consistently raised over the last several years in every relevant hearing, markup and floor debate of this committee.

Yesterday, around the world, 15–20 thousand people died of extreme poverty. Today, around the world, 15–20 thousand people will die of extreme poverty. Tomorrow, around the world 15–20 thousand people will die of extreme poverty. Extreme poverty, like malnutrition and disease,—not conflict—are claiming these lives.

The Foreign Operations Appropriations bill has a real opportunity to turn around these numbers. Look at what has been done to date. Smallpox eradication begun in the 1960s. Control of river blindness in the 1970s.

Increased child immunizations in the 1980s. Initiatives to fight Guinea worm, trachoma and leprosy in the 1990s. And the effort to end polio in this decade. Measurable results produced with the dollars the Foreign Operations subcommittee provides.

But more can be done.

There is a phrase that former Labor-HHS Chairman Porter, a member of the Foreign Ops. subcommittee, was fond of saying, "Noblesse oblige, the belief that the wealthy and privileged are obliged to help those less fortunate. In Luke, chapter 12, verse 48, Jesus simply says, "To who much is given, much is expected."

We are the wealthiest country in the world. We spend more money on our military than the entire world combined with the sole mission of protecting this country, its citizens and advancing U.S. interests.

We protect this country and advance U.S. interests by embracing the three Ds to a successful foreign policy: diplomacy, democracy and development. However, looking at all of FY 06 discretionary spending, I think we have been strongly emphasizing diplomacy and democracy and only given cursory treatment to development.

Providing significantly more resources to development would only further the dollars we spend on defense. Last year, Vice Admiral Lowell Jacoby of the Defense Intelligence Agency said, "a number of factors virtually assure a terrorist threat for years to come . . . Despite recent reforms, terrorist organizations draw from societies with poor or failing economies, ineffective governments and inadequate education systems."

I don't want anyone to misunderstand me. Given the circumstances, this bill is a tremendous effort. Chairman KOLBE, Ranking Member LOWEY and the subcommittee staff have put forward a laudable product.

But more should be done.

I keep hearing members of this committee and the House leadership say that this is a tight budget year. This tight budget year was not created by immaculate conception. Congress voted to make it a tough budget year. Congress approved the budget resolution. Saying it is going to be a tough budget year is like a farmer saying he is going to have a bad harvest because he didn't plant any seeds. Mr. Chairman, when Congress approved the FY '06 budget resolution we didn't plant any seeds. The budget allocation given to this subcommittee is not a natural disaster like a drought. This disaster was of our making.

In Matthew chapter 6, verse 21 , Jesus said, "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." If this verse is true, what does it say about us, about Congress, about our government that we pass budget resolutions each year that spend almost \$400 billion on defense, and hundreds of billions on all kinds of tax cuts for the most well off, yet we can't even match the President's request for international development. I have a masters in theology from the Chicago Theological Seminary and have read my bible from cover to cover, and nowhere does it say, "only take care of the poor if it fits into your annual budget resolution."

Noblesse oblige Mr. Chairman.

In 1984, referring to Marxist-ruled Ethiopia, President Ronald Reagan said, "a hungry child knows no politics." I would also add that

a hungry child doesn't know a 302(b) allocations from a point-of-order." All he knows is that he is hungry.

Again, I plan to support this bill.

But more needs to be done.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for the Global Environment Facility. The Global Environment Facility, GEF, is the primary financing mechanism for addressing global threats to the environment. After only a little more than a decade, the GEF has already established an outstanding record for cost-effective assistance to developing countries struggling with critical issues such as land-degradation, toxic pollution, energy efficiency, the elimination of ozone depleting chemicals, and the difficult task of facilitating sustainable development.

The GEF puts money into countries whose stability matters to us, and our participation in the GEF builds partnerships and a sense of cooperation with other donors in tackling global environmental issues. In addition to furthering U.S. interests, the GEF deserves support for the simple reason that it works. In the Middle East, for example, the GEF is crossing borders, bringing countries together to protect vital water and wetland resources.

U.S. leadership has played an important role in the GEF both as its leading donor and as a powerful voice for reform. Largely because of the United States, the GEF is now more effective, transparent and accountable than ever before. The institution has already met most of the reform criteria we have put forward, and the governing Council is nearing a compromise on the issue of performance-based allocation. Reaffirming our commitment in the current budget cycle will also send a positive signal for the next phase of GEF operations in which U.S. leadership will remain critical.

Clearly, I appreciate the tough decisions that this subcommittee has had to make with the allocation they were given. But we cannot allow the GEF to fail on our watch. I would like to thank Chairman KOLBE for his consideration in giving the GEF Council the opportunity to adopt pending reforms and, if they do so, in being willing to work to restore funding in conference for the GEF. I would also like to acknowledge the good work of my fellow co-chairs of the International Conservation Caucus, CLAY SHAW, JOHN TANNER, and especially Mr. ED ROYCE, for their good work on this issue.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for this bill, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

A strong foreign operations budget enables the U.S. to confront national security threats such as international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as strengthen relations with other countries, address challenges like the genocide in Darfur, help safeguard human rights, and address problems such as hunger and AIDS.

I am especially pleased with the strong and continued support in this bill for our close ally, Israel. This bill provides \$2.5 billion in assistance for Israel, including \$2.3 billion for military grants, and \$240 million in economic assistance.

As Israel takes bold steps to promote the peace process by disengaging from Gaza and parts of the West Bank, relinquishing security control of West Bank towns, and releasing

hundreds of Palestinian prisoners, this funding will be essential to Israel's security and economic well-being.

This bill also includes an important provision expressing the sense of Congress that Arab League countries should immediately end the boycott against Israel and its trading partners, and calls on President Bush to consider a country's participation in the boycott when determining whether to sell U.S. weapons to the country.

The bill also withholds U.S. funds for the International Red Cross headquarters building in Geneva until the organization recognizes the Magen David Adom Society as the national humanitarian society of Israel. Finally, the measure includes \$40 million for the resettlement of refugees from the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Ethiopia to Israel, provided through the Migration and Refugee Assistance Account.

To uphold our commitment to the only true democracy in the Middle East and America's closest ally in the war on terror, Congress must ensure Israel has the means necessary to defend herself.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides these funds and reaffirms our dedication to Israel's well-being, and for that reason, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3057

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

The Export-Import Bank of the United States is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such corporation, and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out the program for the current fiscal year for such corporation: *Provided*, That none of the funds available during the current fiscal year may be used to make expenditures, contracts, or commitments for the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology to any country, other than a nuclear-weapon state as defined in Article IX of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons eligible to receive economic or military assistance under this Act, that has detonated a nuclear explosive after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1(c) of

Public Law 103-428, as amended, sections 1(a) and (b) of Public Law 103-428 shall remain in effect through October 1, 2006.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations regarding the fiscal year 2006 budget for counternarcotics programs in Peru.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, I have been extensively involved in United States counternarcotics efforts in Central and South America. As a result, I was deeply disappointed to see that the President's fiscal year 2006 request for the Andean Counterdrug Initiative for Peru is 16 percent below last year's enacted level. The President's budget aims to reduce the U.S. assistance for Peruvian counternarcotic eradication and interdiction from a level of \$62 million enacted in 2005 to a request of \$54 million in 2006, and reduces alternative development funds from a level of \$54 million to \$43 million.

I believe this is absolutely the wrong time for such a cut and such a low level of funding, if enacted, will only jeopardize the gains we have made in Peru in the areas of coca eradication, interdiction and alternative development.

In 2004, with the assistance of the United States, Peru eradicated almost 10,000 hectares of coca, of which 7,500 hectares were eradicated manually by the Peruvian police, and another 2,500 hectares were voluntarily eradicated by Peruvian communities in exchange for community development programs. Moreover, alternative development programs supported legally grown crops on almost 20,000 more hectares of Peruvian farmland.

