Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules has gone the extra mile. We bring forth this measure not only with a fair rule, but an open rule. Any amendment any Member wants to come up with, as long as it is germane, can be presented. So we feel really good about our work. We ask for the support of the House on both sides of the aisle for the rule.

Reiterating that, I support this rule, and urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 256, nays 172, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

YEAS—256

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

NAYS—172

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sherman
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Dicks
Jones (OH)
Martinez
McDermott
Peterson (PA)
Skelton

☐ 1638

Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. OWENS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. DEAL of Georgia, KUCINICH, KLINK, CRAMER and KANJORSKI changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 263 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. 2606.

☐ 1640

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. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to open debate on H.R. 2606, the fiscal year 2000 appropriation bill for foreign operations, export financing, and other related programs.

This bill is within the subcommittee allocation. It contains no emergency provisions, and it includes no earmarks. This bill reflects many priorities requested by Members of both parties, but it gives the President and the Secretary of State maximum flexibility to support American interests abroad.

The bill before the House totals $12.624 billion. Like the past four foreign operations bills that I have managed, it is less than the bill that was enacted into law the previous year. In this instance, if we discount the emergency funding for Kosovo and Hurricane Mitch, as well as the International Monetary Fund, the bill is still some $200 million less than the amount enacted for 1999. If we include all of these items, this bill is $21 billion less than last year, a reduction of more than 60 percent, which Mr. Chairman, I believe is a record.

This bill is almost $2 billion less than the President's request, and I understand that he may be requesting additional funds later this year. The fact is we have to live within our budget caps agreed to by the President and the Congress in 1997. Although foreign aid represents less than one-half of 1 percent of the Federal budget, $12.6 billion is the amount we have been allocated, and this bill reflects the committee's best recommendation on how to distribute that amount.

This bill marks the second year of a 10-year program to phase out economic assistance to Israel and Egypt. The committee has rejected the administration's proposal to speed up the phaseout by 25 percent. At the same time, we are increasing military aid to Israel by a smaller amount. I would note that President Clinton and Prime Minister Barak now concur with the plan undertaken by this committee and the Congress last year.

In the recent supplemental appropriation bill, Congress appropriated $431 million in emergency funds for refugees in the vicinity of Kosovo. Congress also made a generous provision in the supplemental for the reconstruction of the areas of Honduras and Nicaragua affected by Hurricane Mitch.

While this bill provides for ongoing refugee and humanitarian aid programs worldwide, it does not include any funds for the long-term reconstruction of Kosovo and Southeastern Europe. We agree with President Clinton that Europe is responsible for that task.

The gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and I have written the President reminding him that the refugee funds were not appropriated by Congress for long-term reconstruction efforts in Kosovo.

Having funded refugees and hurricane reconstruction in the supplemental, this bill has different priorities.

□ 1645

Significant increases above last year's level are limited to child survival and a renewed effort to reduce threats from infectious diseases and international narcotics trafficking.

Further, we are proud to be leaders in the global effort to eradicate polio. Our committee, led by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), has led the way to eliminate the global spread of HIV/AIDS, and this is especially important to the future of Africa.

This year, our committee recommends more attention to the threat posed by drug-resistant tuberculosis, and we recommend greater focus on the needs of orphans and displaced children. Dozens of Members have written to us about both matters. And, finally, the committee rejected the President's proposal to cut the American donation to UNICEF, the International Children's Fund.

The committee report contains a number of recommendations and direction to the agencies that implement the activities funded in this bill.

House Report 106–254 encourages continued economic cooperation with Latin America, a prime market for American exports. I will include in the RECORD a table from pages 15 and 16 of the report indicating the amount of assistance the bill provides for sub-Saharan Africa, an area of interest to many, many Members of Congress. I would also direct attention to the report language directed at the management of AID and at the Inter-American Foundation.

One closing note. This is our 10th regular appropriations bill this year. In order to complete our work on time, we need to finish this bill tonight, however long it takes. I am aware of relatively few amendments to the four spending titles of the bill. Most of the known amendments are limitations that are taken up at the end of the debate. I reserve the right to seek to limit time on such amendments. The managers appreciate Members cooperating in moving this bill to completion today.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD a detailed table showing the committee's recommendation.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2606)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE					
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES					
Subsidy appropriation	765,000	839,000	759,000	-6,000	-80,000
Emergency funding (by transfer)	(10,000)			(-10,000)	
(Direct loan authorization)	(1,333,000)	(1,687,000)	(1,350,000)	(+17,000)	(-337,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(12,702,000)	(13,825,000)	(10,400,000)	(-2,302,000)	(-3,425,000)
Administrative expenses	50,000	57,000	55,000	+5,000	-2,000
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	400			-400	
Negative subsidy	-25,000	-15,000	-15,000	+10,000	
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States	790,400	881,000	799,000	+8,600	-82,000
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION					
Noncredit account:					
Administrative expenses	32,500	35,000	35,000	+2,500	
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	840			-840	
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections	-260,000	-303,000	-303,000	-43,000	
Direct loans:					
Loan subsidy	4,000	14,000	10,500	+6,500	-3,500
(Loan authorization)	(136,000)	(130,000)	(85,000)	(-51,000)	(-45,000)
Guaranteed loans:					
Loan subsidy	46,000	10,000	10,000	-36,000	
(Loan authorization)	(1,750,000)	(1,000,000)	(850,000)	(-900,000)	(-150,000)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	1,260			-1,260	
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation	-175,400	-244,000	-247,500	-72,100	-3,500
TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY					
Trade and development agency	44,000	48,000	44,000		-4,000
Total, title I, Export and investment assistance	659,000	685,000	595,500	-63,500	-89,500
(Loan authorizations)	(15,921,000)	(16,642,000)	(12,685,000)	(-3,236,000)	(-3,957,000)
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Agency for International Development					
Child survival and disease programs fund	650,000	555,000	680,000	+30,000	+125,000
Emergency funding	50,000			-50,000	
Development assistance	1,225,000	780,440	1,201,000	-24,000	+420,560
Central America and the Caribbean Emergency Disaster Recovery Fund (Emergency Funding)	621,000			-621,000	
Emergency funding (transfer out)	(-17,000)			(+17,000)	
Development Fund for Africa		512,560			-512,560
International disaster assistance	200,000	220,000	200,880	+880	-19,120
Emergency funding	188,000			-188,000	
Micro & Small Enterprise Development program account:					
Subsidy appropriation	1,500	1,500	1,500		
(Direct loan authorization)	(1,000)			(-1,000)	
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(40,000)	(30,000)	(30,000)	(-10,000)	
Administrative expenses	500	500	500		
Urban and environmental credit program account:					
Subsidy appropriation	1,500	3,000		-1,500	-3,000
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(14,000)	(26,000)		(-14,000)	(-26,000)
Administrative expenses	5,000	5,000	5,000		
Development credit authority program account:					
(By transfer)		(15,000)			(-15,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization)		(200,000)			(-200,000)
Subtotal, development assistance	2,942,500	2,078,000	2,088,880	-853,620	+10,880
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	44,552	43,837	43,837	-715	
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development	479,950	507,739	479,950		-27,789
Emergency funding (by transfer)	(8,000)			(-8,000)	
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	10,200			-10,200	
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General	30,750	25,261	25,000	-5,750	-261
Emergency funding (by transfer)	(1,500)			(-1,500)	
Total, Agency for International Development	3,507,952	2,654,837	2,637,667	-870,285	-17,170
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance					
Economic support fund	2,362,000	2,539,000	2,227,000	-135,000	-312,000
Emergency funding	211,500			-211,500	
Emergency funding (transfer out)	(-3,770)			(+3,770)	
International Fund for Ireland	19,600		19,600		+19,600
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States	430,000	393,000	393,000	-37,000	
Emergency funding	120,000			-120,000	
Assistance for the New Independent States of the former Soviet Union	801,000	1,032,000	725,000	-76,000	-307,000
Emergency funding	46,000			-46,000	
Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	3,990,100	3,964,000	3,364,600	-625,500	-599,400

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2606)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Inter-American Foundation					
Appropriation	.....	22,300	.....	.....	-22,300
(By transfer)	(20,000)	.....	(5,000)	(-15,000)	(+5,000)
Total	(20,000)	(22,300)	(5,000)	(-15,000)	(-17,300)
African Development Foundation					
Appropriation	.....	14,400	.....	.....	-14,400
(By transfer)	(11,000)	.....	(14,400)	(+3,400)	(+14,400)
Y2K conversion (emergency funding)	137	.....	.....	-137	.....
Total	(11,137)	(14,400)	(14,400)	(+3,263)	.....
Peace Corps					
Appropriation	240,000	270,000	240,000	.....	-30,000
Emergency funding (by transfer)	(1,769)	.....	.....	(-1,769)	.....
Department of State					
International narcotics control and law enforcement	261,000	295,000	285,000	+24,000	-10,000
Emergency funding	255,600	.....	.....	-255,600	.....
Migration and refugee assistance	640,000	660,000	640,000	.....	-20,000
Emergency funding	266,000	.....	.....	-266,000	.....
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund	30,000	30,000	30,000	.....	.....
Emergency funding	165,000	.....	.....	-165,000	.....
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs	198,000	231,000	181,630	-16,370	-49,370
Emergency funding	20,000	.....	.....	-20,000	.....
National Commission on Terrorism	840	.....	.....	-840	.....
U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom	3,000	.....	.....	-3,000	.....
Total, Department of State	1,839,440	1,216,000	1,136,630	-702,810	-79,370
Department of the Treasury					
Debt restructuring	33,000	120,000	33,000	.....	-87,000
Emergency funding	41,000	.....	.....	-41,000	.....
International affairs technical assistance	3,000	8,500	1,500	-1,500	-7,000
United States community adjustment and investment program	10,000	17,000	.....	-10,000	-17,000
Subtotal, Department of the Treasury	87,000	145,500	34,500	-52,500	-111,000
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance	9,664,629	8,287,037	7,413,397	-2,251,232	-873,640
Appropriations	(7,675,192)	(8,287,037)	(7,413,397)	(-261,795)	(-873,640)
Emergency funding	(1,994,437)	.....	.....	(-1,994,437)	.....
Rescission	(-5,000)	.....	.....	(+5,000)	.....
(By transfer)	(10,230)	(15,000)	(19,400)	(+9,170)	(+4,400)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(11,269)	.....	.....	(-11,269)	.....
(Loan authorizations)	(55,000)	(256,000)	(30,000)	(-25,000)	(-226,000)
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Military Education and Training	50,000	52,000	50,000	.....	-2,000
Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Grants	3,330,000	3,780,000	3,470,000	+140,000	-310,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(29,910)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(+585)	(+495)
Direct loans:					
Subsidy appropriation	20,000	.....	.....	-20,000	.....
(Loan authorization)	(167,000)	.....	.....	(-167,000)	.....
FMF program level	(3,497,000)	(3,780,000)	(3,470,000)	(-27,000)	(-310,000)
Total, Foreign Military Financing	3,350,000	3,780,000	3,470,000	+120,000	-310,000
Emergency funding	50,000	.....	.....	-50,000	.....
Special Defense Acquisition Fund: Offsetting collections	-19,000	-6,000	-6,000	+13,000	.....
Peacekeeping operations	76,500	130,000	76,500	.....	-53,500
Total, title III, Military assistance	3,507,500	3,956,000	3,590,500	+83,000	-365,500
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(29,910)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(+585)	(+495)
(Loan authorization)	(167,000)	.....	.....	(-167,000)	.....

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 (H.R. 2606)—Continued
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 1999 Enacted	FY 2000 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Financial Institutions					
World Bank Group					
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Global Environment Facility	192,500	143,333	50,000	-142,500	-93,333
Rescission	-25,000	.....	.....	+25,000	.....
Subtotal, Global Environment Facility	167,500	143,333	50,000	-117,500	-93,333
Contribution to the International Development Association	800,000	803,430	576,600	-223,400	-226,830
Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency	.....	10,000	.....	.....	-10,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	.....	(50,000)	.....	.....	(-50,000)
Total, World Bank Group	967,500	956,763	626,600	-340,900	-330,163
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	25,611	25,611	25,611	.....	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(1,503,719)	(1,503,719)	(1,503,719)	.....	.....
Fund for special operations	21,152	.....	.....	-21,152	.....
Contribution to the Inter-American Investment Corporation	.....	25,000	.....	.....	-25,000
Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund	50,000	28,500	.....	-50,000	-28,500
Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank	96,763	79,111	25,611	-71,152	-53,500
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	13,222	13,728	13,728	+506	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(647,858)	(672,745)	(672,745)	(+24,887)	.....
Contribution to the Asian Development Fund	210,000	177,017	100,000	-110,000	-77,017
Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank	223,222	190,745	113,728	-109,494	-77,017
Contribution to the African Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	.....	5,100	.....	.....	-5,100
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	.....	(80,000)	.....	.....	(-80,000)
Contribution to the African Development Fund	128,000	127,000	100,000	-28,000	-27,000
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Paid-in capital	35,779	35,779	35,779	.....	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	.....	.....
Total, International Financial Institutions	1,451,264	1,394,498	901,718	-549,546	-492,780
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,274,815)	(2,429,702)	(2,299,702)	(+24,887)	(-130,000)
International Organizations and Programs					
Appropriation	187,000	293,000	167,000	-20,000	-126,000
(By transfer)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	.....	.....
Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance	1,638,264	1,687,498	1,068,718	-569,546	-618,780
Appropriations	(1,663,264)	(1,687,498)	(1,068,718)	(-594,546)	(-618,780)
Rescission	(-25,000)	.....	.....	(+25,000)	.....
(By transfer)	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	.....	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,274,815)	(2,429,702)	(2,299,702)	(+24,887)	(-130,000)
TITLE VI					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Monetary Programs					
Loans to International Monetary Fund	3,361,000	.....	.....	-3,361,000	.....
United States Quota, International Monetary Fund	14,500,000	.....	.....	-14,500,000	.....
Total, International Monetary Programs	17,861,000	.....	.....	-17,861,000	.....
Grand total	33,330,393	14,615,535	12,668,115	-20,662,278	-1,947,420
Appropriations	(31,313,456)	(14,615,535)	(12,668,115)	(-18,645,341)	(-1,947,420)
Emergency appropriations	(2,046,937)	.....	.....	(-2,046,937)	.....
Rescission	(-30,000)	.....	.....	(+30,000)	.....
(By transfer)	(12,730)	(17,500)	(21,900)	(+9,170)	(+4,400)
(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(21,269)	.....	.....	(-21,269)	.....
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(29,910)	(30,000)	(30,495)	(+585)	(+495)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,274,815)	(2,429,702)	(2,299,702)	(+24,887)	(-130,000)
(Loan authorizations)	(16,143,000)	(16,898,000)	(12,715,000)	(-3,428,000)	(-4,183,000)
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Total mandatory and discretionary	31,246,456	14,615,535	12,668,115	-18,578,341	-1,947,420
Mandatory	44,552	43,837	43,837	-715	.....
Discretionary	31,201,904	14,571,698	12,624,278	-18,577,626	-1,947,420

ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Development Assistance	$460,000,000
Child Survival and Disease Prevention	275,000,000
African Development Foundation	14,400,000
International Disaster Assistance	90,000,000
Peace Corps	54,500,000
Refugee and Migration programs	135,000,000
Debt forgiveness for Africa [1]	160,000,000
UNICEF [2]	54,000,000
African Development Fund	100,000,000
International Development Association [3]	283,000,000
Total	1,625,900,000

[1] $160,000,000 is the total amount of U.S. debt forgiven. The appropriation contained in this bill to cover the costs of debt forgiveness is $18,000,000.

