McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—4

Cook
Filner
Markey
Vento

□ 2109

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 2115

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4461, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 538 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 538

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4461) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. When the reading for amendment reaches title VIII, that title shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: page 74, line 19, through page 75, line 4; page 84, line 21, through page 96, line 4. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 513 is laid on the table.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for purposes of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 538 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4461, the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. Further, the rule waives points of order against provisions of the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, except as specified in the rule.

The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and further, it allows the Chairman to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote. The rule provides 1 motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Finally, the rule provides that House Resolution 513 is laid on the table.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this open rule which provides for the consideration of the agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. The primary difference between this rule and the one reported by our committee last month, House Resolution 513, is the removal of the amendment which would have offset funds provided for relief to apple and potato farmers. Due to the reallocation of funds by the Committee on Appropriations, which now keeps this funding within the subcommittee's budget limits, the offset amendment is no longer necessary.

A substantive legislative provision which constitutes a change in current law has been exposed to a point of order by this rule, title VIII of the bill, a provision which would, in my view, undermine U.S. foreign policy goals with regard to terrorist states by eliminating restrictions on the sale of agricultural commodities to the terrorist states, Iran, Libya, Iraq, Cuba, and North Korea.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why the House rules preclude major changes in substantive legislative policy on appropriations bills is that the appropriations process has hearings and is set up for deliberation on appropriations issues, while the authorizing process, the authorizing committees, have hearings on major legislative policy changes, and they are set up to concentrate on and improve major, substantive legislative policy proposals.

I think that an example of why the House has this rule is in fact before us today. My friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), included an amendment in the appropriations bill, as I mentioned, to end restrictions on the sale of agricultural commodities to rogue regimes. The legislation allegedly precluded exports from the terrorist states to the United States, and prohibited Federal financing of sales to those States.

After reviewing the legislation carefully, however, the Congressional Research Service, for example, informed my office that that is not necessarily correct. It was not clear, for example, that exports to the United States from the terrorist states would be precluded, and secondly, with regard to Federal financing, at least one significant credit program would have become available to any of those rogue regimes if the administration simply deleted them from the State Department terrorist list; something, by the way, Mr. Speaker, that the administration has admitted it is considering doing with a number of terrorist states, despite the fact that some of these States have recently carried out the murders of United States citizens.

In fact, only last week Secretary of State Albright tinkered with the terminology by declaring that the terrorist states are no longer rogue states, but rather, states of concern. It is obvious that various or all of these terrorist regimes will soon be taken off the terrorist list by the current administration.

I informed my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), of these concerns. But in the appropriations process, we simply cannot amend this legislation pursuant to and after the necessary study to make certain that we are not doing what even the legislation's proponents do not wish to do.

In addition, in my view, the timing of the legislation offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) has been unfortunate. We are dealing here with states that have engaged in acts of terrorism against Americans in recent years. We are

dealing with states against which American victims of terrorism, their surviving family members, have obtained judgments in the Federal courts under the Antiterrorism Act of 1996 for the murders of their family members by those terrorist regimes.

We are dealing with regimes which harbor murderers, terrorists, drug dealers, and other fugitives from United States justice. We are dealing with the terrible message that we would be sending, for example, to the regime in Iran if we were to pass the legislation as is, the legislation which is left exposed to a point of order by this rule.

In a letter just a few days ago by, for example, the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee, the timing of this legislative language, the unfortunate timing of the language, was made clear.

The letter reads, ''We have serious concerns regarding the Nethercutt language. Our concerns center on the changes in U.S. export policy towards Iran that the legislation would require, changes which we believe are unjustified. Such changes would be particularly untimely, coming at the very time that the government of Iran is engaged in a major show trial of 13 Iranian Jews. We are deeply troubled by the direction that trial is taking. Any action taken to help Iran at this moment would send exactly the wrong message to the Iranian regime, particularly coming on the heels of the outrageous decision last month by the World Bank to proceed with new loans to Iran. Now is the wrong time to be seen as helping Iran.''

Mr. Speaker, this issue is much more serious than simply the purported attempt to open some markets for American food products. We must remember that the ingredients, for example, in the deadly car bombs which killed hundreds of our brave troops in Beirut, or the Oklahoma City car bombing, ingredients from fertilizers to other chemicals, also in the opinion of experts may fall within the definition of ''agricultural commodities'' which would become available to terrorist states.

If the language were to become law as it passed out of the Committee on Appropriations, the only option available to a United States president to counter the development of chemical or biological weapons by a terrorist state in effect would be military action. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this issue is much more complicated and serious than it seems at first glance.

The Committee on Rules did its duty pursuant to House rules in exposing the language to a point of order in this rule. The issue will, under the rule, certainly be open for resolution in conference. I am pleased that we have been able to reach a compromise on the Nethercutt language which I believe contains some improvements over current law.

However, in this particular bill today, the agriculture appropriations bill, that original language is subject to a point of order. I support wholeheartedly including the compromise language in either the conference report on this bill or another legislative vehicle to get it to the President's desk as soon as possible, but to get to that stage, Mr. Speaker, we must first pass the open rule that is before the House this evening.

This is a fair rule, and I ask for all of my colleagues' support for it today.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill has come to the floor through such a convoluted, twisted process I am surprised that it is here at all.