Historically, Colombian narcotraffickers sent cocaine base from Peru to Colombia for conversion into cocaine HCL, but in recent years the traffickers have relied more on coca cultivation and base production in Colombia. But the traffickers in Colombia are under increasing pressure from the Colombian Government, thanks to the successes of Plan Colombia.

So far we have successfully avoided a so-called "balloon effect" from the successes of Plan Colombia in terms of seeing Colombian traffickers substantially shifting cultivation of narcotics crops back to Peru. But there are warning signs, indications that coca cultivation is starting to spring up outside the traditional cultivation zones in Peru that point to this happening if we do not take steps to prevent it.

Additionally, there is good intelligence that appears to indicate an upward trend in terms of poppy cultivation in Peru regarding heroin. I have spoken to officials in Peru, and they are deeply concerned about these warning signs, as well as the emerging opium threat.

Recent Ministry of Peru data indicates that Peru now may have 1,400

hectares of opium crops, mostly in the north near the Ecuadorian and Colombian borders, and there are strong indications that opium latex is now being moved by Colombian drug dealers through Ecuador into Colombia for processing into heroin. A recent seizure of 4,440 kilos of opium in Peru, nearly half a ton of opium, potentially 40 kilos of processed heroin, shows just how serious the growth of opium is becoming.

Taken as a whole, I believe, as do my colleagues in Peru, that this data indicate that enacting drastic cuts for Peruvian counternarcotic efforts at this time would seriously undermine Peru's coca eradication efforts in the long term and the ability of Peru to implement a similar opium eradication program.

So, Mr. Chairman, the government and, more importantly, the people of Peru have recognized the dangers of narcotics to their society. Public polls last year consistently found that Peruvians see narcotics as the second most serious problem in the country after the state of the economy. The people of Peru have taken a courageous stand against the drug traffickers; and like the people of Colombia, they are taking their country back from the criminals and terrorists. Now is not the time to reduce U.S. support for their efforts.

I would like to yield to my colleague from Arizona to hear his views about this funding.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am happy to respond. I want to thank the gentleman for his stalwart efforts in fighting narcoterrorism in Latin America. I share the gentleman's concerns and thank him for raising this issue here today.

Since 2002, Peru's budget under ACI has decreased slightly each year, but the decrease in the 2006 request was for an astounding 16 percent. Therefore, the committee included language in the House report rejecting these cuts and directing that not less than \$61 million be made available for eradication and interdiction for Peru and not less than \$53 million shall be available for alternative development and institution-building in Peru.

When the committee proceeds to conference negotiations with the Senate later this summer or fall, I commit to the gentleman that we will push for this funding in the final agreement.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I really appreciate his hard work in this effort. We can count on the gentleman, I know.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word to engage the Chairman in a colloquy for the purpose of discussing the international narcotics control in methamphetamine.

Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago, Members of both sides of the aisle joined me in

affirming this body's strong support for combating international methamphetamine trafficking. Today, I would like to thank the Chair and ranking members for their work on the foreign operations approps bill and for supporting the State Department's international narcotics control and law enforcement efforts above the FY 2005 level, particularly the \$40 million in programs for Mexico.

As you know, the effects of international methamphetamine trafficking have invaded our communities and homes. SONDCP reported earlier this year that approximately two-thirds of meth production comes from large labs increasingly from Mexico. The trade also has origins in China, India, Germany, and the Czech Republic in the form of precursor manufacturing.

Recently, the Oregonian reported that only nine factories manufacture the bulk of the world's supply. We simply must get a handle on this situation in order to stop the sweep of this drug across this country and prevent it from infesting our areas.

I see mention in this bill report language on poppy cultivation and heroin trafficking. However, I do not see any explicit language on the importance of controlling the importation of meth precursors such as sudafedrine and efforts to train international customs officials to better control these imports.

Has the chairman considered addressing this issue in report language of this legislation?

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

Mr. BAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. The report language does not specifically raise the topic raised by the gentleman from Washington. I am certainly glad that he has taken this moment on the floor because of his interest in this issue, and I agree with him about the importance of our counternarcotics and law enforcement assistance in Mexico.

He correctly points out that the bill includes \$40 million in international narcotics and law enforcement assistance for the country of Mexico. Part of this represents a restoration of funding to last year's level. The President had only requested \$30 million for this purpose in this year's bill.

So I would be happy to work with the gentleman from Washington as we move forward with this bill with the Senate and in conference. We can work together to make sure that the issue of methamphetamine trafficking as it relates to Mexico is forthrightly addressed in the administration's request or in the final budget account. In representing a district right along the border, I understand fully the importance of this issue.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and his willingness to work together on this and appreciate the time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, 25 years ago this April, the breakaway British colony of Rhodesia emerged from years of guerrilla conflict as the new nation of Zimbabwe. The United States and many other Western nations were hopeful that Zimbabwe's new President, Robert Mugabe, who came to prominence as a guerrilla leader in the 1970s, would moderate his Marxist views and build a better future for all Zimbabwe citizens.

□ 1445

Zimbabwe's people also had high hopes. The country had considerable natural wealth and, despite years of bitter warfare, many in the business community opted to remain, providing crucial economic stability. Zimbabwe's people were determined not to share in the fate of so many of their neighbors, who had also emerged from colonialism amid fanfare and high expectations.

Now, after a quarter century of tyrannical and frequently bizarre misrule by Mr. Mugabe, Zimbabwe is shattered. Its inflation rate is the highest in the world, unemployment estimates range up to 80 percent, with seven in 10 Zimbabweans living below the poverty line. Zimbabwe has one of Africa's highest HIV/AIDS infection rates, with more than a quarter of the adult population infected.

While the Mugabe regime has frequently resorted to Draconian internal security laws and plain old thuggery to suppress and divide the Zimbabwe opposition, Harare's intimidation tactics have taken an especially nasty turn in the last 3 months since the country held parliamentary elections at the end of March.

Those elections, which were won by Mugabe's ruling party, were fraudulent and widened the schism between Zimbabwe's urban masses, who tend to support the opposition, and rural voters, who make up the bulk of the ruling party supporters.

To punish his opponents, Mr. Mugabe's government has waged a 6-week campaign, revealingly called "Operation Drive Out Trash," against opposition strongholds in Zimbabwe's cities. Tens of thousands of bewildered families have been forced into the open of the cold winter after police torched and bulldozed their shanty town homes on the flimsiest of pretexts. Street markets were also targeted and left smoldering in ruins.

Last week, the government, in a nation facing severe food shortages, moved on to vegetable gardens planted by the poor in vacant lots around Harare. Authorities claimed the gardens threatened the environment.

International human rights groups say at least 300,000 people have lost their homes by conservative estimates. The United Nations puts the figure as high as 1.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, I know that many of our colleagues share my anger and my sorrow at a state of affairs that is beginning to look eerily like Cambodia

after the Khmer Rouge came to power in 1975. I have no desire to cut U.S. aid that goes to help the people of Zimbabwe and their struggles against HIV/AIDS and one-party rule, but I feel that we cannot stand by and watch Zimbabwe become a failed State.

I am especially frustrated by the failure of the African Union and SADC, the Southern African Development Community, to confront the horrors going on in Zimbabwe. I hope that the AU will, at the weekend summit in Sirte, Libya, take a firm stand against the Mugabe regime's excesses, and I urge President Bush to make it clear at next week's G-8 meeting that South Africa's President Thabo Mbeki, who has refused to confront Mr. Mugabe and we hope Mr. Mbeki will take a strong and unequivocal stand against the Zimbabwe regime.

Will the chairman work with me and the chairman of the full Committee on International Relations and other interested Members in developing policies that continue to assist the Zimbabwe people while putting additional pressure on the Mugabe regime?

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

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I share my colleague's abhorrence regarding the rule in Zimbabwe, and he has outlined it, I think, extraordinarily well. Through his mismanagement and outright oppression, he has driven Zimbabwe, once known as the bread basket of southern Africa, into the greatest source of instability in the region. I want to make it clear that no funding, no funding from this bill will be used to support Mr. Mugabe's government.