[2] UNICEF dedicated approximately 49 percent of its resources to sub-Saharan Africa in 1999. UNICEF expects this percentage to continue.

[3] The IDA–12 replenishment targeted 50 percent of all IDA credits to sub-Saharan Africa countries.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I wish to begin my remarks on the fiscal year 2000 foreign operations bill as I always do by complimenting the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for the manner in which he has developed this bill.

Given the constraints of a low 302(b) allocation and the contentious policy issues that normally weigh this bill down, he has done an excellent job of balancing funding and policy considerations. Both the subcommittee and the full committee markups went as smoothly as could be expected for this bill, and that is a testament to his fairness and his bipartisanship.

It is also a tribute to the bipartisanship on the Democratic side of the aisle, I might add, and I commend my fellow Members on the Democratic side. It is a pleasure to work with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and his Republican colleagues on this bill.

Having said that, I also want to make it clear that the total level of spending in the bill of $12.625 billion is not adequate to meet our national security requirements and will, I believe, seriously impair the President's ability to carry out an effective foreign policy. That is why the administration has put out a veto threat on the bill, that is one of the reasons, the underfunding.

I have indicated my support for the bill on the basis that the chairman has been judicious in his distribution of the resources available to him. It will be necessary at a later time to provide additional resources for this bill to enable the United States to meet new challenges and maintain our leadership around the world. If that does not happen, I would have to urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' at some later date in order to sustain a presidential veto.

And another issue of contention is the Smith amendment. If the Smith amendment passes, and the Mexico City language is included in this legislation, I would then oppose the bill and urge my colleagues to do so also.

The bill now contains only $100 million of the $1.4 billion requested to support the Wye River Accords. I would expect these funds to be included at a later stage in the process also when needed to implement the accords. There is also a need to address additional resources for other needs, such as support for the peace implementation efforts in and around Kosovo, and for meeting U.S. commitments on debt restructuring to poor countries.

This is a very high priority for many of us in the Congress. The bill is, therefore, in my view, a work in progress. If additional resources are not forthcoming at a later time, I will be urging those who support this bill at this time to oppose it.

The total recommendation of $12.625 billion is almost $2 billion below the President's request and is $715 million below last year's spending level for foreign assistance. The programs in the bill that are most severely underfunded include the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union; the International Development Association, IDA, which does so much to assist the poorest of the poor in Africa and other places in the world; AID's operating expenses; Debt Restructuring; the Global Environmental facility; and the Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, and Demining account.

On the positive side, the bill includes $680 million for the Child Survival and Diseases Program fund, known by us affectionately within the committee as the Callahan Account, which will enable the expenditure of $145 million to combat HIV/AIDS, as well as fund increased efforts against tuberculosis and other childhood diseases, such as measles and malaria. Of course, we would like to be doing more, and that is why we want the funding levels up.

In addition, the bill includes $30 million for displaced children, orphans and blind children, which is an increase over last year, and I thank the chairman for that.

The bill also includes funding for vitamin deficiency programs, polio eradication, and basic education. Poll after poll, Mr. Chairman, shows that the American people support well-directed humanitarian aid programs that assist poor children and the poor countries with basic human needs.

While the bill does not contain a separate account for African development assistance, and I wish that it would, it does maintain last year's funding level for Africa. Maintaining last year's level is not a victory, but at least it did not get cut, as other programs have; and I would hope that as we go forward with the bill we will have an increase for Africa. The total, of all accounts, the bill provides $1.6 billion in assistance to Africa.

With respect to the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union, the bill contains $725 million. This is far too low, well below last year's level, and $307 million below the President's request. This means serious cuts in the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative and cuts to emerging republics, such as Armenia and Georgia, and reductions in programs that support small businesses, exchanges, and regional initiatives, which are also designed to develop a new generation of pro-reform leaders and institutional partnerships.

Mr. Chairman, the cut to AID's operating expenses will scale back necessary security improvements. The cuts in the nonproliferation account will limit new initiatives for anti-terrorism, export controls, and demining.

I mention all these, Mr. Chairman, so that our colleagues will know what the impact is of the underfunding of this bill.

It provides only $50 million of the $143 million for the Global Environmental Facility. In addition, the cuts in the Development Assistance account will mean cuts to bilateral and environmental programs.

The bill includes only $33 million of the $120 million requested for debt restructuring, and prohibits funding for the trust fund for the Highly Indebted Poor Countries, HIPC. This request was made before the recent historic agreement among the G–7 in Cologne, Germany, which has broad support from governments, multilateral institutions, and religious groups. Granting generous debt restructuring to the world's poorest countries, as called for in these new agreements, will be the most significant poverty alleviation action we can take in a generation. The amounts currently in the bill do not even put us on the playing field.

I would hope that we could get it to a level where we could honor the Jubilee 2000 initiative goal of debt forgiveness in the months ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I have been pointing out some of the deficiencies and some of the pluses in the bill. In the interest of time, I will submit the rest of my statement for the RECORD and just close by saying that this House takes pride in providing ample resources to the defense bill to protect our national security. The importance of an engaged foreign policy with the resources to back it up also protects our national security.

In that interest, Mr. Chairman, I did want to just take a moment to acknowledge the tragedy of the plane that went down in Colombia and ask for just a moment of recognition for those brave young men who lost their lives. I respect their dedication to a dangerous task and would ask the House to take a moment to acknowledge their ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. Chairman, President Kennedy said in his inaugural address in 1961, and everybody in America knows this quote, President Kennedy said, ''My fellow Americans, ask not what our country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.'' But everybody does not know that the very next sentence, the very next sentence the President said, and I was there to hear him when I was a college student in Washington, D.C., the very next sentence is, ''My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what we can do working together for the freedom of man.''

Mr. Chairman, that is what we do in this bill and, hopefully, what we do in this Congress is to reach out to help promote the freedom of man throughout the world. This embodies what the bill is about or should be about.

My colleagues, we have an obligation to move forward together to provide for a robust foreign assistance program that enhances our national security. This bill is a start and it should be supported, of course, unless the Smith amendment succeeds. However, we have a long way to go before the end of the year to finish the job.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the gentlewoman from California regarding her opening comments, and I would just say to her that I thank her very much for her very gracious comments. If I did not know better, Mr. Chairman, I would swear she was from Alabama, she is so gracious.

The gentlewoman pointed out many of the good aspects of the bill. She noted a couple of things she did not agree with, but primarily they revolve around the fact that we cut President's Clinton's request by $2 billion. I would remind the gentlewoman from California that we have to live within budget constraints, and that President Clinton wants to bust the budget. He can send such a message up here when we finish the appropriations process, but we are trying to save Social Security, we are trying to make sure Medicare is adequately funded, and we are trying to maintain a balanced budget at the same time. And I think to come from the original $10.4 billion to the $12.6 billion, where we are today, is right in the middle of compromise, which is what this body is all about.

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

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I am not from Alabama, Mr. Chairman, but if I were, I know my colleague's fellow Alabamans would love to hear me say that we are not spending enough money on foreign policy, and we certainly want to prevent another Kosovo and prevent spending billions of dollars, and we want to save lives instead of spending money on defense.

This is about our national security. And, also, we do not need a tax cut.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3¼ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), who is a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me this time and for his excellent work in developing this bill. He and his staff have worked very hard to meet the numerous concerns of many Members, including this Member.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is the first time in my 19-year tenure in Congress where I have not sought to amend the foreign operations bill at any point in the process. Since the gentleman from Alabama took over the helm of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, he and his staff have shown great patience in addressing my concerns, and I truly appreciate this.

I am pleased with the language of this bill and report supporting the furtherance of the peace process among Armenia, Nagorno-Karabagh and Azerbaijan. I remain, however, deeply disappointed in the administration's role in furthering this peace process.

I also support the committee's recommendation of $15 million for Cyprus and the condemnation of the remarks made by the leader of the Turkish Cypriots.

I am also very pleased with the committee's continued assistance on limiting Guatemala and Indonesia to expanded IMET as well as the committee's attention and support of environmental and women's issues within the development assistance account.

□ 1700

Finally, and I will expand on each of these areas in the remarks I submit for the RECORD, I strongly support the committee's funding for aid to Israel. We are at a critical and, hopefully, promising point in the Middle East peace process. I am hopeful that we will ultimately be able to fund the Wye agreement and support Prime Minister Barak as he actively works toward implementing this agreement and making new agreements in the peace process.

However, while I support these items and others in the bill, I remain concerned about the overall funding level. The United States continues to enjoy the strongest economy ever, and yet the money we spend on foreign assistance continues to shrink. We are the strongest, most economically productive Nation on Earth; and yet we are shunning leadership in promoting and supporting the values we cherish most: democracy, human rights, and the rule of law and free markets in other parts of the world.

Continuing to reduce our support for foreign assistance activities, in my judgment, not only wastes previous U.S. investment but effectively pulls the rug out from under nongovernmental organizations that have worked for years to build trust and to promote important programs in the developing world that have saved lives and improved countless lives.

If we want to encourage others to respect human rights, protect their environment, and promote democracy, we must be engaged. Among bilateral donor countries, the U.S. provides among the least in foreign assistance in comparison to gross domestic product. This, in my judgment, is deplorable and only shows ignorance towards the increasing impact that the rest of the world has on health and productivity in the United States.

I hope that that trend can be reversed as we plan our leadership role in the world for the next century.

Again, on the whole, I support this bill and the excellent work of my colleague from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN). He was presented with a very difficult task and has succeeded in rising to the challenge.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for his excellent work in developing this bill. He and his staff have worked very hard to meet the numerous concerns of many Members, including this Member.

I think that this is the first time, in my nineteen-year tenure in Congress, where I have not sought to amend the Foreign Operations bill at any point in the process. Since the Gentleman from Alabama took over the helm of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, he and his staff have shown great patience in addressing my concerns and I truly appreciate this.

In particular, I am pleased with language in this Bill and Report supporting the furtherance of the peace process among Armenia, Nagorno-Karabagh and Azerbaijan. Although it appeared that forward movement of process was at a standstill earlier in the year, limited talks have resumed among the parties and I hold out hope for a peace agreement.

I remain extremely disappointed in the Administration's role in furthering this peace process. As indicated in the Committee's Report, I am appalled that the State Department would transfer their Special Negotiator to another desk without announcing a replacement. As Presidents Kocharian and Aliyev hopefully continue discussions, I hope that the U.S. will do everything possible to facilitate a lasting peace.

I also support the Committee's recommendation of fifteen million dollars for Cyprus and condemnation of the remarks made by leader of the Turkish Cypriots. This is another serious conflict that Turkey must recognize and the U.S. should work to facilitate peace on this island.

I am also very pleased with the Committee's continued insistence on limiting Guatemala and Indonesia to expanded-IMET as well as the Committee's attention and support of environmental and women's issues within the development assistance account.

Finally, I strongly support the Committee's funding for aid to Israel. We are at a critical and hopefully promising point in the Middle East peace process. It is imperative that the U.S. continue to support the peace process and remain solid in its support of the parties. I am hopeful that we will ultimately be able to fund the Wye Agreement and support Prime Minister Barak as he actively works towards implementing this agreement.

However, while I support these and other items in this bill, I remain very concerned about the overall funding level. The United States continues to enjoy the strongest economy ever, yet the money we spend on foreign assistance continues to shrink.

Throughout the history of our country, we have waged wars and defended other nations to protect the values we cherish: democracy, human rights, the rule of law and free markets. Now, we have arrived at the point of being the strongest, most economically productive nation on Earth—and we are shunning

leadership in promoting and supporting our values in other parts of the world.

Some may argue that the U.S. has already invested enough in the developing world, especially now, after the conflict in Kosovo. That is just the point. We have already invested a great deal which should not be squandered at this critical time.

The extensive network of international and community-based non-governmental organizations that utilize funds from the U.S. Agency for International Development have finally established roots and are making great progress in improving the lives of millions.

Continuing to reduce our support for these activities will not only waste previous U.S. investment but effectively pull the rug out from under organizations that have worked for years to build trust and promote important programs in the developing world. If we want to encourage others to respect human rights, protect their environment and promote democracy, we must be engaged.

Among bilateral donor countries, the U.S. provides among the least in foreign assistance in comparison to GDP. This is deplorable and only show ignorance towards the increasing impact that the rest of the world has on the health and productivity of the United States. I hope that this trend can be reversed as we plan our leadership role in the world for the next century.

Again, on the whole, I support this bill and the excellent work for my colleague from Alabama. He was presented with a very difficult task and has succeeded in rising to the challenge.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the leader on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2606.

I want to commend both our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for the hard work they have put into crafting this bill. I believe they have done the best they could with a very bad situation.

Very simply, the allocation handed down to our subcommittee by the leadership was just too low. In fact, when we started this process, our allocation was only $10.3 billion, about $3.4 billion lower than last year's enacted level.

The members of our committee, Republican and Democrat alike, made very clear that a foreign aid bill with that low an allocation was just not sufficient. And today we are working with a number that is a full 20 percent higher than the original allocation. In fact, it is $100 million higher than the foreign aid bill that passed the House last year. But by no means does that make this a great bill. It is still woefully underfunded.

I just want to highlight a few of the bill's biggest problems that I hope we can address in conference. During full committee markup of this bill, the leadership pushed through a $200 million cut in IDA, the arm of the World Bank that provides loans to the poorest of the poor around the world.

IDA, which is now funded at $226 million below the administration's requested level, provides the World Bank's lending on primary health care, basic education, and microcredit, and a number of other critical development programs.

The International Organizations and Programs account, which includes funding for the United Nations Development Program, is $25 million below the administration's request. At this level, UNDP could not hope to be funded at anywhere near the $100 million it received last year.