The bill does include \$15 million to help the people of Zimbabwe. I feel strongly that this assistance is critical and must be sustained. Over \$11 million of this is for HIV/AIDS and other health programs. Most of the rest is used to help strengthen citizen groups and other organizations, so one day the people may have an effective voice against Mr. Mugabe and his cronies.

Democratic change must be driven by the people. As we have seen in Georgia and Ukraine, our democracy programs can be effective in supporting that process. And, the people of Zimbabwe must not feel that the international community has given up on them.

While I feel strongly that our assistance to the Zimbabwean people must be sustained, I will be happy to work with the gentleman to find ways to increase pressure on President Mugabe.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from California for raising this issue. I too am very concerned about the repressive and totalitarian turns that Zimbabwe has taken in recent years under Mr. Mugabe.

The decision to evict thousands of poor people from their homes and bulldoze their property is one of the worst forms of brutality Mr. Mugabe has used against his own people, who are already suffering from food shortages and economic stagnation. He is truly relentless in his effort to quash any opposition he perceives.

As the chairman has said, there is no U.S. funding for Mr. Mugabe's regime contained in the bill. However, at a time when Zimbabweans are suffering so much, I am loathe to place conditions or limitations on any assistance that might help the beleaguered people of the country and ease their isolation from the rest of the international community. I am particularly concerned about any limitations on HIV/AIDS programs which comprise the bulk of our assistance to Zimbabwe.

Once again, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for raising this issue, and I hope to work with him and the chairman as the bill progresses.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, last year I joined the chairman and the ranking member here on the floor to send a clear and, I thought, bipartisan message that it is not in the national interest, nor in the national security interest, of the United States to slash our development funding to our neighbors in our own front yard here in the Western Hemisphere.

Yet, I find myself here once again to send the same exact message. To be frank, it makes me question whether the administration was listening to what Congress said last year.

As the ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere and as a member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and as an American, I was outraged when the President, in his proposed fiscal year 2006 budget, slashed core development funding to Latin America by over 12 percent.

In his fiscal year 2005 budget, Latin America was the only region in the world, the only region in the world, to be cut in both total economic and development aid, and total narcotic and military aid. In his fiscal year 2006 budget, the President once again broke his pledge to the people of the Western Hemisphere. So much for looking southward, not as an afterthought, in U.S. foreign policy, an integral part of a forward-looking vision we were promised, this certainly is not it. So much for being an amigo, a friend of Latin America.

And, if we look below the broad 12 percent cuts, we find even more disturbing trends. Under the administration's proposed budget, basic education funding would be cut by over 20 percent and adult literacy funding would be cut by 28 percent, as compared to the fiscal year 2004 budget. In the midst of the

debate on CAFTA, the President cuts development assistance funding to El Salvador by over 30 percent, and child survival and health funding to the Dominican Republic by over 18 percent. This will only exacerbate the gap between those who have and have not.

At a time when Latin American presidents are being toppled left and right by crowds frustrated with the failure of government to provide them with adequate education, housing, and health care; at a time when anti-Americanism is on the rise throughout the hemisphere; at a time when our hemisphere is growing smaller, when infectious diseases move throughout the hemisphere, when crime penetrates borders, when terrorists may use failed States as safe havens, these cuts are the wrong policy for the United States of America.

Let me be clear: a stable, safe, and prosperous neighborhood is in the national interest and national security interest of the United States. It is in the national interest of the United States to increase demand for U.S. goods in a region of 500 million people by enhancing economic development. It is in the national interest and national security interest of the United States to create greater economic growth in Latin America so that people will not seek to leave their homes out of despair. It is in the national interest and national security interest of the United States to increase stability in our hemisphere, because chaos and insecurity creates unwanted opportunity for terrorists and criminals throughout the region. That is the reality.

So I want to take this opportunity, as I express these frustrations and these criticisms, at the same time to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ranking Member Lowey) for their bipartisan effort on this issue, particularly for including language which restores funding specifically to Central America directly in the bill text, since similar report language in our statements on the floor have been ignored in the past. I also hope our friends in the administration understand that the report language disagrees with the deep cuts to development assistance for the entire hemisphere.

I believe that we should restore all development funding that was cut to the hemisphere, not just to Central America. It has been static for so many years, and then we cut it in addition to that. It is woefully inadequate for the national interest and security interest of the United States.

But I do not believe that restoring funding to fiscal year 2005 levels is enough. In fact, that would be an overall decrease, even then, since there is no increase that accounts for inflation.

So I hope that we can move in a different direction. I know that Hispanic Americans in this country are increasingly paying attention to this issue. We are going to hear a lot of debate

about Central America and the Central America Free Trade Agreement at the same time we are eviscerating the very programs that can help create stability and opportunity within the hemisphere.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for raising this important issue today. I agree with him that ensuring a robust level of funding for all of Latin America, particularly in the Child Survival and Development Assistance account, serves U.S. national interests. We need to remember that the challenges of development are not only found halfway around the world, they exist in America's own backyard as well.

I want the gentleman to know that the chairman and I worked hard to restore cuts proposed to these two accounts in the President's budget request, and it would be my expectation that the funding in this bill is sufficient to ensure that at least the fiscal year 2005 levels would be achieved. That was certainly our intent in working to avoid the proposed cuts.

I thank the gentleman again for raising this very important issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point to the membership on both sides of the aisle. As has been the case with most appropriation bills this year, we are trying to work our way to a unanimous consent agreement that will limit time for discussion of amendments to this bill in such a way that we can finish this bill today.

Right now, the unanimous consent agreement which is being worked on would result, if you take into account the debate time plus the slippage time that occurs between each speech, we would probably be on the floor for about 6 to 6½ hours, not counting vote time. That means that we would be very lucky to finish this bill by 10 o'clock tonight.

We are being asked to do so earlier if possible so that we can finish the transportation bill by debating it on Wednesday and Thursday, trying to avoid a Friday session before the July Fourth break.

We are getting, frankly, crossed signals from Members. Some Members want to see to it that we get out by Thursday; other Members want to see the time on their amendments extended. We cannot accomplish both goals at the same time. So I ask Members to choose for themselves what they want, whether they want to be here Friday or whether they would like to reach a reasonably congenial agreement on time limits so that we can finish this bill at a reasonable hour tonight and finish the remaining appropriation bill by Thursday.

But this is really up to Members. We cannot control what Members offer on the floor; all we can do is deliver the bad news.

□ 1500

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the United Nations Population Fund. Regrettably, the underlying bill continues the Bush administration's policy of prohibiting the use of U.S. funds to pay for vital family planning services for millions of women around the world.

As we all know, UNFPA is the single largest global source of multilateral funding for maternal health and family planning programs. It works to provide support to over 150 countries by helping with the delivery of healthy babies, providing prenatal care and educating men and women about HIV and AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases so people can live healthier lives.

This fund helps women and families in 30 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and many more in Asia, Africa and Arab countries. In Nicaragua, Central America where my mother was born, families and poor women in particular struggle for survival. Infant mortality rates there are three times higher in the lowest income group and almost half of all Nicaraguan girls become pregnant by the age of 19. These infant mortality rates and teen pregnancy rates demonstrate the need for maternal health care and family planning services through this fund.

Also, the underlying bill continues the global gag rule which prohibits U.S. funding to any private or non-governmental or multilateral organization that uses its own funds to directly or indirectly perform abortions abroad except in instances of rape and incest.

Restoring the UNFPA funding could prevent 2 million unintended pregnancies, nearly 800,000 abortions, 4,700 maternal deaths, and nearly 66,000 cases of serious maternal illnesses and more than 77,000 infant and child deaths.

We must work together to restore this funding and improve the lives of women all over the world.

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

Mr. Chairman, I may not be able to be here during the debate on an amendment for veterans, and I wanted to speak to it. I want to offer a little history, but I think it is a balanced history from both sides. I remember when President Clinton's budget on the veterans, the VFW, the American Legion, Vietnam veterans, all rallied against the budget because it cut veterans health care. We worked with the other body, both of us on both sides of the aisle; and even some of those that voted with President Clinton on his

budget voted with us to restore that health care by \$1 billion.

We have increased veterans health care by 16 percent. But it is not enough. There is a shortfall and we must attend to it.

Historically, this body works with the other body in conference and I believe that some of those dollars will come forward, maybe not what we all want, but I believe some of those dollars will come together for veterans health care.

I remember in 1993 when my colleagues occupied the White House, the House and the Senate, veterans COLAs were cut. Military COLAs were cut. And there was a tax increase on the middle income.

In 1994, when Republicans took the majority, together with Republicans and Democrats, many of the same Democrats that voted with the President on his budget restored the military COLAs. We worked together to restore the veterans COLAs. And I would have to say probably on this side we will take a little more credit for restoring and reducing the tax on the middle class.

We have worked together, although we have not got what we want on concurrent receipts. For 40 years my colleagues on the other side did not address concurrent receipts. And we have. But at the same time, when it has been addressed under a Republican majority, then the Democrats have come forward and helped us.

Two different sessions we have passed bills on concurrent receipts together. And now there is a bipartisan commission going forward to see what direction we will write down.

I look at TRICARE for life, which we worked together on.

Subvention. I did not write the subvention bill, but my veterans in San Diego, California wrote that bill and put it forward, basically, where you can use Medicare dollars at VA health care.

The Filipino Veterans Equity Act. One of the gentlemen on the other side I very rarely vote with. But we worked together to restore the promise that was made to our Filipino veterans back during the MacArthur days, and we have worked together on that as well.

You do not have to look far to see where we come together, and I do not think any Member on either side of the aisle can look at another one and say, you do not care about veterans; you do not care about our military; you do not care about our Guard and Reserve. That is just not true.

Some people vote against military issues. Maybe their district has got extreme poverty and it is a way of funding their issues and their problems. It does not mean they do not care about the military itself.

The Republican budget looked at many years of substantial increases and almost every account, including veterans, including education and health care. But we decided to get our arms around the deficit.

Many of my colleagues on both sides talk about the deficit and the debt. If we, as Members, or you, Mr. Chairman, if you have got a checkbook and you spend more than you are going to take in, you are going to be bankrupt, and you are going to have less in the future to spend. For us to get our arms around this budget and still fund our priorities, I think we will when we come together with the other body.

A classic case of savings: the welfare reform bill passed many years ago which was lauded by President Clinton as one of the best bills to help people in this country. I also happen to agree with him.

But at the same time we have gone through these increases, we have been fighting the war on terror. If you look at Kadafi, his nuclear weapons are in the United States today. And even more important, we have found the black market that supported North Korea, Pakistan, India, and others. What kind of value is that to us, not just to our veterans, but our military and our homeland security?

I mentioned a minute ago Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and Hambali and Abu Halibi, the people that were actually planning raids on the United States. Now, those people are all made up of military that then become veterans, and we owe them a priority.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) to engage with me in a colloquy. And I take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for all of the fine work that she has done on this appropriation. And I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for the concern and care that he has shown for Africa and on this issue of HIV/AIDS over the years. And I do appreciate it.

But I rise today to talk about the fact that back in 2003, January 2003, the President made a commitment. If you recall in his State of the Union address, he said he was going to provide \$15 billion over 5 years. That is \$3 billion a year for global HIV/AIDS programs.

In the past year, the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or as it became known as PEPFAR, has been underfunded significantly. I do appreciate the work that you have done. But in fiscal year 2003, we only received \$1.6 billion for global HIV/AIDS programs.

In fiscal year 2004, only \$2.3 billion was provided for those programs. We have done better in 2005, receiving \$2.9 billion.

So the total funding for the last 3 years is only \$6.8 billion. Congress would have to appropriate \$8.2 billion over the next 2 years to complete the commitment for \$15 billion for the 5-year commitment.

Why do I push this? I push this because every year 3 million people die of AIDS. Every year 5 million people become infected with AIDS. Over 25 mil-

lion are living with HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa and over 7 percent of the adults in sub-Saharan Africa are infected by this deadly virus.

So while I thank you, I guess the question I am asking is can we do more and can we even save this funding that is in the budget, given that one of your Members, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is talking about cutting it?

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

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and for her kind remarks about my support for HIV/AIDS funding. It is a commitment that I share with the gentlewoman from California. I believe very strongly in the importance of this. In fact, when I became chairman of this subcommittee, I said there were three primary things that I wanted to do, and this was one of them.

I think the gentlewoman is forgetting something, and that is there is funding in another appropriation bill for international AIDS, largely in CDC and NIH, in the Labor-HHS bill. When you add those amounts in, this year, we are at \$3.2 billion total funding for HIV/AIDS and international programs, so we are above. If you take the \$15 billion over 5 years that the President talked about, \$3 billion would be a level funding. We started off below that. This year in the third year we are above it. We are not only on target to meet the \$15 billion; we will be above that by the end of the fifth year. So we are moving clearly in that direction. And I believe that we are showing our commitment.

We are \$131 million this year above the amount requested by the President. We are \$502 million above the amount that was appropriated in 2005. That is just in our particular appropriation bill.

So I do share the gentlewoman's concerns about this, and I believe, however, that we are moving very strongly in that direction. And perhaps the gentlewoman from New York would like to add something.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I was referring to the PEPFAR portion of this. It was my understanding that the \$15 billion commitment was above and beyond the other programs that you are alluding to. But I do appreciate that.

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentlewoman would yield just for one clarification, I think the gentlewoman is mistaken on that. The \$15 billion was a total for all HIV/AIDS programs, not just the PEPFAR's program. So when you look at all the programs that were already under way in bilateral programs, things being done in NIH and CDC as well as in the new PEPFAR program, the global fund, all of that, we will be well above, I think we will be considerably above the \$15 billion.

Ms. WATERS. Well, I understand that and I appreciate the gentleman

correcting my thinking relative to where the money was to come from, because in the AIDS activist community, we were all under the impression that the PEPFAR fund alone would produce the \$15 billion. But we will certainly take that information.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, continuing this colloquy, just so you have the numbers correct here as we see them here: in 2004, total appropriations for international AIDS programs was \$2.4 billion. In 2005 it was \$2.9 billion; and in 2006, the current year that we are funding, it is \$3.2 billion. That gives you a total of \$8.5 billion which means that we have \$6.5 billion left to do in the next 2 years in order to reach the \$15 billion. That would be slightly less, actually, than \$3 billion a year to meet that. So I do believe we are on target.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I want to thank the gentlewoman for her commitment to combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic. She has been a strong and constant voice championing the cause of the poorest, and I agree with my colleague from California that more needs to be done to help address the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) discussed the funding in the bill. However, we all agree, and I know the chairman agrees, that more needs to be done. And the U.N. has estimated the total resources needed to combat HIV/AIDS around the world to be \$15 billion per year. An additional \$5 billion is needed to combat TB and malaria. And while I do not believe that the United States can or should fulfill all of the need on our own, the amount that we are currently contributing, about 15 percent of the total need, is not representative of what we are capable of doing.