Underfunding UNDP threatens U.S. leadership in this critical organization and hurts UNDP's efforts to address some of the world's development issues around the world.

This bill does not include the Wye River Agreement aid package. This aid package is a critical component of advancing the Middle East peace process and preventing violence in the region.

We all have such high hopes for Prime Minister Barak's ability to jump-start the peace process that it would be foolish of us to turn our backs on the commitments we made at Wye.

I think it is very clear that the bill does need some serious work. But it is important, my colleagues, to pass it today, send it to conference; and there we can fix what we believe is wrong.

I fully expect that we shall increase the level of funding for the full range of our important foreign assistance programs, and I will fight hard with my colleagues for the Wye aid package and ensure that there are no killer restrictions on our international family planning programs.

If these problems are not fixed before the final version of the bill is sent to the White House, the President will veto it; and we are very concerned that all the good things in this bill will not become a reality.

So, my colleagues, for now the right thing to do is to vote for this bill, move the process along, and let us hope that we can correct these inequities which I have mentioned in the conference and pass a really good bill.

Again, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gracious gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for her comments.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) who is an outstanding member of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2606, the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill for foreign operations, export financing, and related agencies.

As a member of this subcommittee, I want to commend my good friend from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) for all of his hard work. Shepherding this kind of a bill, an appropriations bill at that, through this process is not easy. Yet this man has done it, I think, with diligence and impartiality. That speaks highly of the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN).

I also want to extend congratulatory thanks to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, who, along with the entire subcommittee and the staff, has helped to bring about a bill that has been crafted, I think, to do the best for this country.

As members of this subcommittee, we have all worked in a bipartisan fashion to craft this foreign operations bill that reflects our Nation's international priorities while adhering to the budget constraints that we face today.

In addition to addressing the need in such areas as child survival and international narcotic control, this bill focuses funding on our most important foreign aid priorities and maintains the integrity of our vital national security needs.

This bill again highlights congressional concern over North Korea and the dangerous activities of this rogue nation. Despite the 1994 Agreed Framework and North Korea's commitment to end its nuclear program, Pyongyang remains determined to develop weapons of mass destruction and the delivery systems that threaten ourselves and our allies.

In fact, even the administration acknowledges that next month North Korea is planning to test a missile capable of reaching U.S. territory. If this test proves successful, it will be the first time in our history that a rogue nation will have the capability to deliver a warhead within U.S. borders.

The risk to the United States inherent in this capability is unacceptable, and this bill takes strong action to address it.

The 1994 Agreed Framework with North Korea, I believe, has failed, leaving Americans less secure today than they were 5 years ago. We are now forced to face the dangerous consequences of North Korea's broken commitments. Before another dime of U.S. taxpayer money is spent on this flawed agreement, North Korea must live up to its end of the bargain.

The U.S. must send a strong signal by conditioning any aid to North Korea on real and verifiable proof that it has ended its dangerous ballistic missile and nuclear programs.

The bill also maintains the U.S. commitment to the Middle East peace process, as has been noted, and our long-standing ally, Israel. It provides resources for the resettlement of former Soviet, East European and other refugees in Israel. This refugee resettlement program provides initial food, clothing, and shelter to Jewish migrants fleeing from areas of distress.

I am proud of the role that Congress has taken to provide those in need with the means to begin a new life in Israel.

In addition, while U.S. support for peace in the Middle East is reaffirmed, the bill contains a historic effort to eliminate the region's long-standing reliance on U.S. economic aid.

I would also like to highlight provisions of this bill that deal with the ongoing conflict in the Caucasus. Unfortunately, many Americans do not know the history of this small, troubled region of the former Soviet Union; but this conflict will continue to have a direct impact on the interest of both its neighboring countries and the United States.

I am proud to have worked with the subcommittee to craft a productive, positive approach that will facilitate the peace process in the Caucasus and reinforce the U.S. role as an unbiased mediator in the peace process.

Despite the lack of broad recognition, each of us has a vested interest in the outcome of the Caucasus. U.S. interest can best be served through swift and meaningful resolution to the conflicts plaguing this troubled region. And that is precisely the approach that this bill takes.

By pursuing meaningful, confidence-building measures between Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Nagorno Karabagh and also keeping the administration fully engaged in this part of the world, we may finally see this region free of bloodshed and conflict and rich with prosperity and opportunity.

The subject of foreign aid often sparks heated debate on this floor. While we all have strong opinions about a number of programs, I would ask my colleagues not to let heated discussions about details keep us from the business at hand. We need to unite behind this fair bill that will maintain U.S. leadership and strengthen our influence across the globe.

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

Again, I want to thank the chairman, the staff, the ranking member for all of the effort they have made in an extraordinary fashion.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of the subcommittee.

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I want to first start off thanking the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and his staff for working with us in a bipartisan way. And a special thanks to my ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who has certainly shown her leadership and allowed me to participate in the process adequately.

This bill before us today, this foreign operations bill, I am told sometimes takes a day and a half and hours to complete. As my first year on this subcommittee, I found that working with the chairman and ranking member and working with the two sides to be quite enjoyable as well as educational.

While I support the bill and have in committee, I always said that it was underfunded. And we said that from our side of the aisle. I say to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), although we respect his hard work, we believe it is underfunded.

The gentleman from Illinois (Chairman PORTER) in his earlier remarks stated that this country still provides less foreign aid around the world than any of the other developed GA countries in the world. We can do better.

But I want to commend our chairman and ranking member for increasing our appropriations to Africa for the first time, a continent with over 750 million people who are in dire need.

Some of the poorest of the poorest countries, as said by Mr. Wolfensohn earlier this week as we had breakfast with him, President of the World Bank, debt relief, yes, they need it. But it is not a panacea. What they need is education and health services and other kinds of attention paid to their country so that their people and their children can come up into the 21st century.

It is important that as we move this foreign operations bill forward we let everyone know that, yes, it is a good bill and it was worked on bipartisanly, but it does still need more funding.

We are very concerned about the $200 million that was cut from full appropriations from the IDA account, which again is money that goes to the poorest of the poorest nations so that those children and those nations can be educated, can have the health services that they need.

We are concerned about the Smith amendment that will be coming up this afternoon. It is unfair. We hope that it will not be attached to this wonderful bill that we have worked out to date.

HIV–AIDS, a curse as we move to the 21 century, devastating the African continent today, India tomorrow, the U.S., and countries around this world. Will we do our part as American citizens, the finest country in the world, to provide the assistance, the education, the treatment, the research that we know to get rid of this dreaded disease?

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his leadership and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for her concern and her leadership as we work in a bipartisan way.

This Congress can work on good legislation bipartisanly when we work together and commit to doing that. Thanks to the staffs. Thanks to our ranking member.

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gracious gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) for her comments and I tell my colleagues that it has been a pleasure working with a Member of Congress who has grasped this complicated system of legislation that we have here in the United States Congress in a very short period of time, never forsaking her principles, but at the same time understanding and working toward bipartisan agreement on every issue that she can.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the efforts of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs for especially operations, and his staff and the members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations for their efforts in drawing attention to the critical economic situation affecting our friends in the Balkans.

Most of us are proud of the cooperation and joint efforts we have made to provide funding and support for the regional programs that aid those most in need. The economic challenges facing that region have only been exacerbated by recent events in Kosovo.

□ 1715

As the NATO forces continue their efforts to stabilize the peace in Kosovo, it is also imperative to look beyond the end of the conflict. We need to work to find programs that will help restore the economic foundation of these nations and, more importantly, to help restore the economic foundation that will enable the refugees to rebuild their lives.

Permit me to draw my colleagues' attention to a particular effort that has demonstrated great potential to help restore the economic foundation to these front-line Balkan states.

The Rochester Institute of Technology started a program 2 years ago called the American College of Management and Technology. Located in Dubrovnik, Croatia, this college has enjoyed great success in introducing new training and educational opportunities for the residents of the front-line states in tourism and management.

The program has been at capacity since it began. It focuses on a cooperative work experience that places students with world renowned organizations. This cooperative experience objective is to facilitate the infusion into the workforce of people who are educated in American economic values and work ethic, and through them speed the shift to contemporary entrepreneurial practices and, in turn, enhance the economic growth of the region.

Building upon the successes in their program, the ACMT has plans to expand the program to provide support to young refugees from Albania, Kosovo, Montenegro and Macedonia, thereby giving them a brighter future and the

ability to help rebuild their homeland states. I would like to commend the college for its efforts in establishing that program. It truly merits Federal support.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, to comment on this fine program.

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

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I thank the gentleman from New York for his kind words. I would encourage USAID to review proposals to fund a Federal partnership with the college that would allow for the expansion of this program to address some of the training needs of the refugees from Kosovo, Montenegro and Macedonia.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for his support of this initiative. I would hope that in conference with the Senate on the fiscal year 2000 bill, we would carefully review their proposal for a $2.5 million program that would help the economic recovery of this region.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the chairman of the Committee on International Relations that I will do the best I can to bring this proposal to the attention of AID.

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his assurances and support.

Mr. Chairman, I am also pleased to note in this bill that there is full funding of the administration's request for international narcotics control, and in particular the report language supporting the badly needed supply plane for the dedicated Colombian National Police antidrug unit so that they can maximize the use of the Black Hawk utility helicopters soon to be delivered to them.

I also note that the committee is critical of the intelligence service in Peru in the INL account, but it should be noted that little if any money has gone to that particular entity in their fight against drugs. It would be a mistake to overlook the fact that Peru in the last few years has reduced coca production by nearly 60 percent to end their long-held world leadership in coca production.

With regard to narcotics eradication, I note that the Senate bill has follow-on funding for the mycoherbicide drug eradication initiative that I believe holds a long-term potential to save billions of dollars and thousands of lives. I hope that in conference we will support the $10 million provided by the Senate for that program in fiscal year 2000.

Again, I want to commend the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs for their outstanding work on this measure.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

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

I rise in a moment of passion, passion for the greatest aid that this country gives countries in need all over the world, and that is the passion I have for the United States Peace Corps.

Peace Corps volunteers serve at the invitation of host countries. Guess what? Countries want more Peace Corps. About 6,000 volunteers are currently serving in about 80 countries.

Last year, in this country, 150,000 U.S. citizens inquired about whether they could serve in the United States Peace Corps. For my friends on the other side of the aisle who are supply siders, this is very simple. The demand is there and the supply is there. What stands between that demand and that supply is the budget of the United States Congress and how much we will appropriate to the Peace Corps. Guess what? What we have appropriated is not enough.

I thank the chairman of the subcommittee. The gentleman from Alabama is a good listener. He is producing a good bill, it is a work in progress, and we are going to make it better. He has done a better job than our colleagues in the other house.

I just got out of a cab in D.C. I came from a Peace Corps good-bye to the director, Mark Gearan. The cab driver said, ''I'm in the United States because I had two teachers in Ethiopia, Peace Corps volunteers. The gift I'm going to give back is my son who is an American citizen who is going to serve in the Peace Corps.''

On behalf of returning Peace Corps volunteers who are now Members of Congress, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) and myself, we ask that you try to add more, at least what the Peace Corps asked for and what they need.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to commend the gentleman for his comments and for his hard work, especially in Central America, and also commend Mark Gearan who is retiring as the head of the Peace Corps. I think Director Gearan has done an outstanding job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL).

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. Let me echo my comments on the fine work the gentleman from Alabama has done on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for a counterdrug initiative that would be funded through the State Department Bureau of International Law Enforcement Affairs. This initiative uses naturally occurring mycoherbicides to eradicate illicit drug crops at their source. It was supported in the Senate Foreign Operations bill. I know that the gentleman from Alabama is familiar with this program.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Yes, I am.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mycoherbicides are safe and they do not kill other crops as do the chemicals that are currently being used in countries in Latin America. I ask that the gentleman from Alabama take into account the positive impact this initiative will have on the environment as well as our war on drugs as he considers this issue in conference.

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

Mr. HILL of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Yes, I am aware of the potential of this program to fight narcotics. As the gentleman knows, with my support Congress provided $10 million for this purpose in the emergency supplemental bill earlier this year. I am hopeful that the State Department will soon obligate those funds so that this important research can be undertaken expeditiously.

Mr. HILL of Montana. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a distinguished member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and other members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations for the bipartisan, collegial spirit evident during our hearings and the subcommittee markup. As a new member of the subcommittee, I feel privileged to have worked with such a fine group of members.

We all know this is a very difficult budget year and I am grateful to the gentleman from Alabama for his even-handed approach to drafting the Foreign Operations bill. Although I would have liked to see additional funding to be provided for Africa in the bill, at the very least funding for Africa was maintained at a freeze. Many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree that for us to maintain our position as a global leader, we must continue to lead the world in assisting those countries that need the most help.

I am concerned, however, about three particular areas of this bill, the Development Fund for Africa in the Development Assistance section of the bill; the Africa Development Bank; and the Africa Development Fund. I am most disappointed that the bill does not fulfill the administration's and my request to reinstate the Development Fund for Africa as a separate line item as it was several years ago. Many nations on the

continent of Africa are making unprecedented progress toward democratic rule and open markets and with the Development Fund for Africa included as a separate account, funding would be assured to remain focused on the long-term problems and development priorities of our African partners.

Although there have been numerous concerns in the past about management of the Africa Development Bank, I know that strides have been made. I feel it is unwise to completely zero out funding for the bank at this time when they are working diligently to address the management problems.

I am encouraged that the Africa Development Fund received a level allocation from last year. However, the Africa Development Fund helps the poorest of the poor countries, and I had hoped that the committee would have provided a higher number.

I cannot stress enough how much I have enjoyed working this year on this Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs and I look forward to future work with my colleagues as we address the problems and concerns of the developing world.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for his outstanding job and the gentlewoman from California, and I want to encourage all of my colleagues in light of these amendments to follow the gentlewoman from California on these votes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the bill. I thank the gentleman from Alabama and the gentlewoman from California for their diligence and their efforts on our behalf.

I have an amendment which would withhold funding for the introduction of our Armed Forces into hostile situations unless the situation represents a clear threat to our strategic national interest. This amendment reflects the foreign policy that successfully guided our Nation through the Cold War. Based on a set of six firm principles, this policy was designed by President Reagan's Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger. The rule today does not allow me to offer this amendment, but I will ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

Just 1 month ago, Air Force Chief of Chief General Michael Ryan explained to Congress that while the Air Force could meet our Nation's emergency needs, its short-term operations tempo had to be greatly reduced. This is one of many reports of degradation in our force's readiness that are common because of the widening gap between our Nation's global security obligations and the resources provided to meet these obligations. Every Member in this body knows that under this administration, we are increasingly asking our men and women to do more with less.

Fortunately, this Congress recognized that our forces are stretched to the limit and are on the brink of exhaustion. We recently took the much needed step of increasing our budget to address the services' long list of critical unfunded requirements. We must also review and scale down an American foreign policy which is increasingly expansive.

There is no doubt that the United States is the anchor for the world's democracies. We proudly accept this responsibility and seek to promote the American ideal of freedom in every corner of the world. Unfortunately over the past decade, fulfilling our security obligations has become confused with a policy of policing the world. It is not the responsibility of the United States and her forces, nor should it be, to extinguish every political flare-up around the globe.

This administration continues its attempts to reduce our force structure, it increases our military's operational tempo and involvement around the world. Over the past 8 years, our forces have endured a rate of deployment never before experienced in our Nation's history. Our men and women in uniform have been called to arms for ''operational events'' no less than 26 times since 1991 as compared to 10 times in the previous 30 years. The number of missions is almost countless. From Somalia to Haiti, Rwanda to Bosnia and most recently Kosovo, this administration has placed American men and women in harm's way without a defined objective. This fly-by-the-seat-of-our-pants form of diplomacy is extremely dangerous, particularly when the lives of Americans are at stake.

Secretary Weinberger wisely taught this Nation that American idealism does not always reflect our national security. While we seek to undermine political oppression and overthrow political tyranny, we cannot, in every instance, commit American force. We simply do not have the resources and, quite frankly, it is not our place. This policy is also counterproductive because it discourages our allies and others from paying their share and playing their part.

Secretary Weinberger provided us a model that would prevent seemingly reckless military deployments. I believe it should be dusted off and used again by this administration and administrations to come. The Weinberger Doctrine calls for the engagement of our forces only: In defense of our own vital interests; with a clear intention of winning; with defined objectives; with continual reassessment of the conditions and our goals; with the overwhelming support of the American people and the Congress; and as a last resort.

To many Americans this may seem elementary. In fact, most Americans believe these six premises compose the guiding principles that underscore our current foreign policy. As all of us know, this is unfortunately not the case.

Mr. Chairman, I will not offer the amendment today, but I am committed to returning the Weinberger Doctrine to American foreign policy, and I intend to offer it in the future. I encourage all of my colleagues to review this doctrine, support it, and would urge the administration to adopt it.

Mr. Chairman, I include the amendment I would have offered, as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 2606, AS REPORTED

OFFERED BY MR. HAYES OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 116, after line 5, insert the following:

ADHERENCE TO A CONSISTENT POLICY WITH RESPECT TO THE INTRODUCTION OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES INTO HOSTILE SITUATIONS

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for the introduction of United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances unless such introduction meets the following requirements:

(1) The introduction of Armed Forces adheres to the ''Weinberger Doctrine'', the philosophy of former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, which states—

(A) such introduction of Armed Forces should take place only if the vital national interests of the United States are in jeopardy;

(B) the commitment to introduce the Armed Forces should be framed around clearly defined political and military objectives;

(C) prior to such introduction of Armed Forces, there should exist a reasonable assurance that the President will have the support of the people of the United States and their elected representative in Congress for such introduction;

(D) such introduction of Armed Forces should be a last resort;

(E) such introduction of Armed Forces should be done wholeheartedly and in a manner by which the Armed Forces have an overwhelming superiority so that a swift victory is virtually certain; and

(F) the President should continually reassess and, if necessary, readjust the commitment to introduce the Armed Forces if conditions and objectives invariably change after such introduction; and

(2) The President, after the mission of the Armed Forces has been defined and the Armed Forces have been introduced, allows senior general officers of the Armed Forces to carry out the mission in an unhindered manner.

□ 1730

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), a new Member to Congress, but a great champion for our country.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding this time to me and appreciate her kind words.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill we should be supporting international family planning and opposing efforts to gag or block international family planning because those efforts will surely lead to more unintended pregnancies. Accordingly, I rise to oppose the Smith

amendment and to support the Greenwood-Lowey amendment.

The amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) would gag foreign nongovernmental organizations in the private actions they take as private organizations to spend private money to pursue their goals. The amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is unnecessary, at least as it affects United States money, which is already prohibited from these uses, as Greenwood-Lowey would continue.

It is wrong to stifle public debate in this way. It is micromanagement. The real target is family planning.

The amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) would make it harder to conduct family planning, to avoid unintended pregnancies. It is a mistake; it should be opposed. Greenwood-Lowey should be supported.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his important statement, and I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to take this opportunity to express my strong support for the Seeds of Peace International Camp, located in my congressional district and its related programs. This innovative program takes Arab and Israeli teenagers from the Middle East to a small camp in rural Maine to teach them communication teamwork, conflict resolution skills. Since it opened in 1993, more than a thousand young people have graduated, and 400 more will be completing the program this summer. I have been to this camp and met with these children, and I can unequivocally say that this camp deserves this body's full support. The cultural connections and friendships forged in Maine will last a lifetime.

Seeds of Peace is a small but growing force of hope amidst the hatred and despair that has for all too long mired relations between the nations of the Middle East. While the current peace process is critically important to achieving peace in the region, Seeds of Peace will create an environment that will sustain a lasting peace because it will mend differences in fostering understanding where it counts most, between individuals.

I am pleased that, year by year, this innovative and desperately needed program is gaining political and financial support. I strongly support public funding for the International camp and its other programs as they are clearly one of the best uses of our foreign aid dollars. I am pleased with the report language contained in this bill supporting this program.

I thank Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI for their support of this program which gives these future leaders the tools they need to forge a lasting peace in the Middle East. Thank you.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for the purpose of engaging in colloquy with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN). I want to take a moment to raise the issue of American prisoners being held overseas.

I want to commend the chairman for including language in this report that required the Secretary of State to report on whether American citizens have not been able to receive fair trials in Ecuador as well as the evaluation of whether foreign assistance to Ecuador has an impact on the lawfulness of the Ecuador justice system.

As the gentleman is aware, Mr. Chairman, I have visited Ecuador three times in the past 2 years, and the disregard for fair or even speedy trials have become a crisis in this country. I am very disturbed that many people, especially Americans, are asked to pay bribes to ensure innocent finding. One American in particular, Mr. Jim Williams of Jacksonville Beach, has had very little chance at justice since he was imprisoned almost 3 years ago. His family have struggled to help Mr. Williams get a fair trial, but they have faced a maze of corruption in addition to unreliable policy and a justice system that does not function.

This is a very complicated problem that affects many Americans in Ecuador. However, a big part of the solution involves the United States. I hope this report will help our government understand the limitations of the Ecuador justice system as well as the far-reaching impact of our drug policy on countries like Ecuador. With limited resources and corruption in judiciary, I look forward to learning the results of this study and thank my colleague for its inclusion in this report.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for her concern about Mr. Williams' plight in Ecuador, and I certainly share her concerns. We have expressed our discontent with the administration's handling of the Williams case. I have met with the Williams family. We need a quick, fair judicial resolve, to this issue; and I certainly will support the gentlewoman in any endeavor that we can undertake to make certain that this gentleman receives a fair trial in an expeditious manner.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

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

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the gentlewoman that the gentleman from Alabama has been attentive to this issue. Indeed, we visited Ecuador and spoke to the authorities there, the U.S. counsel there, about this subject. So when the gentleman says he is looking into it, as my colleagues know, indeed he is.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to recognize and address the continued contributions made by the Republic of Croatia. Croatia emerged from years of oppressive Communist control in 1991 and approved a new constitution and elected a parliament. Croatia's modern parliamentary democracy is charged with guaranteeing fundamental human rights, freedom of expression and respect for private property. Croatia has also been a loyal and valuable ally of the United States, as we have recently witnessed during the Kosovo crisis. Having a reliable partner in the strategic and volatile region of southeastern Europe can only help to prevent future crises and aggression.

Croatia deserves commendation for its clear desire to stand with the United States and the West, as evidenced by its support of U.S.-NATO policy in the Balkans including S–4 and Operation Allied Force.

People, few people, realize how helpful Croatia was during NATO's Operation Allied Force. Croatia closed its oil pipelines to Yugoslavia, which was later recognized as a key element in Milosevic's decision to surrender. Croatia opened its airspace and its ports for NATO's unrestricted use. Croatia also emerged as one of the most vocal advocates for stability in southeastern Europe during the negotiations and on the newly launched stability pact for that region.

Croatia meets all the requirements for partnership for peace especially regarding defense related cooperation, perhaps even more so than some of its current members. Croatia should be evaluated for membership in the partnership for peace at the earliest possible opportunity. I believe that the United States should work closely with Croatia to ensure that every opportunity is provided.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), a member of the Committee on International Relations and a champion on human rights throughout the world.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from California for yielding me this time.

First, I would like to just say that the chairman and the ranking member and the entire Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs have done an incredible job of trying to put together an equitable bill under really outrageous conditions where they have been told that they have a funding limit which constitutes a $2 billion reduction over the administration's request; a $700 million reduction over this year's appropriated level; and many, many billions of dollars in reductions over what funding levels were several years ago. So, I have no argument with the bill that they have presented, given the cards that they were dealt.

I am here to urge support for the bill and an aye vote on final passage, but I do have to say that two things could make me change my mind if the bill came back from conference committee: one, with inadequate funding levels, without some relief from the conditions under which the Committee on International Relations were required to put this bill; and, secondly, were the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) to be adopted.

In either one of those cases, I would think that at conference when the bill comes back from conference we should take a second look at this question, and my hope is that the administration, working with the appropriators, will deal with some of the critical shortfalls that do exist in this bill.

And at the same time I have to say the bill fully funds the Camp David countries, Israel and Egypt; it provides a partial funding for Jordan under the Wye request. It is our understanding that the Wye request and the appropriations which I consider critically important will be dealt with at the time of the conference committees, whether they come from the 150 or the 050 account; but somewhere in the context of all of this, before this Congress leaves this year, we think it is very important that that should be funded. The increase in funding for child survival programs even in the context of the severe limitations is badly needed; the same with UNICEF.

So I think there is a lot of important provisions in this bill. There are a lot of deficiencies. The gentlewoman from California has touched on a number of them. I would like to see more money in the refugee and migration assistance account, Peace Corps is underfunded, a number of other provisions; but I will not belabor that at this point.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. As my colleagues know, I think the gentleman from California is a super individual and I have expressed that to him on many occasions. But let me remind my colleague the only way we can balance the budget, the only way we can save Medicare, the only way we can save Social Security is to cut back on spending, and that also means foreign affairs, foreign aid.

So I appreciate the gentleman's philosophy.

Mr. BERMAN. Reclaiming my time, I say to the gentleman from Alabama I think he is super too, but I have to say if America is going to maintain its leadership in the world, a number of things have to happen. If we are going to continue to try and promote democracy and respect for human rights and development of human potential around the world, we have to put resources into this. I do not believe for a second that funding the foreign assistance at the level the administration has requested will in any way hurt our ability to continue to balance our budget, save Social Security, reform Medicare, and do the other things we need to do. This is small potatoes in the context of the whole budget, and let me just add one thing.

The problem is we get ourselves into a cycle. Originally, the Committee on Foreign Operations was given an incredibly low allocation of $10.4 billion. The chairman with his valiant efforts, I assume, all of a sudden that level was $12.6 billion. That is much better, but our colleagues keep lowering, dashing our expectation so much.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. First of all we cannot resolve this issue over whether or not an additional increase in foreign aid would jeopardize Social Security and Medicare. We just want to make certain it does not. But I will be happy to sit down one evening with the gentleman for as much as 3 or 4 hours to discuss this issue as to whether or not foreign aid ought to be increased even at the expense of jeopardizing Social Security and Medicare. I think it would make an interesting conversation, and I would invite the gentleman to sit down with me one evening in the near future for several hours to discuss this issue.

Mr. BERMAN. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's offer. I plan to take him up on it. We can go either way in terms of this conversation.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her tremendous efforts on behalf of all the peoples of the world. She really does do a great job serving as ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations, and let me just say I have appreciation for everything that I have heard today about the bipartisan efforts, and I understand the limitations that my colleagues were working within.

□ 1745

However, that does not ease my pain nor satisfies my criticism of what is not happening for Africa.

This bill completely eliminates funding for the highly indebted poor countries, the initiative that provides debt relief to countries that desperately need it. The governments of heavily indebted poor countries have been forced to make drastic cuts in basic services such as health and education in order to make payments on their debts. This administration requested $120 million. This bill allocates $33 million and zero for PIP pick.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I am working to improve the HIPC initiative. I have introduced H.R. 2232, the Debt Relief and Development in Africa Act of 1999. This bill would relieve the debts of sub-Saharan African countries and target the savings from debt relief to HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, health care, education and poverty reduction programs. I am also a cosponsor of H.R. 1095, the Debt Relief for Poverty Reduction Act of 1999 which would expand the HIPC initiative.

Also, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill also cuts funding for the African Development Fund which provides low-interest loans to poor countries in Africa and completely eliminates funding for the African Development Bank, which provides market-rate loans to qualifying African countries.

Furthermore, the bill cuts refugee assistance by $266 million below this year's budget. Well, I guess if we take out the money for Kosovo, we cut it by $20 million below this year's level. There are 6 million refugees and internally displaced people in Africa today. Sadako Ogata, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, is complaining.

So if I was the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), I would be happy because Israel and Egypt got its funding. Africa still lags far behind, and every year I must get up and do this until Africa is treated fairly.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks and for her leadership on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services on all of the issues relating to debt relief and AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to applaud the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her tireless work against the scourge of HIV/AIDS, a disease which has not only plagued and crippled American society but the global community as well. Nearly 33 million people worldwide are infected with HIV/AIDS. Ninety percent of them live in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. However, 90 percent of the resources spent on prevention and care are devoted to people in industrialized countries. The funding provided in this bill is just a drop in the bucket compared

to the funding needed to address this deadly crisis developing in these countries.

I am encouraged that the committee has provided $141 million for international HIV prevention and care, a $20 million increase over last year's funding level. As such, I hope that in the future, we will make an even stronger commitment to this fight.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 3 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time to close.

I want to thank all of the Members of the House who have spoken on this bill that we have worked so hard on. I am so pleased with the interest in the bill. Our differences are largely not partisan on this bill, and we have very few differences today, except for the funding level.

I wanted to take just a moment to talk about that because my distinguished chairman keeps bringing up the subject of Medicare and Social Security, and I want to point out to our colleagues that this bill is about, as we have heard, about $12.8 billion, $12.6.5 billion. That is about less than 1 percent of our national budget. And if we take out what we have in there for export finance and trade financing and guarantees, then it is even less than that, because that is not foreign assistance, that is assistance to the U.S. manufacturers.