□ 1515

So although the Chair has mentioned, and I would agree that we have done as much as we possibly can in this bill, I would like to work with him, you, and certainly with the Chair to make sure that we continue to increase our commitment to HIV/AIDS. I thank the gentlewoman for entering into this colloquy.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his commitment. The gentleman has demonstrated his commitment to this issue as much as anyone, more than most in the Congress of the United States. And I am going to review the numbers and

take his representation of how that funding has come together and have further discussions with the AIDS community. They are so concerned because since the President's commitment, over 7 million people have died. And also we will have an amendment coming up today from the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), and although I do not want to preempt the gentleman's presentation, I would hope the gentleman would join me in helping to put that down because that would undermine all the work that he has done.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

My purpose in going through those numbers was simply to illustrate that we are meeting this commitment, not as the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) suggested, not that it is enough. There is not enough. We are not doing enough. But I think we are meeting the commitment we did make. This is a pandemic of absolutely unprecedented proportions, and we need to be doing a lot more in Africa, in the Caribbean, in Southeast Asia, now in countries like China and in Russia where it is growing with great rapidity. So there is a lot more that needs to be done. I thank the gentlewoman for highlighting that and providing the clarion call today for this country and for the AIDS community around the world to respond to this need in this pandemic.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance, and tied-aid grants as authorized by section 10 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, \$125,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That such sums shall remain available until September 30, 2024, for the disbursement of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance and tied-aid grants obligated in fiscal years 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior Act appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for tied-aid credits or grants may be used for any other purpose except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this paragraph are made available notwithstanding section 2(b)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by any Eastern European country, any Baltic State or any agency or national thereof.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan and insurance programs, including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed \$30,000 for official reception and representation expenses for members of the Board of Directors, \$73,200,000: *Provided*, That the Export-Import Bank may accept, and use, payment or services provided by transaction participants for legal, financial, or technical services in connection with any transaction for which an application for a loan, guarantee or insur-

ance commitment has been made: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 117 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1992, subsection (a) thereof shall remain in effect until October 1, 2006.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HOOLEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. HOOLEY:

Page 4, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 30, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) that I am prepared to accept this amendment.

I have concerns about a large cut in Ex-Im Bank expenses, but I certainly agree that the need in Mexico is very great to fight methamphetamines, and I certainly am prepared to accept this amendment.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's willingness to accept this amendment. I will be extremely brief.

Methamphetamine has traveled across this country. It is a huge problem. There are many children who are being referred to other people because of methamphetamine. In my State, 75 percent of the crime that is committed is because of methamphetamine.

We know that roughly 200 tons of pseudoephedrine is needed to produce all the meth sold in the United States. This pseudoephedrine from Mexico can produce half of our Nation's supply of this deadly drug. Again, we need to do everything we can to fight the spread of methamphetamine.

My amendment would provide the State Department with additional resources. With so much of meth in this country coming from Mexico, we must take action to stop the production and importation of this dangerous drug. As any cop in America will tell you, meth is destroying our communities. This should be one of the top foreign policy items on our bilateral agenda.

I thank the gentleman for accepting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss foreign aid, American tax dollars that are going to the Palestinian Authority.

The problem the Palestinians have has nothing to do with money. The problem is a complete failure of their leadership. The United States has provided an average of \$85 million a year per year since 1993. Not counting inflation, this comes to over a billion dollars. We have provided direct aid to the Palestinian Authority on three occasions, \$36 million in 1994, \$20 million in 2003, and another \$20 million again in 2005.

Since 1975 we have given over \$1.2 billion of assistance for the West Bank

and the Gaza. Between 1994 and 1998 American taxpayers gave \$65 million to expand economic opportunity in the Palestinian controlled areas and \$85 million to help the Palestinian people establish their own government.

Before Congress decides to spend another \$150 million, I would just like to know exactly what the Palestinian Authority has done with all of this money. With all of the money the United States has spent, with all of the international aid, the Palestinian people still live in squalor. After decades of aid and billions of dollars, it boggles the mind that there is no economic self-sufficiency and no improvement to the quality of life.

How is that possible? Because it is not about the money. It is about the Palestinian Authority failing to do what any responsible government would have done with several billion dollars, build infrastructure, improve health care, provide economic opportunities, improve education, and move the Palestinian people into the 21st century.

The money is not going into housing. Palestinians continue to live in wretched conditions in refugee camps with corrugated tin roofs and dilapidated ramshackle huts. The money is not going to schools. If it was, Palestinian children would not be rioting in the streets. They would be sitting in classrooms being trained as the next generation of doctors and engineers who will lead their people in the 21st century instead of being trained as terrorists and suicide bombers.

Palestinian education is little more than anti-Israel, anti-Semitic and anti-American rhetoric. The Palestinian Authority continues to be financially corrupt and morally bankrupt and that is why the Palestinian people turn to Hamas, the most dangerous terrorist organization on the planet, to get their basic needs met.

The problem is not a lack of money. The Palestinian leadership is either unable or unwilling to provide for basic needs of its people. It is either unwilling or unable to lift them out of poverty. It is either unwilling or unable to prepare them for statehood and self-sufficiency.

Until they disarm the terrorists and dismantle the terrorist organizations, Abu Mazen and the Palestinian leadership are sentencing their people to continued misery, continued hopelessness, continued anger and continued self-loathing. Year after year, generation after generation.

The problem is a lack of Palestinian leadership, a lack of vision, a lack of hope for the future, not a lack of money. Mr. Chairman, if our money has not been doing any good, why are we giving more? Until we get some answers we should not give another penny to the Palestinian Authority. As a matter of fact, we should be asking for a refund.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION
NONCREDIT ACCOUNT

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to make, without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by 31 U.S.C. 9104, such expenditures and commitments within the limits of funds available to it and in accordance with law as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the amount available for administrative expenses to carry out the credit and insurance programs (including an amount for official reception and representation expenses which shall not exceed \$35,000) shall not exceed \$42,274,000: *Provided further*, That project-specific transaction costs, including direct and indirect costs incurred in claims settlements, and other direct costs associated with services provided to specific investors or potential investors pursuant to section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall not be considered administrative expenses for the purposes of this heading.

PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, \$20,276,000, as authorized by section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to be derived by transfer from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Non-Credit Account: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That such sums shall be available for direct loan obligations and loan guaranty commitments incurred or made during fiscal years 2006 and 2007: *Provided further*, That such sums shall remain available through fiscal year 2014 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 2006, and through fiscal year 2015 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 2007: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to undertake any program authorized by title IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in Iraq: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the authority of the previous proviso shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

In addition, such sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses to carry out the credit program may be derived from amounts available for administrative expenses to carry out the credit and insurance programs in the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Noncredit Account and merged with said account.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, \$50,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

TITLE II—BILATERAL ECONOMIC
ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, to remain available until September 30, 2006, unless otherwise specified herein, as follows:

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL
DEVELOPMENTCHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapters 1 and 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, for child survival, health, and family planning/reproductive health activities, in addition to

funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$1,497,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That this amount shall be made available for such activities as: (1) immunization programs; (2) oral rehydration programs; (3) health, nutrition, water and sanitation programs which directly address the needs of mothers and children, and related education programs; (4) assistance for children displaced or orphaned by causes other than AIDS; (5) programs for the prevention, treatment, control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, polio, malaria, and other infectious diseases, and for assistance to communities severely affected by HIV/AIDS, including children displaced or orphaned by AIDS; and (6) family planning/reproductive health: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for nonproject assistance, except that funds may be made available for such assistance for ongoing health activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed \$250,000, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used to monitor and provide oversight of child survival, maternal and family planning/reproductive health, and infectious disease programs: *Provided further*, That the following amounts should be allocated as follows: \$347,000,000 for child survival and maternal health; \$25,000,000 for vulnerable children; \$350,000,000 for HIV/AIDS; \$200,000,000 for other infectious diseases; and \$375,000,000 for family planning/reproductive health, including in areas where population growth threatens biodiversity or endangered species: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, and in addition to funds allocated under the previous proviso, not less than \$200,000,000 shall be made available for a United States contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the “Global Fund”), and shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities: *Provided further*, That up to 5 percent of the aggregate amount of funds made available to the Global Fund in fiscal year 2006 may be made available to the United States Agency for International Development for technical assistance related to the activities of the Global Fund: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$65,000,000 should be made available for a United States contribution to The Vaccine Fund, and up to \$6,000,000 may be transferred to and merged with funds appropriated by this Act under the heading “Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development” for costs directly related to international health, but funds made available for such costs may not be derived from amounts made available for contribution under this and preceding provisos: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this Act nor any unobligated balances from prior appropriations may be made available to any organization or program which, as determined by the President of the United States, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion: *Provided further*, That in order to reduce reliance on abortion in developing na-

tions, funds shall be available only to voluntary family planning projects which offer, either directly or through referral to, or information about access to, a broad range of family planning methods and services, and that any such voluntary family planning project shall meet the following requirements: (1) service providers or referral agents in the project shall not implement or be subject to quotas, or other numerical targets, of total number of births, number of family planning acceptors, or acceptors of a particular method of family planning (this provision shall not be construed to include the use of quantitative estimates or indicators for budgeting and planning purposes); (2) the project shall not include payment of incentives, bribes, gratuities, or financial reward to: (A) an individual in exchange for becoming a family planning acceptor; or (B) program personnel for achieving a numerical target or quota of total number of births, number of family planning acceptors, or acceptors of a particular method of family planning; (3) the project shall not deny any right or benefit, including the right of access to participate in any program of general welfare or the right of access to health care, as a consequence of any individual’s decision not to accept family planning services; (4) the project shall provide family planning acceptors comprehensible information on the health benefits and risks of the method chosen, including those conditions that might render the use of the method inadvisable and those adverse side effects known to be consequent to the use of the method; and (5) the project shall ensure that experimental contraceptive drugs and devices and medical procedures are provided only in the context of a scientific study in which participants are advised of potential risks and benefits; and, not less than 60 days after the date on which the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development determines that there has been a violation of the requirements contained in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (5) of this proviso, or a pattern or practice of violations of the requirements contained in paragraph (4) of this proviso, the Administrator shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations a report containing a description of such violation and the corrective action taken by the Agency: *Provided further*, That in awarding grants for natural family planning under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 no applicant shall be discriminated against because of such applicant’s religious or conscientious commitment to offer only natural family planning; and, additionally, all such applicants shall comply with the requirements of the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this or any other Act authorizing or appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, the term “motivate”, as it relates to family planning assistance, shall not be construed to prohibit the provision, consistent with local law, of information or counseling about all pregnancy options: *Provided further*, That to the maximum extent feasible, taking into consideration cost, timely availability, and best health practices, funds appropriated in this Act or prior appropriations Acts that are made available for condom procurement shall be made available only for the procurement of condoms manufactured in the United States: *Provided further*, That information provided about the use of condoms as part of projects or activities that are funded from amounts appropriated by this Act shall be medically accurate and shall include the public health benefits and failure rates of such use.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PITTS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PITTS:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3057, AS REPORTED,
OFFERED BY MR. PITTS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 7, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$750,000,000)”.

Page 8, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$750,000,000)”.

Page 41, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$750,000,000)”.

Page 41, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$750,000,000)”.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman for his work on these complicated issues but I rise to raise an issue that we just heard about from the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and which we have heard about in past years from the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). I think the time has come to say enough is enough.

Since 1979 Egypt has been the second largest recipient of U.S. foreign assistance. Each year Egypt receives about \$2 billion in economic and military aid. The money goes to support our strategic ally in the Middle East. But I think this money is largely misspent today on a nation that refuses change and excuses oppression.

The State Department tells us that Egyptian police routinely use torture to extract confessions and detain suspects without charge or trial. Egyptian authorities harass and imprison opposition party candidates on trumped up charges. The government is engaged in an unwarranted and dangerous military build-up. It oppresses religious minorities. It violates human rights. It obstructs democratic reforms. It censors the media. In fact, the media is controlled by the government there and they permit a lot of anti-Semitism and hate speech. It continues to arrest Christian converts who leave Islam. I could go on and on.

Egypt is an ally. But we can no longer afford to excuse oppression with the rhetoric of stability and the politics of fear.

We can no longer afford a wholesale subsidizing of such huge violators of basic human rights and basic freedoms.

My amendment would take some of the money that we spend to underwrite the Egyptian military and send it to programs that fight malaria by increasing USAID's Child Survival and Health Account for other infectious diseases, particularly malaria. Malaria kills as many as 3 million people each year. Up to 90 percent of these deaths occur in Africa and 90 percent are children under the age of 5. And though it is difficult to accurately assess the scale of the disease, the WHO estimates that 40 percent of the world's population is at risk of malaria, and there are between 350 and 500 million clinical cases every year.

Malaria disproportionately affects the poor. Fifty-eight percent of malaria deaths occur in the poorest 20 per-

cent of the world's population, a higher percentage than for any other disease of major public health importance.

Reducing Egypt's military subsidy by \$750 million will serve to send a strong message. Money sent to a nation, even a strong ally like Egypt, that refuses to make the necessary political, democratic and human rights reforms should be redirected to a place that better represents our values. In this case I can think of no better use for this funding than to treat and prevent malaria in Africa.

According to the CBO, this transfer will result in a savings of \$400 million in FY 2006 in net outlays. A vote for this amendment is a vote for more responsible Federal spending. It is a vote for American values. It is a vote for kids. It is a vote against the status quo of Egypt's dictatorship.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Our assistance to Egypt has been longstanding and Egypt remains an important ally in the Middle East.

I would be among the first in this body to admit my concerns about Egypt's actions or sometimes their lack of actions when it comes to building programs of democracy in that country. And we have had a lot of discussion at both the subcommittee and full committee levels regarding ways to address these concerns.

I accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to fence \$100 million of our economic assistance to Egypt and to put an earmark around those or to fence it so they could be used specifically for democracy and education programs. That is the first time that we have ever done that in this earmark for Egypt.

□ 1530

I think that sends a very strong message to Egypt. So this amendment, however well-intentioned, is not going to be constructive.

The relationship that we have with Egypt goes back 2 decades. We should not forget that prior to the Camp David agreement Egypt and Israel engaged in several wars and Egypt was an ally of the Soviet Union. That changed when President Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Begin negotiated a peace agreement in 1978 with the help of the United States.

As part of that agreement and in an effort to bring stability and security to the region, the United States agreed to provide major economic and military assistance packages for both Israel and Egypt. Six years ago, the Committee on Appropriations under the leadership of my predecessor, former Congressman Sonny Callahan, initiated a policy to begin a phase-down of economic assistance for both Israel and Egypt. This resulted in a decision to phase out Israel's economic assistance by \$120 million per year over 10 years, while increasing military assistance by \$60 mil-

lion. Egypt's economic assistance declines \$40 million per year with no increase in military assistance.

The agreement reached 6 years ago modifying the Camp David funding formula was agreed to by the parties involved, including the administration. An amendment that would help to impose a new funding regime, a new funding formula on this money, this carefully balanced money that goes to the partners in the Camp David accords, not as a result of any discussion or negotiations with them, but by unilateral action by this body, would undo the delicate balance of economic and military assistance and would be diplomatically disastrous for the United States.

It would not be wise for Congress to disrupt any cooperation that exists between Israel and Egypt by cutting the military assistance to Egypt; and I can assure my colleagues, this is certainly not supported, though I do not speak for them, I feel quite certain in saying this is not supported by the Government of Israel.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raises important issues. For the last several years, I have joined many of my colleagues in expressing concern about the composition of the U.S. aid package to Egypt. Why, at a time when Egypt has no major enemies, should we be providing over \$1 billion each year in military assistance? Why, when Egypt lacks economic prosperity, should we maintain such a high level of military aid even as economic assistance levels drop?

In Cairo last week, Secretary of State Rice announced a new commitment to human rights in the Arab world, imploring the Egyptian Government to hold free and transparent elections and end human rights abuses, and I was very pleased to hear her remarks. For too long, we have coddled undemocratic regimes, looking the other way as democracy and freedom have been stifled.

Despite President Mubarak's pronouncements to the contrary, Egypt is a hotbed neither of democratic reform nor respect for the rights of the opposition.

In late May, members of the Egyptian movement Kifaya, which means “enough” in Arabic, were beaten and dragged through the street by a government-organized mob. Police stood by as women were sexually assaulted; and in some cases, police actively participated in beating and arresting protesters. What radical agenda does Kifaya have? Free, fair, and transparent elections.

Or consider the case of Ayman Nour, leader of a small Egyptian opposition party, who was jailed on charges of faking signatures to form his party. In the weeks leading up to his arrest, Nour had called for a constitutional overhaul to restrain Mubarak's powers.