So we have a very, very tiny percentage of our national budget which we use to prevent war, to prevent the spread of disease, to prevent environmental disasters. To me, it is a small price to pay. Indeed, as our Chairman has said, it is the least we can do. In fact, we should do much more.

We are the lowest of all of the industrialized countries, the lowest in relationship to our GDP in assistance, bilateral assistance to other countries. That is not what the American people want. And there is not going to be any saving of Social Security or risking of Medicare or Social Security because we spend a little bit more money preventing more disease and environmental disasters. Indeed, those are investments which will save money in the end.

Mr. Chairman, we are a great country. The world looks to us for leadership. Certainly, the developing world does. We can prevent many problems that we know are predictable. We are not making them up; we know they are preventable if we invest wisely.

Once again, I want to return to what President Kennedy said: My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America can do for you, but what we can do working together for the freedom of men. Imagine the possibilities if we could invest in microlending and in debt forgiveness in a manner that is appropriate to our capacity and our leadership role in the world. Imagine if we could cooperate with the countries of Africa as they emerge into democracies.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a good investment. I think the American people want us to do it, and I point out it is less than 1 percent of our entire budget, a good investment for peace and security in the world.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill if it does not have the Smith amendment in it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

I will close by saying that the basic argument that I have heard tonight is not over the contents of the bill, but for the lack of money that some think ought to be included therein.

I might say that the opponents on that argument make good points, that maybe it is not enough money. But in my opinion, it is enough money, and I do not think it is going to be detrimental to me at all to go back and explain to my constituents that I was the one who proposed a bill to cut foreign aid. I apologize to the President if he wants $2 billion more. He is not going to get it.

So yes, this vote tonight, finally, on the passage of this bill, Mr. Chairman, is a vote to cut foreign aid, if we want to cut it, well then vote ''yes.''

If one does not want to cut it and one thinks it ought to be more, then vote ''no.''

But the real question in this bill is whether or not we are going to cut the President's request, whether or not we are going to cut last year's appropriation, whether or not we are going to preserve this money to pay for Social Security needs, for Medicare needs, for other areas such as tax reduction, or even balancing the budget and paying off the debt. That is what the final passage of this bill is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I would recommend to my colleagues that they will have an easy explanation when they go back to their districts and people ask them, when SONNY CALLAHAN brought a bill to the floor of the House to cut foreign aid, how did you vote, I should think all Members of Congress would want to say, I voted for the Callahan bill.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, the National Conference of Black Mayors, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors held their annual conventions in Denver and New Orleans, respectively. At these conventions, over 100 mayors from around the country signed a petition calling on EPA to provide utility energy providers with maximum flexibility and lead time necessary to avoid higher energy costs to municipalities and local communities, including industrial and residential consumers.

Mr. Chairman, as you are aware, EPA finalized a rulemaking last year which forced states, including Michigan, to submit State Implementation Plans (SIP's) that meet mandated reductions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) emissions. One element of the rule would force local utilities to control NO_X emissions at unprecedented levels. The reductions are of a magnitude that will require capital intensive technology with likely significant pass-through costs to energy consumers, including citizens, municipalities, and local communities. As rural and urban communities seek investment to spur economic growth, the shadow of higher energy costs could have significant adverse effects on brownfields redevelopment and rural/urban revitalization generally. Further, these higher costs will erode the benefits of lower energy costs realized from deregulation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the EPA compliance deadlines are so stringent that electric utilities could be forced to shut down generating plants to install the necessary control equipment within a very short time. This could result in temporary disruptions of electricity supply.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Court of Appeals, just this past month, issued a stay of the EPA NO_X SIP call pending the agency's appeal of the court's decision to strike down EPA's National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for fine particulate matter (PM 2.5). The future of the agency's NO_X SIP call is uncertain. Nonetheless, the mayors' petition represents a common-sense plea to EPA that, should the agency move forward, that it do so in a way that allows for compliance in the most cost-effective manner possible.

I insert the petition in its entirety, along with the names and cities of supporting mayors to be inserted in the RECORD.

PETITION—EPA OZONE TRANSPORT NO_X SIP CALL

As part of its Ozone Transport initiative, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has finalized a rulemaking forcing States to submit Implementation Plans (SIPs) to meet mandated reductions of oxides of nitrogen (NO_X) emissions in the Agency's effort to control inter-state ozone transport impacts. The rule focuses on 22 mid-eastern States, with the likelihood that EPA will expand the application of the rule to several additional States.

Several States have joined in litigation challenging the EPA rule on grounds that it is contrary to congressional intent, an abuse of Agency discretion and disregards traditional Federal/State relationships. EPA has even taken the unprecedented step of threatening to impose its own Federal Implementation Plan (FIP) in the absence of acceptable State action. Several additional States are considering whether to file an amicus brief in support of the Complaint. The U.S. Court of Appeals recently stayed EPA's NO_X SIP Call pending appeal of the Court's decision setting aside EPA's new Ozone and Particulate Matter standard.

One element of the rule would force local utilities to control NO_X emissions at levels unprecedented to date. The reductions are of a magnitude that will require capital intensive technology with likely significant pass-through costs to energy consumers. The unavoidable consequence will be higher energy costs to municipalities and local communities, including industrial and residential consumers alike. As rural and urban communities seek investment to spur economic growth, the shadow of higher energy costs could have significant adverse effects on Brownfields redevelopment and rural/urban revitalization generally.

The EPA compliance deadlines are so stringent that electric utilities could be forced to shut down generating plants to install the necessary control equipment within a very short time. This could result in a temporary disruption of electricity supply.

Significant NO_X emissions reductions will continue to be realized under existing mobile and stationary control programs as the

Clean Air Act continues to be implemented thus minimizing the need, if any, for such potentially disruptive requirements as called for in the EPA NO_X rule. This is especially true for local areas in the mid-east that are dealing effectively with ozone compliance challenges. Any new control programs, before being implemented, must be weighed against the potential adverse implications for local rural and urban communities.

Accordingly, by our signatures below, we collectively call on EPA to reconsider the NO_X rule in light of these concerns. In light of the Court's stay of the NO_X SIP Call, at a minimum, we urge EPA to provide maximum flexibility to and address lead-time needs of utility energy providers so as to minimize potential adverse economic consequences to local rural and urban communities. Further, we call on EPA to restore balance and cooperation between states and EPA so that States can comply with the rule while protecting their rights to determine the best methods of doing so.

Finally, we direct that copies of this Petition be provided to the President, the Vice President, Members of Congress, Governors and other local officials as are appropriate.

STATE, CITY, AND MAYOR

Alabama

Moses—Walter S. Hill

Arkansas

North Little Rock—Patrick H. Hayes
Marianna—Robert Taylor
Sunset—James Wilburn

California

Alameda—Ralph J. Appezzato
Fairfield—George Pettygrove
Fresno—Jim Patterson
Inglewood—Rosevelt F. Dorn
Modesto—Richard A. Lang
Turlock—Dr. Curt Andre
Westminster—Frank G. Fry

Florida

Eatonville—Anthony Grant
Gretna—Anthony Baker
North Lauderdale—Jack Brady
South Bay—Clarence Anthony
Tamarac—Joe Schrieber
Titusville—Larry D. Bartley

Georgia

Augusta—Bob Young
Dawson—Robert Albritten
East Point—Patsy Jo Hilliard
Savannah—Floyd Adams, Jr.
Stone Mountian—Chuck Burris

Guam

Santa Nita—Joe C. Wesky
Yigo—Robert S. Lizama

Illinois

Brooklyn—Ruby Cook
Carol Stream—Ross Ferraro
Centreville—Riley L. Owens III
DeKalb—Bessie Chronopoulos
East St. Louis—Gordon Bush
Evanston—Lorraine H. Morton
Glendale Heights—J. Ben Fajardo
Lincolnwood—Madeleine Grant
Robbins—Irene H. Brodie
Rockford—Charles E. Box
Sun River Terrace—Casey Wade, Jr.

Indiana

Carmel—Jim Brainard
Fort Wayne—Paul Helmke

Louisiana

Boyce—Julius Patrick, Jr.
Chataignier—Herman Malveaux
Cullen—Bobby R. Washington
Jeanerette—James Alexander, Sr.
Napoleonville—Darrell Jupiter, Sr.
New Orleans—Marc Morial
St. Gabriel—George L. Grace
White Castle—Maurice Brown

Maine

Lewiston—Kaileigh A. Tara

Maryland

Seat Pleasant—Eugene F. Kennedy

Massachusetts

Leominster—Dean J. Mazzarella
Taunton—Robert G. Nunes

Michigan

Detroit—Dennis Archer
Garden City—James L. Barker
Inkster—Edward Bevins
Muskegon Heights—Robert Warren
Taylor—Gregory E. Pitoniak

Minnesota

Rochester—Charles J. Canfield
Saint Paul—Nori Coleman

Mississippi

Fayette—Roger W. King
Glendora—Johnny Thomas
Laurel—Susan Boone Vincent
Marks—Dwight F. Barfield
Pace—Robert Le Flore
Shelby—Erick Holmes
Tutwiler—Robert Grayson
Winstonville—Milton Tutwiler

Missouri

Kinlock—Bernard L. Turner, Sr.

Nebraska

Omaha—Hal Daub

New Jersey

Chesilhurst—Arland Poindexter
Hope—Timothy C. McDonough
Newark—Sharpe James
Orange—Muis Herchet

New York

Hempstead—James A. Garner
Rochester—William A. Johnson, Jr.
White Plains—Joseph Delfino

North Carolina

Charlotte—Pat McCrory
Durham—Nicholas J. Tennyson
Greenevers—Alfred Dixon

North Dakota

Fargo—Bruce W. Furness

Ohio

Columbus—Greg Lashutka
Lyndhurst—Leonard M. Creary
Middleburg Heights—Gary W. Starr

Oklahoma

Muskogee—Jim Bushnell
Oklahoma City—Kirk D. Humphrey
Tatums—Cecil Jones

Oregon

Tualatin—Lou Ogden

Rhode Island

Providence—V. A. Cianci, Jr.

South Carolina

Andrews—Lovith Anderson, Sr.
Greenwood—Floyd Nicholson

Tennessee

Germantown—Sharon Goldsworthy
Knoxville—Victor Ashe

Texas

Ames—John White
Arlington—Alzie Odom
Beaumont—David Moore
Bedford—Richard D. Hurt
Euless—Mary Lib Salem
Hurst—Bill Souder
Hutchens—Mary Washington
Kendleton—Carolyn Jones
Kyle—James Adkins
North Richland Hills—Charles Scoma
Port Arthur—Oscar G. Ortiz
Waxahachee—James Beatty

Virginia

Portsmouth—Dr. James W. Holley III

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI for their work in crafting this important appropriations bill. Given the limited resources available to them, I think they should be commended for their work in bringing this bill forward.

I will support this bill but grudgingly, because I believe the reductions it makes in foreign aid are too deep. And I believe we should be asking other parts of the federal budget to share the burden we are placing on this bill.

But instead, we are increasing spending in other areas, and asking foreign aid to pick up the slack. We are asking this budget to bend further and further, and I'm here to say: this budget can't bend any further.

Mr. Chairman, as a fiscal conservative and a senior member of the Budget Committee, my number one priority in Congress has been to get our financial house in order. In past years, I have supported reductions in our foreign aid budget because it was consistent with our overall efforts to reduce federal spending and eliminate 30 years of deficit spending. We were trying to rein in spending in every other portion of the budget, and the foreign operations bill took a hit like everything else.

But I rise today to say that we have picked on the foreign aid budget too much and for too long. I believe every area must play a part in our effort to control the growth of federal spending. But even as we increase spending on agriculture, defense, and other appropriations bills, we are once again decreasing funding for foreign aid. And, I, for one, do not understand why that is.

This year's agriculture appropriations bill increased discretionary spending from $13.69 billion to $13.94 billion. This year's defense appropriations bill increased spending from $250.5 billion to $266.1 billion. And this year's transportation appropriations bill increased spending from $47.2 to $50.7 billion. Yet, we are decreasing foreign aid spending from $13.4 billion to $12.6 billion.

As a former Peace Corps volunteer, I can attest to the difference foreign assistance makes in the lives of people around the world, and the important role it plays in enhancing international trade and helping maintain national security.

I know it is easy and most often popular to vote to cut foreign aid. But the simple fact is, this bill's $12.6 billion in foreign assistance represents just 0.7 percent of the federal budget. That is what we are debating here today.

Foreign aid is used to promote health, nutrition, agriculture, education, and other noble goals. Foreign aid is truly one of our nation's greatest international investments. It's not a handout; our aid is intended to help the poorest nations rise up and become self-sufficient, so they will no longer require our assistance.

I support this bill, but hope we end this destructive trend of reducing foreign aid budgets.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the Chairman, Mr. CALLAHAN, for including in this legislation the report language regarding the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation described below.

This legislation provides $48,000,000 for the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation including $8,000,000 for cooperatives. This fund enables United States cooperatives and credit unions to share their self-help business approaches with developing and market transition countries. Congressman BEREUTER and I recently sent a letter to the United States

Agency for International Development (USAID) supporting this important office and its funding for US cooperatives.

In addition, the Committee notes that in Central America, US cooperatives in countries hard-hit by Hurricanes George and Mitch. The Committee encourages USAID to fully utilize the expertise of U.S. and indigenous cooperatives in this region, especially in the expansion of cash crops such as coffee and sesame.

U.S. cooperatives have been working overseas for more than three decades. They are at work in the villages of Africa, Asia, and Latin America. In Central and Eastern Europe, they are helping to achieve a free market, democratic way of life—one that cooperatives and uniquely to help other achieve.

Cooperatives have the advantage of keeping economic benefits within a community. Profit is not siphoned off by outside interests, because the co-op's members are its owners, and the co-op exists to fill a need in a community that is not being met to other businesses.

Electric and telephone co-ops meet rural consumers' needs for power and telecommunications not satisfied by private businesses. Farm co-ops help in the production and marketing of commodities. Housing co-ops give low-income people the opportunity to own their own homes. Cooperative insurance protects individuals and small businesses from risk. Credit unions serve people of limited income not reached by commercial banks, and extend credit to micro entrepreneurs who otherwise might not be able to secure funding.

Cooperatives promote democracy by allowing members to jointly own their business. They share capital, elect a board of directors, and receive the benefits of ownership through better service and patronage refunds based on use. Co-ops teach people how to resolve problems democratically. Many individuals who received their education in democracy from cooperatives have gone on to become political leaders in their nations. In emerging democracies, co-ops help throw off the shackles of a non-market economy. Their members develop the skills of entrepreneurship and learn market values.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my appreciation to Mr. CALLAHAN for including this critical language in the legislation before us.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2606, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for FY 2000. I'd like to thank Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Subcommittee for including $13 million in funding for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act expands President Bush's Enterprise for the Americas Initiative—EAI—and provides a creative market-oriented approach to protect the world's most threatened tropical forests on a sustained basis. The bill was overwhelmingly approved by the House last March by a vote of 356 to 61, passed the Senate under unanimous consent and was signed into law on July 29, 1998 as P.L. 105–214.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act is a cost-effective way to respond to the global crisis in tropical forests, and the groups that have the most experience preserving tropical forests—including the Nature Conservancy, World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International and others—agree. The Administration is strongly in support of this effort as well. It is an excellent example of the kind of bipartisan approach we should have on environmental issues.

I commend Chairman CALLAHAN, Ranking Member PELOSI, and the members of the Subcommittee for providing the necessary funds to begin to implement this legislation that preserves and protects important tropical forests worldwide in a fiscally responsible fashion.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the debt restructuring section of the Foreign Operations appropriations bill. This is $87 million less than the President's request, and $41 million less than the FY 1999 level. This bill does not provide the proposed $50 million U.S. contribution to the Highly Indebted Poor Countries Initiative Trust Fund.

There are 41 countries in Africa, Latin America and Asia that are so heavily indebted that they can barely function. The people there suffer from malnutrition, illiteracy, and lack of health care. Many of these debts were incurred in the 70's when we encouraged them to borrow heavily. Recession in the 70's dropped the price of oil, mineral and agricultural products; interest rose. These countries will remain in a vicious, losing cycle of perennial indebtedness just paying off interest unless we essentially allow them to file for bankruptcy and to rebuild their economies. These countries desperately need debt relief.

Jubilee, an impressive coalition of churches from around the world, together with food assistance groups, have worked to call the world's attention to the extreme situation in these heavily indebted poor countries and have asked that the U.S. recognize the crippling effect that paying interest has on these countries.

Additionally, HIV/AIDS stalks Africa. Thirty million people in the world are infected with HIV/AIDS—the vast majority live in these heavily indebted countries. While nearly every region of the world has been affected by the pandemic, Sub-Saharan Africa has been ravaged by the disease, suffering 11.5 million deaths since the epidemic emerged, with a projected 22.5 million more in the next ten years. In some countries, 30% of all working adults now have AIDS or carry the virus.

Debt relief is essential. I ask my colleagues to vote against this appropriations bill.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to lend my strong support for the FY 2000 Foreign Operations spending package.

Mr. Chairman, everyone in this chamber knows that funding America's overseas commitments is not one of the most popular things we do in this body. With tight federal budgets, people back home often ask whey we spend this money, and many people do not realize that this appropriations package is one of the smallest this Congress will consider out of the 13 bills. That being said, I would like to praise the work of Chairman CALLAHAN and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee for bringing to the floor a commonsense package that stretches the taxpayers money and continues the Republican Congress' commitment to slowing foreign assistance.

One of the areas I am very concerned about in this bill deals with America's strongest and most reliable ally in the Middle East, Israel. H.R. 2606 proposes $960 million in economic aid to our friend in the Middle East. Mr. Chairman this is almost $120 million less than the FY 99 level which leaves me with some concern, but nonetheless, this is important funding to help insure stability in Israel's economy, and this approach by the committee will eventually lead us down the glidepath of a phase-out of economic assistance.

H.R. 2606 also helps to provide for the security of Israel. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for a $60 million increase over FY 99 for military assistance to a total of $1.92 billion. While I am pleased to hear that the new Israeli leadership is eager to step up efforts in the peace process, it is clear that we cannot have peace in the Middle East without a strong and secure Israel. These funds for Israel are especially important when the United States is still concerned and engaged with threats by Iraq, Libya, Syria, Iran and international terrorists in the region. Chemical and biological weapons have already been used in the region, and several enemies or terrorist groups in the region are waiting for the opportunity to disrupt the peace process or commit outright acts of aggression towards Israel. These funds will reduce that threat for our ally and for American interests in the Middle East and around the world.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsible bill that meets our overseas commitments and ensures that America's allies are engaged as active partners in U.S. foreign policy. I thank the Chairman for his attention to the needs of our friends in Israel, and I ask that members support this measure.

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.

Before consideration of any other amendment, it shall be in order to consider the amendments printed in part A of House Report 106–269. Those amendments may be considered only in the order printed in the report. The amendment printed in part B of the report may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill.

Each amendment printed in the report may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to amendment.

During consideration of the bill for further 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 Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part A of House Report 106–269.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS THAT PERFORM OR PROMOTE ABORTION

SEC. . (a) Section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) RESTRICTION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS THAT PERFORM OR ACTIVELY PROMOTE ABORTIONS.—

''(1) PERFORMACNE OF ABORTIONS.—(A) Notwithstanding section 614 of this Act or any other provision of law, no funds appropriated for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available for any foreign private, nongovernmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, perform abortions in any foreign country, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the pregnancy were carried to term or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

''(B) Subparagraph (A) may not be construed to apply to the treatment of injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortions or to assistance provided directly to the government of a country.

''(2) LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—(A) Notwithstanding section 614 of this Act or any other provision of law, no funds appropriated for population planning activities or other population assistance may be made available or any foreign private, non-governmental, or multilateral organization until the organization certifies that it will not, during the period for which the funds are made available, violate the laws of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, or engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated or prohibited.

''(B) Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

''(3) APPLICATION TO FOREIGN ORGANIZATIONS.—The prohibitions of this subsection apply to funds made available to a foreign organization either directly or as a subcontractor or subgrantee, and the certifications required by paragraphs (1) and

(2) apply to activities in which the organization engages either directly or through a subcontractor or subgrantee.''.

(b) The President may waive the provisions of section 104(h)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (relating to population assistance to foreign organizations that perform abortions in foreign countries), as added by subsection (a), for any fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Does the gentlewoman from California seek to control the time in opposition?

Ms. PELOSI. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman, and I ask unanimous consent to yield 5 minutes of that 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) will control 5 minutes of the time in opposition.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this on behalf of myself, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA); the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK); the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN); the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS); the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR); and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

Let me begin by telling Members what this is not about. The amendment before us is not about family planning funding. The bill before us provides up to $385 million for international family planning programs. If the amendment passes, this amount will remain exactly the same, $385 million for family planning. The amendment does not cut that amount by one penny.

Second, the vote on this amendment is not about some of the cartoon illustrations that have been conjured up in some of the faxes and fliers being put out by pro-abortion organizations. This amendment already has a track record. It is substantially identical to the antilobbying provision of the Mexico City Policy, which governed all U.S. foreign family planning programs from 1984 until 1993.

During those 9 years, the antilobbying provision was interpreted according to a rule of reason. We gave population assistance to literally hundreds of organizations during those 9 years, and we never cut off funding to a single organization because an officer of the organization gave a speech. Not even once. In fact, during the whole 9 years, only 2 organizations were ever denied Federal funding under the Mexico City Policy, and it was because they themselves refused to agree not to perform or actively promote abortion except to save the mother's life or in cases of rape or incest.

That is what this vote is really all about. The question is simple: Do we want our chosen representatives in foreign countries to do family planning and only family planning, or do we want them working overtime trying to topple pro-life laws in those countries?

Mr. Chairman, in over 100 countries around the world, the lives of unborn children are still protected by law. But in country after country, we find that the biggest U.S. population grantees are also the most prominent advocates—sometimes the only prominent advocates—of legalizing abortion on demand.

Mr. Chairman, the abortion promoters never tire of reminding us that they promote abortion with what they call ''their own money,'' but this argument deliberately misses the point.

First, it ignores the fact that all money is fungible. When we pay an organization millions of dollars, we cannot help but enrich and empower all of that organization's activities, all that they do, even if the organization keeps a set of books that says it uses its money for one thing and our money for something else.

Even more important, this argument totally ignores what it means to be an agent of the United States in a foreign country. When we choose our representatives abroad, we have a right, and I would submit we have a duty, to ensure that certain minimum standards are met.

I would just point out to my colleagues that overwhelming numbers of Americans support the rights of unborn children, and we do not want our agents acting in such a way as to promote something that we find so offensive, the killing of unborn children on demand.

Mr. Chairman, if the United States decided—and I just say this as an example—to give a grant for an antismoking campaign directed at children in a developing country, it might decide not to give the grant to a tobacco company that also planned to run pro-smoking advertisements in that same country, even if the company promised to use its own money for the cigarette ads.

Mr. Chairman, it is exactly the same way with abortion and family planning. If the reason we fund family planning programs in a foreign country is really to provide contraceptives and counseling in order to reduce the number of abortions in the country, then we are well within our rights if we choose not to run the program through an organization that is also working hard to increase the availability of abortion in that same country. Everyone has a right of freedom of speech, but nobody has an absolute and unconditional right to represent the U.S. overseas or to receive multimillion dollar subsidies in exchange for that representation.

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

□ 1800

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the assistant minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. It is a death sentence for thousands of women and children worldwide.

This debate is not about abortion. Under current law, not one penny of U.S. funds can be used for abortion. This debate is about improving the health of women and children and saving lives.

Each year around the world 600,000 women die in childbirth. Access to family planning in the developing world would reduce unintended pregnancies by 20 percent, thus reducing abortions, saving the lives of more than 120,000 women who would die in childbirth every year.

U.S. family planning aid saves the lives of children. It allows families to choose how many children they want and when they will have them. Improved birth spacing can improve the chances of infant and child survival by 20 percent.

If this amendment passes, millions of desperately needed funds now dedicated to family planning would be diverted. More mothers, infants, and children will die. I desperately urge my colleagues to oppose this wrongheaded amendment.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the SMITH amendment. As was just said, every day around the world 1,600 women die in post-partum hemorrhaging. They bleed to death. That is 585,000 women every year. It is a holocaust. Many of these women leave behind orphaned children. These women die because they become pregnant when they are too young, too old, too weak, or too soon after their last pregnancies.

Every day thousands more infants and children die because they are born into families who cannot afford to feed them or to provide medical care for them.

For the past 30 years the developed nations of the world have worked together to stem this awful tide of premature deaths. The program was initiated in 1969 by President Nixon.

International family planning has brought reproductive health care to poor, underdeveloped communities across the globe, and where they have, the death toll has plummeted. It is a good, wise, compassionate, and enlightened program.

But the SMITH amendment threatens that program. It threatens those women and those children. It does so because the reality is no matter how hard local agencies try to provide family planning services to women around the world, some women will become pregnant when they cannot bear another child, and they will seek abortions.

The SMITH amendment says to these medical clinics, if you provide that abortion, we will take away your contraceptive funds. That is exactly, precisely, and frankly the opposite of what is needed. Where women seek abortions, we should promote contraception, not take it away. The SMITH amendment ironically will increase, not decrease, abortions, and it will undermine our international effort to stem the tide of infant and child mortality.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished whip of the majority party.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Smith-Barcia amendment. Under no circumstances, under no circumstances should American taxpayers underwrite pro-abortion activities in foreign countries. Today an increasing number of Americans are growing weary of the abortion on demand policy in our land. There is a growing sense that this practice has hardened our hearts and torn the very moral fabric of this great Nation in two.

After almost three decades, American attitudes towards abortion are becoming less permissive. In fact, a recent survey for the Center for Gender Equality showed that 53 percent of American women believe that abortion should be illegal under all circumstances, or allowed only in cases of rape, incest, and the life of the mother. That is up 8 percent from only 2 years ago.

During this time, when American views on abortion are changing so drastically, it should not be the policy of the United States to undermine abortion laws in other countries. Over the last 6 years, the U.S. Government has provided over $3 billion of taxpayer money to population control organizations overseas. Many of these groups are the largest abortion providers and promoters in the world.

This amendment does not cut population control funding to these organizations by one cent, even though many of us would like to do so. This amendment simply prohibits American aid from going to groups that violate existing foreign abortion laws, or lobby to change the laws in approximately 100 countries that currently restrict that practice.

Mr. Chairman, in a Nation founded on freedom, we must continue to trumpet the reality that all of our rights add up to nothing if we do not protect the most important of them all, the right to be born. While we are struggling with this truth at home, we definitely should not be undermining abortion laws abroad.

I just urge my colleagues to support the Smith-Barcia amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment to the foreign operations bill.

Over the last 40 years, the world's population has doubled, and at the rate we are going it will double again by the year 2050. The number of people on Earth will increase by 78 million a year. It is 156 congressional districts. Think of that.

We must ask ourselves, if we continue to grow at this pace, who will be taking care of these children? What will happen to them? The answer is that they will face water shortages, famines, global warming, infant mortality, and political and economic instability. Supporting family planning services gives the children of the world a chance for the quality of life that we want for our very own children; a quality of life, by the way, that is threatened equally when the population of our globe expands to the extent that it is anticipated.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood compromise and in opposition to the Smith amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Greenwood compromise represents a new bipartisan consensus on family planning. I will note that the Greenwood amendment has a requirement that the Smith amendment lacks. The Greenwood amendment requires recipients to certify that their programs will reduce the incidence of abortion. We know from our experience in Central Asia that family planning reduces unintended pregnancies and abortion.

We all want fewer abortions and we want family planning. The Greenwood compromise is the way to get there. I urge Members to join with CARE, the American Association of University Women, and the League of Conservation Voters who have endorsed the Greenwood compromise.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I intend to vote for the gentleman's amendment.

I want to point out to my colleagues that on page 8 of this bill, it says that none of the funds made available under this heading may be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning, or to motivate or encourage any person in the practice of abortions.

I just wanted to make the bill's position clear on abortion.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the very distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment and in strong support of the Greenwood-Lowey compromise amendment.

The proponents of the Mexico City policy claim it simply cuts abortion funding. What they do not tell us is that abortion funding overseas has been prohibited since 1973, as our chairman has said. This amendment would cut abortion funding from its current level of zero to zero.

What this amendment will really do is destroy our international family planning programs. One of the most important forms of aid that we provide to other countries is family planning assistance. No one can deny that the need for family planning services in developing countries is urgent.

The aid we provide is both valuable and worthwhile. The Smith amendment would defund family planning organizations that perform legal abortions with their own money, and it would also impose a gag rule on nongovernmental organizations and multilateral organizations that provide U.S.-supported family planning aid overseas.

The Greenwood substitute specifically and carefully addresses my colleagues' concerns, so please vote for the Greenwood substitute.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment restricting international family planning funding.

The Smith amendment is at odds with our tradition of free speech. It would impose a gag rule with respect to a single issue. It would deny women and family planning organizations the fundamental right to lobby for redress of grievances, and it holds foreign nongovernmental organizations to a standard which we could not and hopefully would not impose on U.S. organizations or on American women.