Nour spent 42 days in prison being beaten and held under inhumane conditions and is awaiting a trial that will start next week.

The Egyptian record on human rights is rivaled by its record on incitement in the media. Even as diplomatic relations between Israel and Egypt continue to progress, with the recent return of Egypt's ambassador to Israel, anti-Israel and anti-Semitic attacks in the official Egyptian media persist, with claims of Holocaust exaggeration, Zionist-Nazi collaboration, and anti-Semitic canards.

The amendment sends the message that the status quo is not okay. Baby steps toward political reform are unacceptable and will no longer be tolerated. Tepid efforts to stop smuggling along Egypt's border with Gaza are not enough. Disclaimers that the Egyptian press is free and cannot be influenced by the government will not be believed.

The tide in the Middle East is turning toward democracy and freedom, toward rights for women and educational opportunities for children. The tide is turning toward peace between Israel and its neighbors, toward economic cooperation and coexistence.

Egypt has been part of this turning tide. It was the first Arab country to make peace with Israel, and it is a needed partner in closing any peace deal between Israel and the Palestinians. But too often we have seen this powerful player in regional affairs place stumbling blocks in front of progress instead of easing the way.

We know Egypt is listening to our debate today. A lot is at stake. So the one message I have is this: great nations recognize when the changing times will leave them behind, and they stay ahead of the curve. I hope we will see the pace of reform quicken and the quality of cooperation increase in the coming weeks and months.

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

Mr. Chairman, as this amendment is considered, I think it would be useful to remember what the committee has done with respect to our assistance to Egypt. As the gentleman from Arizona has indicated, the committee adopted an amendment offered by me which earmarked ESF funds for Egypt, doubling the amounts spent on democracy, governance, and human rights and providing additional funding for education within that account.

The amendment earmarked \$50 million in ESF for democracy, governance, and human rights and \$50 million for education. Both categories were projected at about \$25 million in the administration request. So this essentially doubles that amount.

The reason for that has already been stated. We were looking for a way to send a clear signal to Egypt that we find their human rights record to be an embarrassment without thoroughly upsetting the administration's ability to continue to negotiate in that region, to try to move what is left of the peace process forward.

I have no idea whether the administration will be sufficiently serious about the issue. I have no idea whether or not they will be successful if they are serious, but I do just want to say one thing. I think every Member of this House would like to be able to vote for this amendment because we like where the money would be put; but we also have a responsibility, regardless of party, to try to see to it that in the attempt to send messages we do not blow things up in different regions of the world.

So I have absolutely no doubt that this amendment would produce a most irresponsible result in the region, but I think it will be interesting to note who supports the administration's position on this roll call and who does not. I intend, for one, to watch very carefully to see whether or not the leadership of the President's own party is going to be sticking with the President or not, and whether they do or not will send an interesting signal to those of us on this side of the aisle.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding.

Indeed, this issue was discussed extensively in our full committee. There is little doubt that the committee, in a totally nonpartisan way, is interested in sending this message; and we are laying the foundation here to reflect the reality that America is at its best when we express ourselves overseas in as close to a bipartisan way as possible.

I must compliment the gentleman for his own statement at this time, but also in the full committee. I think we laid the foundation to let people in the Middle East know how serious we are about a clear message, and this message will be carried forward to the conference with other body as well.

So I appreciate my colleague yielding.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if I could just say, I would be most curious to know what the administration is clearly saying on this subject. I have just received a message which indicates that the administration is pleased with the language in the committee bill. I hope that they continue to clarify their position to make clear exactly where they stand on this amendment. If they do not, they will be the ones who have to explain the consequences.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 326, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—87

Akin	Gibbons	Napolitano
Bartlett (MD)	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Barton (TX)	Goode	Northup
Beauprez	Goodlatte	Norwood
Berkley	Gordon	Otter
Berry	Gutknecht	Paul
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Payne
Blumenauer	Hayworth	Pence
Bono	Hefley	Peterson (MN)
Bradley (NH)	Herseth	Petri
Brown (OH)	Hinchey	Pitts
Burton (IN)	Hostettler	Platts
Cannon	Jenkins	Poe
Cantor	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Cardoza	Jones (NC)	Royce
Carson	Kennedy (RI)	Ryun (KS)
Clay	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Lantos	Serrano
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Deal (GA)	LoBiondo	Souder
DeFazio	Lofgren, Zoe	Stearns
Doggett	Maloney	Strickland
Duncan	Matheson	Tancredo
Fossella	McCullum (MN)	Tiberi
Foxx	McHenry	Towns
Frank (MA)	Melancon	Udall (CO)
Franks (AZ)	Musgrave	Udall (NM)
Garrett (NJ)	Myrick	Watson
Gerlach	Nadler	Weiner

NOES—326

Abercrombie	Culberson	Hoekstra
Ackerman	Cummings	Holden
Aderholt	Cunningham	Holt
Alexander	Davis (AL)	Honda
Allen	Davis (CA)	Hooley
Andrews	Davis (FL)	Hoyer
Baca	Davis (IL)	Hulshof
Bachus	Davis (KY)	Hyde
Baird	Davis (TN)	Inglis (SC)
Baker	Davis, Jo Ann	Inslee
Baldwin	Davis, Tom	Israel
Barrett (SC)	DeGette	Issa
Barrow	Delahunt	Istook
Bass	DeLauro	Jackson (IL)
Bean	DeLay	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Becerra	Dent	Jefferson
Berman	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jindal
Biggert	Diaz-Balart, M.	Johnson (CT)
Bilirakis	Dicks	Johnson, E. B.
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Johnson, Sam
Bishop (NY)	Doyle	Jones (OH)
Blackburn	Drake	Kanjorski
Blunt	Dreier	Kaptur
Boehlert	Edwards	Keller
Boehner	Ehlers	Kelly
Bonilla	Emanuel	Kennedy (MN)
Bonner	Emerson	Kildee
Boozman	Engel	Kilpatrick (MI)
Boren	English (PA)	Kind
Boswell	Eshoo	King (NY)
Boucher	Evans	Kirk
Boustany	Everett	Kline
Boyd	Farr	Knollenberg
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kolbe
Brady (TX)	Feeley	Larsen (WA)
Brown, Corrine	Ferguson	Larson (CT)
Brown-Waite,	Filner	Latham
Ginny	Fitzpatrick (PA)	LaHood
Burgess	Flake	Langevin
Butterfield	Foley	Larsen (WA)
Buyer	Forbes	Larson (CT)
Calvert	Ford	LaTourette
Camp	Fortenberry	Leach
Capps	Frelinghuysen	Lee
Capuano	Gallegly	Levin
Cardin	Gilchrest	Lewis (CA)
Carnahan	Gillmor	Lewis (KY)
Carter	Gingrey	Lipinski
Case	Gonzalez	Lowey
Castle	Granger	Lucas
Chabot	Graves	Lungren, Daniel E.
Chandler	Green (WI)	Lynch
Chocola	Green, Al	Mack
Cleaver	Green, Gene	Manzullo
Cole (OK)	Grijalva	Marchant
Conaway	Gutierrez	Markey
Conyers	Hall	Marshall
Cooper	Harman	Matsui
Costa	Hart	McCarthy
Costello	Hastings (FL)	McCaull (TX)
Cox	Hastings (WA)	McCotter
Cramer	Hensarling	McCrery
Crenshaw	Herger	McDermott
Cubin	Hinojosa	
Cuellar	Hobson	