The Smith amendment would preclude USAID from working with many organizations that provide effective voluntary family planning and women's health services, and often in places where women have few alternatives. The result would be an increase in unintended pregnancies, maternal and infant deaths, and unsafe abortions.

I repeat that family planning reduces abortions. The Greenwood-Pelosi amendment would prevent abortion funding, require adherence to the laws of the country in which the NGOs operate, and deny funding of abortion as a means of family planning. So I would ask this body strongly to vote ''no'' on Smith, ''yes'' on Greenwood.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

(Mr. RYUN of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to offer my support for the Smith amendment, and ask that my colleagues vote for the Foreign Families Protection Amendment.

Mr. Chairman, until its removal in 1993 by President Clinton, the Mexico City Policy prevented foreign organizations from using American tax dollars to perform or encourage the termination of a child's life through abortion. Since 1993, over three billion American taxpayer dollars have been given to international population control groups. Many of these organizations provide and promote abortions, considering abortions a reasonable and convenient means to achieve their objective.

That is why I support the Foreign Families Protection Amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. The amendment renews the Mexico City Policy that was in effect from 1984 to 1992. The Amendment will also prohibit funds from being given to organizations which lobby to change abortion laws in other countries.

In keeping with my responsibility to uphold the Constitution, I cannot agree to lend U.S. financial support to organizations in other countries that seek to deny others their inalienable right to life. I would urge my colleagues to search their consciences and protect the rights of unborn children who have no voice to speak for themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a ''yes'' vote on the Foreign Families Protection Amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¾ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, the Mexico City Smith amendment has changed drastically over the years. All it does now is it prevents subsidizing lobbying activities in foreign countries. It is called the Foreign Families Protection Amendment.

As millions of U.S. taxpayer dollars flow to developing nations for the purpose of population control, it is critical that we refrain from paternalistically injecting our own penchant for abortions into these Nations. With the degree that we in this Nation disagree on the subject of abortion, it is not, at the very least, appropriate that we refrain from providing U.S. taxpayer funds to organizations that lobby for abortions overseas.

Where are the multiculturalists now who suggest that we respect developing cultures when their beliefs do not agree with ours? Apparently, if these beliefs are not pro-abortion, that creed holds no meaning.

Mr. Chairman, United States taxpayers who hold such conflicting views on abortion should absolutely not be forced to subsidize those lobbying activities. Support the Smith amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am very, very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), a leader on issues of family planning throughout the world and a champion of poor women and poor families.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her leadership and for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Smith amendment, which if it should pass, would be surely vetoed by the President, as he has vetoed it in the past. It has no chance of becoming law.

If Members support additional restrictions on family planning, they should support the bipartisan Greenwood compromise, because it has the possibility of actually becoming law.

□ 1815

The Smith amendment is unnecessary because U.S. law, the Helms amendment of 1973, already prohibits the use of United States funds to either perform abortion or to lobby for or against abortion rights. The real target is and always has been family planning services and those organizations most qualified to deliver them.

The Smith amendment's ban on speech is nothing more than a gag rule that will punish foreign organizations for engaging in public policy debate, for petitioning their government, for being involved in the democratic process, rights that would be protected under the First Amendment in our country.

The Smith amendment is constitutional solely because it applies only to foreigners outside of the United States.

Instead, I ask my colleagues to join me and many others in a compromise. Instead of telling other countries what they can and cannot do, let us respect other countries' laws. In the Greenwood compromise, these countries would be disqualified, any foreign nongovernmental organization, from being eligible for U.S. population assistance if it provides abortions in violation of that country's laws.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the unnecessary, because it is already law, the anti-family planning, and the undemocratic Smith amendment, and to support the Greenwood compromise.

The CHAIRMAN. All time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has expired. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 2½ minutes remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GREENWOOD. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, who is entitled to close this debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Under this circumstance, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) would be entitled to close the debate.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), who I think of when I think of the conscience of this House.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for that very generous introduction.

Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) if he would enter into a colloquy.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Sure. I would be happy to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman's knowledge, does the United States give money to Israel?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes, it does.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Does Israel permit abortion?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Israel does permit abortions.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, would not the logic, then, of the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey, is not about fungible money, mean that we should vote to cut off all aid to Israel?

Does the gentleman not believe, then, that the logic he is putting forward to this House, namely, that all money is fungible; that if we give money for some purposes which are good, but some of the recipients which receive that money use it for other purposes, including abortion; then that premise justifies cutting off all assistance, and that that premise would lead you to cut off all aid to Israel.

I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me.

Absolutely not. As a matter of fact, we faced that back in 1984 when the Mexico City policy was first crafted, that there is only one government per country, whereas there are a multitude, a myriad of NGOs to whom we could provide money. And if a certain NGO said it wanted to promote abortion and lobby to bring down the right-to-life laws, we could find another NGO that wanted only to do family planning.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time to suggest that the logic of the gentleman from New Jersey puts him into this corner. I know the gentleman's amendment avoids it, but the logic that he presents to us is, if we give money and it is intended for a good purpose, but, since all money is fungible, if some of it ends up for abortion, then we should not give any money at all.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that there is awfully important work done by family planning. The underlying bill, the chairman's mark, does not include this language. We should not support the Smith amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the Smith amendment, and I ask my colleagues to vote for it and vote in opposition to the Greenwood amendment.

This is much clearer this year, and it is pretty straightforward. If my colleagues think taxpayer dollars should go to fund organizations that are going to try to overturn pro-life laws in foreign countries, then they do not want to vote for the Smith amendment. If my colleagues think that it is an inappropriate use of the taxpayer dollars of working Americans, vote for the Smith amendment; vote against the Greenwood amendment. It is not confusing this year. It is very straightforward.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) to close.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Smith amendment that would protect foreign countris from U.S. taxpayer dollars being used to undermine their laws on abortion.

Congress has repeatedly banned the use of taxpayer dollars to pay for abortions within our own borders, except when the life of the mother is endangered or in cases of rape or incest. This amendment continues to guarantee that American taxpayer dollars are subject to the same test when the money is used to assist foreign countries.

Money is fungible. Any organization that is involved in international family planning efforts and performs abortions and lobbies to weaken abortion laws should not receive taxpayer dollars.

The international population control groups are active and powerful. Some of the groups are actively trying to lift restrictions on abortions in over 100 countries, including Ireland, Brazil, Mexico, and Sri Lanka. We should not be funding their lobbying efforts. But if we continue to subsidize their other programs, we will be doing exactly that.

This amendment will not decrease the amount of money available for international family planning. It does not limit funding for organizations that perform abortions only in cases where the mother's life is endangered or in cases of forcible rape or incest.

The Smith amendment does not limit the ability of the staff of international population control groups from lobbying on their own time as individual citizens, but they would be limited from doing so as a representative of an organization that receives U.S. funds because these organizations are seen as our representatives.

Mr. Chairman, we need to protect our taxpayers' dollars. I urge a vote for the Smith amendment and against the Greenwood amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by Representative SMITH that would prohibit U.S. population assistance funds from being made available to foreign organizations that perform abortions. This amendment also prohibits these funds from being used to change the abortion laws of foreign countries and for any activities that violate the abortion laws of foreign countries. I believe that this amendment is tantamount to a global gag rule on abortion.

This amendment prohibits overseas nongovernment organizations ("NGOs") that receive government funds from providing education or even engaging in discussion about abortion services. The NGOs are also prohibited from lobbying the foreign government or encouraging the citizens to lobby their government with respect to abortion law and policy.

We value freedom in this country, and freedom of speech is one that we hold dear. We also value the freedom to petition our government when we disagree with certain policies. In other countries, we advocate the cause of democracy, and freedom of speech is an important component of a democratic government.

When NGOs travel to other countries with the purpose of advocating certain programs, such as family planning information, we should not support a gag rule that limits the ability of that organization from providing that information.

Family planning and reproductive health information is crucial to women in developing countries. Without this information, many women, are at risk for death due to pregnancy and childbirth. Information about abortion service simply provides these women with the option of exercising a choice for their reproductive health.

This global gag rule also prevents these organizations from providing abortion services when necessary. These organizations often use their own funds and this restriction impinges on the free speech rights of these organizations. It is unconstitutional to treat a U.S. organization in this manner.

I strongly oppose any form of a global gag rule and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. We must support efforts to increase family planning around the globe, and this amendment simply imposes a restriction on the rights of women to choose.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 228, noes 200, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

AYES—228

Aderholt	Buyer	Doolittle
Archer	Callahan	Doyle
Armey	Calvert	Dreier
Bachus	Camp	Duncan
Baker	Canady	Dunn
Ballenger	Cannon	Ehlers
Barcia	Chabot	Emerson
Barr	Chambliss	English
Barrett (NE)	Coble	Everett
Bartlett	Coburn	Ewing
Barton	Collins	Fletcher
Bateman	Combest	Foley
Bereuter	Cook	Forbes
Berry	Cooksey	Fossella
Bilirakis	Costello	Fowler
Bliley	Cox	Gallegly
Blunt	Crane	Ganske
Boehner	Crowley	Gekas
Bonilla	Cubin	Gibbons
Bonior	Cunningham	Gillmor
Bono	Danner	Goode
Borski	Deal	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	DeLay	Goodling
Bryant	DeMint	Goss
Burr	Diaz-Balart	Graham
Burton	Dickey	Granger

Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—200

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Kelly
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kuykendall
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—6

Chenoweth
Jones (OH)
McDermott
Peterson (PA)
Rahall
Skelton

□ 1842

Messrs. RODRIGUEZ, STRICKLAND and ENGEL changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think at this point it is my understanding, and the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may be able to confirm this, that the procedure is going to be that we are going to now bring up the Greenwood amendment, which has a total of 20 minutes debate, at which time we will then vote on the Greenwood amendment.

After the vote on the Greenwood amendment, we will then roll votes for at least 2 hours in order that Members will have the opportunity to go and have dinner, or to do what other business they need to do, and then return and vote on the rolled votes at approximately 9 or 9:15 p.m.

Is that the Chairman's understanding as well?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2, printed in Part A of House Report 106–269.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GREENWOOD

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Part A amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 106–269 offered by Mr. GREENWOOD:

At the end of this bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

RESTRICTION ON POPULATION PLANNING ACTIVITIES OR OTHER POPULATION ASSISTANCE

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for population planning activities or other population assistance under title II of this Act may be made available to a foreign nongovernmental organization unless the organization certifies that—

(1) it will not use such funds to promote abortion as a method of family planning or to lobby for or against abortion;

(2) it will use such funds that are made available for family planning services to reduce the incidence of abortion as a method of family planning;

(3) it will not violate the laws or policies of the foreign government relating to the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited; and

(4) it will not engage in any activity or effort in violation of applicable laws or policies of the foreign government to alter the laws or policies of such foreign government relating to the circumstances under which abortion is permitted, regulated, or prohibited, except with respect to activities in opposition to coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization.

(b) The limitation on availability of funds to a foreign nongovernmental organization under subsection (a) shall apply—

(1) to funds made available to an organization either directly or indirectly as a subcontractor or subgrantee; and

(2) to activities in which the organization engages either directly or indirectly through a subcontractor or subgrantee.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 263, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD).

□ 1845

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) seek to control the time in opposition?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 5 of those 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her to control.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, the Greenwood-Pelosi amendment, is one that all of us on both sides of the aisle can easily vote for.

Under current law, let me just reiterate, no U.S. funds are used to perform abortion. I want to repeat that. No U.S. funds can be used to perform abortion under current law or to lobby for or against abortion. We already know that.

I want to point out that the Greenwood-Pelosi amendment reiterates the ban on the use of U.S. funds to lobby on abortion and, in addition, it adds that no U.S. funds may be used to promote abortion as a method of family planning.

The Greenwood-Pelosi amendment makes clear that organizations receiving U.S. funds for family planning services must be committed to using those funds to reduce the incidence of abortion.

We all know that it has been very clear, looking at Russia and other states of the former Soviet Union, that abortion was relied on previously as a primary method of birth control. And now with the advent of contraception,

the abortion rate has plummeted 25 percent. The number has dropped by 800,000.

So I ask this body to vote for the Greenwood-Pelosi amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Greenwood amendment.

Sometimes in Congress it is hard to tell one bill from another. We just passed the Smith–Barcia foreign families protection bill. The Greenwood amendment looks very much like it.

As we wade into this, we need to recognize that this is not just another pro-choice, prolife debate. Because that is really not the issue. And the issue is not cutting funding for family planning abroad, because we certainly support family assistance abroad. The bill we have passed does not cut that.

The main issue here today is will we force American taxpayers to undermine the values of families and other countries and to try to change their laws.

Approximately 100 countries already have laws restricting abortions. These are countries like Ireland, Brazil, and Mexico.

Now, we can debate and argue about whether or not we like the way they restrict abortion. But, hopefully, all of us would agree that we should not ask American taxpayers to fund an organization that is working to change those laws when here at home we have not agreed about that issue.

That is really the crux of the issue. Because while we talk about funding, we need to understand how the Greenwood amendment would fund these activities.

The Greenwood amendment would allow our taxpayer money to go to organizations that lobby to change or undermine laws restricting abortions. The way the amendment is written, it says these funds cannot be used for those purposes. That is kind of like giving soft money to a political party and telling them not to use that to support candidates.

We are supporting the lobbying to undermine organizations abroad if we vote for the Greenwood amendment.

I have got the wording here. And so, if we need to debate it, it is constantly use funds to promote abortion while it would allow organizations to receive this funding who promote abortion and lobby against the laws.

There is a clear distinction here if we read it. And I ask my colleagues on both sides of the prolife, pro-choice issue to vote against the Greenwood amendment and allow the Smith–Barcia foreign families protection amendment to stand.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to just acknowledge the statement of the gentleman that giving this amendment to the groups is like giving soft money to a candidate.

Does that mean that he then is opposed to soft money in campaigns? I hope it does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) a distinguished leader and a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from California for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my colleague. Because the Greenwood substitute specifically and carefully addresses the concerns of my colleague about abortion without destroying our international family planning programs.

It says explicitly, no U.S. funds may be used to lobby on abortion, for or against, that no U.S. funds may be used to promote abortion as a method of family planning; and it prohibits any recipients of U.S. international family planning assistance from using U.S. or private funds to violate abortion and advocacy laws in the countries in which they operate.

In other words, if abortion is illegal in a country, an organization cannot use its own money to perform abortions. And if a country prohibits advocacy on abortion, an organization cannot use its own money to advocate on the issue. If an organization violates either of these requirements, it loses its U.S. assistance, period.