McGovern	Radanovich	Snyder
McKeon	Ramstad	Sodrel
McKinney	Rangel	Solis
McMorris	Regula	Stark
McNulty	Rehberg	Stupak
Meehan	Reichert	Sullivan
Meek (FL)	Renzi	Sweeney
Meeks (NY)	Reyes	Tanner
Menendez	Reynolds	Tauscher
Mica	Rogers (KY)	Taylor (MS)
Millender-	Rogers (MI)	Taylor (NC)
McDonald	Rohrabacher	Terry
Miller (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	Thomas
Miller (MI)	Rothman	Thompson (CA)
Miller (NC)	Royal-Allard	Thompson (MS)
Miller, Gary	Ruppersberger	Thornberry
Miller, George	Rush	Tiahrt
Moore (KS)	Ryan (OH)	Tierney
Moore (WI)	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Moran (KS)	Sabo	Upton
Moran (VA)	Salazar	Van Hollen
Murphy	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez
Murtha	T.	Visclosky
Neal (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walden (OR)
Ney	Sanders	Walsh
Nunes	Saxton	Wamp
Nussle	Schakowsky	Wasserman
Oberstar	Schiff	Schultz
Obey	Schwartz (PA)	Waters
Olver	Schwarz (MI)	Watt
Osborne	Scott (GA)	Waxman
Owens	Scott (VA)	Weldon (FL)
Oxley	Sessions	Weldon (PA)
Pallone	Shadegg	Weller
Pascall	Shaw	Westmoreland
Pastor	Shays	Wexler
Pearce	Sherwood	Wexler
Pelosi	Shimkus	Whitfield
Peterson (PA)	Shuster	Wicker
Pickering	Simmons	Wilson (NM)
Pombo	Simpson	Wilson (SC)
Pomeroy	Skelton	Woolsey
Porter	Slaughter	Wu
Price (GA)	Smith (NJ)	Wynn
Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)	Young (AK)
Putnam	Smith (WA)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Brown (SC)	Hunter	Ortiz
Capito	Kingston	Price (NC)
Clyburn	Linder	Rahall
Doolittle	McHugh	Ross
Etheridge	McIntyre	Spratt
Hayes	Michaud	Wolf
Higgins	Mollohan	

□ 1605

Messrs. WAMP, MARSHALL, ROHR-ABACHER, OWENS, BUTTERFIELD, HYDE, THOMPSON of California, GREEN of Wisconsin, CULBERSON, and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. LoBIONDO, HEFLEY, GOOD-LATTE, UDALL of Colorado, UDALL of New Mexico, FRANKS of Arizona, CANTOR, FRANK of Massachusetts, BURTON of Indiana, SERRANO, Towns and Ms. MCCOLLUM changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I was at Walter Reed Army Medical Center visiting Army Specialist Matt James, a constituent from Virginia's 10th District, who was wounded while serving in Iraq, and I missed the vote on rollcall 326.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 326, the Pitts amendment to H.R. 3057, Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr.

SIMPSON) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3057) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3058, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 342 on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution and on any other votes arising in this series.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 263, nays 152, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

YEAS—263

Abercrombie	Conyers	Garrett (NJ)
Ackerman	Cooper	Gilchrest
Akin	Costa	Gillmor
Alexander	Costello	Gohmert
Andrews	Cox	Gonzalez
Baca	Cramer	Goodlatte
Bachus	Crenshaw	Granger
Baker	Crowley	Green, Al
Baldwin	Cubin	Green, Gene
Barton (TX)	Culberson	Grijalva
Bass	Cummings	Gutierrez
Beauprez	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Berman	Davis (AL)	Hall
Biggert	Davis (FL)	Harman
Bilirakis	Davis (IL)	Harris
Bishop (GA)	Davis (KY)	Hastings (FL)
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Tom	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	DeGette	Heffley
Blunt	Delahunt	Herger
Boehlert	DeLaurio	Hinchey
Boehner	DeLay	Hinojosa
Bonilla	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hobson
Bonner	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hoekstra
Bono	Dicks	Honda
Boucher	Dingell	Hostettler
Boyd	Doyle	Hoyer
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hunter
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Hyde
Brown, Corrine	Emanuel	Inglis (SC)
Burton (IN)	Engel	Israel
Butterfield	Eshoo	Issa
Buyer	Everett	Istook
Calvert	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Camp	Fattah	Jackson-Lee
Cannon	Feeney	(TX)
Cantor	Ferguson	Jefferson
Capuano	Filner	Johnson, E. B.
Cardin	Foley	Johnson, Sam
Carter	Fortenberry	Jones (OH)
Clay	Frank (MA)	Kanjorski
Cleaver	Franks (AZ)	Kennedy (RI)
Cole (OK)	Frelinghuysen	Kilpatrick (MI)
Conaway	Gallegly	King (IA)

King (NY)	Ney	Smith (TX)
Kirk	Nunes	Solis
Kline	Oberstar	Souder
Knollenberg	Olver	Stark
Kolbe	Owens	Sullivan
Lantos	Oxley	Sweeney
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Tancredo
Larson (CT)	Pascrill	Tauscher
LaTourette	Pastor	Terry
Leach	Payne	Thomas
Lee	Pelosi	Thompson (CA)
Levin	Pence	Thompson (MS)
Lewis (CA)	Poe	Thornberry
Lewis (GA)	Pombo	Tiberti
Lewis (KY)	Price (GA)	Tiabrt
Lipinski	Pryce (OH)	Tierney
Lowey	Putnam	Towns
Lucas	Radanovich	Turner
Lungren, Daniel	Rangel	Upton
E.	Regula	Van Hollen
Lynch	Rehberg	Velázquez
Mack	Reyes	Visclosky
Marchant	Reynolds	Walsh
Markey	Rogers (KY)	Wasserman
Matsui	Rohrabacher	Schultz
McCarthy	Rothman	Waterson
McCotter	Ruppersberger	Watson
McCrery	Royal-Allard	Watt
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Waxman
McGovern	Rush	Weiner
McKeon	Sabo	Weldon (FL)
McNulty	Sánchez, Linda	Weldon (PA)
Meehan	T.	Weller
Meek (FL)	Saxton	Westmoreland
Meeks (NY)	Schakowsky	Weller
Menendez	Schwarz (MI)	Westmoreland
Millender-	McDonald	Wexler
McDonald	Serrano	Whitfield
Miller (MI)	Sessions	Wicker
Miller, Gary	Shadegg	Wilson (NM)
Miller, George	Shaw	Wilson (SC)
Moore (WI)	Shays	Wolf
Moran (VA)	Sherman	Woolsey
Murtha	Simpson	Wynn
Myrick	Skelton	Young (AK)
Nader	Slaughter	Young (FL)
Neal (MA)	Smith (NJ)	

NAYS—152

Aderholt	Fossella	Moore (KS)
Allen	Fox	Moran (KS)
Baird	Gerlach	Murphy
Barrett (SC)	Gibbons	Musgrave
Barrow	Gingrey	Napolitano
Bartlett (MD)	Goode	Neugebauer
Bean	Gordon	Northup
Becerra	Graves	Noorwood
Berkley	Green (WI)	Nussle
Berry	Hart	Obey
Bishop (NY)	Hayworth	Osborne
Blackburn	Hensarling	Otter
Boozman	Herseth	Paul
Boren	Holden	Pearce
Boswell	Holt	Peterson (MN)
Boustany	Hooley	Peterson (PA)
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Petri
Brown (OH)	Inslee	Pickering
Brown-Waite,	Jenkins	Pitts
Ginny	Jindal	Platts
Hall	Karpur	Reichert
Burgess	Johnson (CT)	Romero
Capps	Johnson (IL)	Porter
Caroda	Jones (NC)	Ramstad
Carnahan	Kaptur	Reinert
Case	Keller	Renzi
Castle	Kennedy (MN)	Rogers (AL)
Chabot	Kildee	Rogers (MI)
Chandler	Kind	Royce
Chocola	Kucinich	Ryan (OH)
Coble	Kuhl (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Cuellar	LaHood	Ryan (KS)
DeFazio	Salazar	Sanchez, Loretta
Dent	Manzullo	Sanders
Doggett	Marshall	Sherwood
Drake	Matheson	Shimkus
Duncan	McCaull (TX)	Shuster
Edwards	McCullom (MN)	Simmons
Emerson	McHenry	Smith (WA)
English (PA)	McKinney	Snyder
Forbes	McMorris	Sodrel
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Melancon	Stearns
Flake	Mica	Strickland
Forrest	Miller (FL)	Stupak
Ford	Miller (NC)	Tanner