This substitute is very clear that the U.S. respects the laws of the nations in which we have family planning programs and respects the ability of those nations to enforce their laws.

I urge my colleagues to support the Greenwood substitute.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON).

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, it is not the same old debate.

First of all, remember, the Smith language has never ever become law. The Greenwood language this time includes a new requirement that the Smith language does not include. The Greenwood language requires that an organization certify that the funds will be used to reduce abortion.

I think every prolife Member of this body ought to be voting for Greenwood. It requires certification that the money will be used to reduce the incidence of abortion.

How can he do that? Well, in Central Asia, where abortion was the only method of family planning under Soviet rule, once women were given access to family planning, abortion rates plummeted, plummeted. So under this bill, if they receive this money, they will have to be willing to certify that they are going to go after those populations that have essentially no choice in family planning but abortion.

Support the Greenwood amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA).

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Chairman, we should not spend American dollars for activities that we cannot similarly spend within our own borders.

We have, as a Nation, established a policy in which we prohibit the use of Federal dollars to pay for abortions because of the value that we place on each human life. We should and must demand that any international organization receiving our dollars follow the same limitations that we impose upon ourselves.

The Smith-Barcia amendment, which this House has already passed, uses precise language to prevent taxpayer funding of organizations that engage in any activity or effort to alter the laws or governmental policies of any foreign country concerning abortion.

This amendment now before us would only serve to dilute and confuse this pro-child, pro-family statement. We should not hide behind any ''shades of meaning'' interpretations. Instead, we must be explicit about our goals.

The Smith-Barcia amendment retains the amount of funding available for international population assistance but we ensure that the money goes only to those organizations who do not perform abortion.

We know that there are some organizations which claim that they are assisting in only family planning activities, not abortions, even though the end result of what they are promoting is in fact an abortion. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Greenwood amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, the Greenwood amendment ensures that organizations receiving U.S. assistance do not use those funds to perform abortions, promote abortions, or to lobby for or against abortions.

I am baffled why my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would oppose this amendment and oppose programs which have increased childhood survival rates, reduced maternal death rates, and improved women's reproductive health in the developing world.

It is estimated there are 75 million unwanted pregnancies worldwide, mostly in developing countries. The reproductive health services we need to preserve will dramatically reduce these unwanted pregnancies by providing family planning services and will, therefore, reduce unwanted abortions.

If my colleagues really support reducing abortions and reducing unwanted pregnancies, vote ''yes'' on this amendment. If they want to eliminate family planning altogether, say so.

Do not mask it in some other argument. Just tell us that, and then we can debate on those grounds.

□ 1900

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to respond briefly.

Mr. Chairman, in the previous amendment we made very clear to all our colleagues—all of the sponsors of the amendment, and there were several—that we were not reducing family planning by one penny. Our amendment says we have got to get out of the promotion of abortion overseas. Regrettably, many of the so-called family planning organizations in some countries are the primary engine trying to topple right-to-life laws. That is cultural imperialism. It certainly puts the unborn and their mothers at risk. And as Planned Parenthood has said, and I can give Members the quote, ''When abortion laws are liberalized, the number of abortions skyrocket.'' That is their word, skyrocket. So if we want more abortions, liberalize the laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform the Committee that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) has 3 minutes remaining, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 3 minutes remaining.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right, the entitlement to close this debate?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Pennsylvania is one of the great Members here to try to work out different compromises. I commend him for that, and in many pieces of legislation we can. When we get to the issue of abortion, it is very difficult to divide a baby, particularly if you believe, as I do, that it is a human life and it is either going to be alive or dead.

For many of us, this is a very deeply held position. We believe, as my colleagues heard in the earlier debate, that this is directly fungible money, that these organizations have hidden goals to them, and while I respect very much my friend from Pennsylvania's attempt to come up with compromise language, there are just too many loopholes in this language, it is too duplicative in other parts, and I believe that it would not in fact stop international abortion funding. I do not believe in the end that we can split a baby.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Smith amendment and in support of the Greenwood-Pelosi amendment. The Greenwood-Pelosi amendment ensures that U.S. funds for family planning will continue to be made available to foreign countries and the U.S. will not interfere with the laws of those foreign countries. These provisions embrace our Nation's attempts to create healthy and prosperous communities around the world.

Family planning is a necessity, Mr. Chairman, within our country and around the world. Providing education on methodologies which may harm a woman's pregnancy, ways to avoid needing an abortion, prenatal care, and how to care for babies are all necessary components of family planning.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentlewoman from California and all of my colleagues who are here today to stand up for responsible foreign policy and making sure that the essentials of family planning are available to the women and families that need it throughout the world. I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the Greenwood-Pelosi amendment and defeating the Smith amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, because this amendment respects the laws of other countries and it respects the women of other countries.

Now that we have passed the Smith amendment, we have three choices before us: We can either outlaw sex, which is probably not going to be particularly successful, it certainly has not in the countries that we are talking about; or we can turn our back on illegal abortions and we can accept the women of Third World countries being consigned to the poverty, the desperation, the suffering, the exploitation that overpopulation entails; or we can do what the Greenwood amendment does, which is to say there is an alternative to abortion, and, that is, responsible family planning.

That is what our country has done. That is why we are successful. That is why we are a first world country, because we have been able to control overpopulation because we have been able to empower women to control their lives.

Vote for the Greenwood amendment. It is the responsible thing to do. It is the only responsible thing to do.

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

I rise in support of the Greenwood amendment. I do so for the following reasons:

Listening to the debate, I think that it is important to make a couple of points. One of our colleagues said that we should have the same limitations on the organizations overseas that we have in the United States. Indeed, if we tried to put this gag rule on any organizations in the United States, it would be unconstitutional. I think we should treat the international organizations the same way as we treat those in the United States, and, that is, with the freedom of speech.

Secondly, I am very baffled, I will join my colleague from Colorado in using the word ''baffled,'' by the comments of some of our colleagues. If indeed our colleagues agree that abortion should be permitted in case of rape, incest and life of the mother, why then would we say that there should be no conversation about this subject in case of rape, incest and life of the mother for women who need to terminate a pregnancy overseas and organizations who are striving to reduce abortions with family planning?

Mr. Chairman, if we want to reduce abortions, we know the best way is to fund family planning. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a fine alternative. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the House has just made a very strong statement in favor of women and children around the world by passing the pro-life Foreign Families Protection Act offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA), the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and myself. I believe if we stand firm now, we have a chance not only to make a statement but also to make a difference. Even though the Greenwood amendment, the pending amendment, does not alter our amendment one iota—the two would lay side by side, I do urge my colleagues not to dilute the pro-life, pro-family, pro-child message by passing the amendment now pending.

Mr. Chairman, the Greenwood amendment is an empty shell. I say that with all due respect to my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania. It has a tremendous amount of surface appeal, but that is all it has. Its supporters try to portray it somehow as a pro-life amendment.

Look at it. I have had Members come up and say, ''What's wrong with this? It looks like a right-to-life amendment.'' But I would say again with all due respect that they, the Members offering this amendment today, are the leadership of the abortion rights movement here in this Congress. They are certainly entitled to their deeply held opinions, and we can respect those opinions. But I think we should be skeptical about whether their amendment is really a pro-life amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I ever stand up on this floor and suggest to Members that

I am offering a pro-abortion amendment, I hope that my colleagues would be equally skeptical, and I hope that they would look at the fine print. I make the same strong recommendation in this case. When the leadership of the abortion rights movement say they are offering an amendment with all kinds of seemingly pro-life language in the amendment, we need to read the fine print.

The fire print says this, Mr. Chairman: There is nothing whatever in the Greenwood amendment that would alter current policy, which today provides millions of dollars to foreign nongovernmental organizations that are aggressively working to overturn the laws of other countries on abortion.

If we go back and look at history, the reason for the Mexico City policy—and we have only offered half of that policy in the previous vote, the President has a waiver for the performance part but not on the promotion part—was that the current policy was found to be so infirm. It was not doing the job. Foreign nongovernmental organizations were setting up shop in one country's capital after another and then they would network and begin trying to topple the right-to-life law. I believe that is cultural imperialism, especially when we are the major donor in many cases to those various nongovernmental organizations.

Under the Greenwood language, U.S. taxpayers would still subsidize foreign pro-abortion organizations. You just have to flip on and go through the Internet. Bring up the Irish Times. There was a piece just the other day about how the Irish Family Planning Association is going to be spearheading a big effort to undermine the pro-life laws in the Republic of Ireland. That is happening all over the world.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut pointed out earlier that this has never been law, but it was the policy under the Reagan and Bush years. We provided a maximum amount of money for family planning, we were the major donors during those years, but we had a fire wall between family planning (contraception) and abortion, believing that the latter destroys the life of an unborn child.

The language in the amendment of my good friend from Pennsylvania is actually weaker than current law, because he restricts lobbying only when it is a ''method of family planning.'' Planned Parenthood has said in their statements that there is no such thing as a birth control abortion. They would say it is a health abortion. Roe v. Wade says ''health,'' includes emotional and mental health. So we have a situation where virtually any abortion would be permitted and no lobbying would be precluded under my friend's amendment.

Again, I think it tries to look like a pro-life amendment. I looked at it and had to look at it very carefully. I do hope we will vote it down and I hope that in conference the real McCoy, not the counterfeit, will be accepted.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, my good friend, and he is my good friend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), said that he hopes that his language remains in the conference committee report. It is a false hope. It is an ardent hope, but it is a false hope. It will not and it has not, year after year, this year being no exception. It received 228 votes, but it will not remain in the conference committee and it will not become law.

So the question before us now is what will remain in the conference committee? If we adopt the Greenwood amendment, we will have some restrictions that we should all support. What are those provisions? The organizations that receive these funds have to certify, as my language does, that they will not use funds to promote abortion as a method of family planning or to lobby for or against abortion. We all support that. Every Member of this House supports that notion. It says that they will use these funds that are made available for family planning services to reduce the incidence of abortion as a method of family planning. We all, 435 of us, stand for that premise. It says that these organizations must certify that they will not engage in an activity or effort in violation of applicable laws or policies of the foreign government, or alter the laws or policies of such where pregnancy was carried to term. In the case of rape or incest, it is with that exception. And it says, the funds appropriated for family population planning activities must only be made to organizations that agree not to violate the laws of any foreign country. So why would all 435 of us not vote for something that all 435 of us believe in?

The gentleman from New Jersey said his legislation makes a statement and it does. He said it will make a difference and it will not. It will not become law. So if you want to make a difference, then you vote for what is left. It is a compromise. It is wise, it is fair, it is something in which we all believe.

And so the only reason, Mr. Chairman, to vote against this amendment is to make the statement that we are so divided by our ideology that we cannot work together and stand together on the basis of our shared intentions. That is what is left to fight about.

The gentleman from New Jersey said this language looks like it is pro-life language. It is pro-life language in the way that most Americans think of. This supports the notion that we care about the 585,000 women, mothers, sisters, daughters who hemorrhage to death because they do not have the availability of family planning. It supports the life of the tens and hundreds of thousands of children who die of starvation and for lack of medical care. That is the pro-life it is for. That is why we should all vote for it.

I urge my colleagues to get together and do the right thing.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of the Greenwood Amendment that prohibits U.S. funds from being used to promote abortion as a method of family planning. This amendment also prohibits the use of U.S. funds to lobby for or against abortions in countries where abortion is illegal. I support this amendment because it continues to support the notion of international family planning.

This amendment requires that non-governmental organizations respect the laws of foreign countries where abortion is illegal. But unlike the Smith amendment, it does not prohibit these organizations from performing abortion services when necessary.

This amendment does provide restrictions on abortion services in other countries, but the restrictions refer to governmental activities that would undermine the sovereignty of a nation to determine what laws should govern its citizens.

This amendment does not encourage a global gag rule that restricts all discussion of abortion. The funds given to these NGOs must be used to reduce the incidence of abortion as it encourages other methods of family planning.

This amendment does not discourage these organizations from using their own funds to promote education, but simply places a restriction on the use of U.S. funds.

I support this amendment because I understand that many Members are uncomfortable with the U.S. government funding abortions overseas. This amendment offers a compromise that would allow these private NGOs to use their own funds. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Greenwood/Lowey amendment. For 19 years, I have come to the floor in support of international voluntary family planning.

During this time, in spite of Congressional intransigence, international family planning programs have evolved, and in return, countless infants and mothers have been saved and their lives and the lives of their families are healthier and more productive. Family planning is not simply about providing women in the developing world with health options. It is about empowering women to take charge of their lives and in return improve the lives of their families.

I find it ironic that some Members who oppose international family planning seek to increase funding for child survival programs. If babies do not survive birth, they will never benefit from child survival programs. Further, if these children that we seek to help, are not born to healthy mothers and into a healthy family, their chances for survival are greatly reduced.

Family planning services are a standard part of other health services in the developing world because some of the greatest health crises facing these populations unfortunately, originate with the transmission of infectious diseases. HIV/AIDS infection continues to increase.

Earlier this year, AIDS became the number one killer in Africa, only eighteen years after it was first recognized.

In the past six months, HIV/AIDS has reached epidemic proportions in Russia, In

Moscow, there has been a twelvefold increase of reported cases in comparison to last year. Maternal deaths attributed to AIDS has left 8.2 million orphans across the world. 8.2 million orphans!

If people are truly interested in helping children in the developing world, they would support international voluntary family planning. Because there is no vaccine for HIV/AIDS, the only way to try to slow the spread of HIV/AIDS is through education and the distribution of contraceptives, and these services are part of family planning programs.

Providing extensive child health programs without providing reproductive health services would be like building a house without the foundation. If children in the developing world never reach the point of being able to benefit from child health programs, these programs are useless.

This amendment is basically a compromise. Send this amendment to conference. Let the conferees decide whether this amendment will lead to adoption of the conference report on this bill. I have confidence they will be where the American people are—overwhelmingly in support of family planning services for all women.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 208, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—221

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dunn
Edwards
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kuykendall
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—208

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Costello
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Forbes
Fossella
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jenkins
John
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kildee
King (NY)
Kingston
Klink
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Myrick
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Reynolds
Riley
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Chenoweth
McDermott
Peterson (PA)
Skelton

□ 1930

Mrs. NORTHUP changed her vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. DUNN and Messrs. SANDLIN, BISHOP, and NETHERCUTT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR) 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. 2606), making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION WAIVING SECTION 132 OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–274) on the resolution (H.Res. 266) providing for consideration of a concurrent resolution waiving the requirement in section 32 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 that the Congress adjourn sine die not later than July 31, 1999, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to House Resolution 263 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2606.

□ 1937

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. Thornberry in the chair.