Mr. Speaker, this all started 2 months ago when an amendment to lift the American embargo on food and medicine to five countries passed the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, and later the full Committee on Appropriations as part of the agriculture appropriations bill. That amendment would have ended the horrible United States policy of denying people food and medicine just because we disagree with that country's leaders.

□ 2130

This was a great step forward, Mr. Speaker. Not only for American farmers, but also for the residents of Cuba, North Korea, Libya, Sudan, and Iran.

But evidently, the Miami Cuban community got wind of it and started their powerful lobbying wheels turning; and by the time the bill came to the Committee on Rules, the embargo-lifting amendment that was approved by the majority of the committee had been exposed to points of order which meant it was essentially dead on arrival.

When word got out, the American people were horrified to learn that the decision of the majority of the Committee on Appropriations had been subverted and the Congress was forced to continue its ill-advised debacle. So the rule sat around for weeks and weeks waiting for some sort of resolution.

Late yesterday, Mr. Speaker, it became official. The Miami community is more powerful than the American farmers. The Miami community is more powerful than the majority of the Congress. At 2 a.m. this morning, the Committee on Rules met to do a new agricultural appropriations rule. This one delivered a fatal blow to the amendment lifting the embargo.

Apparently, some supporters of the bill were bought off with the promise that the food and medicine amendment would come up later in a different form, in a milder form that makes it nearly impossible for American farmers to sell even one kernel of corn to the hungry Cuban families. But at this point, we have not even seen the new amendment, so we really cannot be sure.

Mr. Speaker, when the amendment is finally unveiled, if the rumors are true, American farmers will be able to sell to Libya, the 15 million people at risk of starving in Sudan, and the 25 million starving people in North Korea. However, that will not be tonight, thanks to this rule which takes the embargo out of the agriculture bill.

So the House, Mr. Speaker, will not have the chance to vote up or down on the momentous issue of ending the embargo. Instead, the end of the embargo will probably be rolled into another bill, and the House once again will be denied a separate vote.

Mr. Speaker, there should be a separate vote on ending the embargo. I think that vote should be on this bill. I have been to Cuba. I have seen the suffering to which our embargo has contributed. Three years ago, I met a little boy in a pediatric hospital. I will never forget that sight as he lay in his hospital bed in Cuba. The 3-year-old had a respiratory disorder that is widely treated here in the United States with a simple plastic shunt. But because the shunt was made in the United States, it was prohibited from entering Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, that little boy spent 86 days in intensive care, lost a lung, nearly died. By the time we met him, he was lying in a hospital bed covered with tubes and barely breathing. And all he needed, Mr. Speaker, was a little piece of plastic, very available, just 90 miles away in Miami. I carry that image of the boy to this day because politics kept him in that bed when he should have been outside playing ball.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues that despite what people say, Castro will always have the best steaks. Castro will always have the best wines. Castro will always have whatever he wants, no matter what we do here today or tomorrow. But for the rest of the Cuban people, it is a very different story.

My Republican colleagues have erected a number of hurdles making it close to impossible for children in Cuba to get their food and medicine in a straightforward fashion. See, people view these situations very differently, Mr. Speaker. When some people think of lifting the embargo, they see Castro's face. When I think of lifting the embargo, I see that little boy's face in that pediatric hospital.

We are not arguing for normal trade with these countries. We are not trying to send them sneakers or CDs or VCRs or television sets. We are arguing for simple human decency, and I should think that all of my colleagues would want to support that with no strings attached.

Mr. Speaker, the embargo may have been right 40 years ago, 39 years ago, 38 years ago, or whatever. But it just did not work, and all it does is hurt people. It hurts children. I think we should end it with this bill. So I hope that this rule is defeated.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I vigorously, obviously, disagree with the merits of what the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) has just said. The gentleman from Massachusetts has a number of others who are here ready to speak and consistently come forth with subterfuges to hide their support for a brutal regime that has maintained itself for 40 years.

He has a right, and they have a right, to admire and to support that regime. But I will not accept from the gentleman . . . There is no community in this United States, sir, that would accept a Member of Congress getting up and saying, like you have said, ''the Miami community got word of it.'' No community. No community in the United States. No ethnic community in the United States would accept that, whether it is the Boston Irish community or any community in any city, and I do not accept it.

And you owe, sir—you can have all the views you wish, but you owe an apology to that community in South Florida . . .

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) be taken down. The gentleman has accused the gentleman from Massachusetts of making an ethnic slur.

The gentleman referred to a city. The gentleman, to my knowledge, made no ethnic slur, whatsoever; and I think it is the gentleman from Florida who owes the gentleman from Massachusetts an apology.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman will be seated, the Clerk will report the words and then the Chair will be prepared to rule.

□ 2145

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry. Do we have an opportunity to be heard before the Chair makes a decision?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Perhaps at a later point.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my words with regard to the attribution of ethnic slur.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me.

I rise tonight, Mr. Speaker, with some concern about this rule, but with a commitment to vote for it. I will vote for it, not because I am happy that the provision that I had worked so hard to get into the appropriations bill will not be protected, but because of the very strong commitment I have received from the House leadership to make certain that the agreement that has been reached between the gentleman from Florida, (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is one that I believe is in the best interest of the country and I believe is in the best interest of moving the agriculture appropriations bill forward and completing our appropriations process.

I have been working on this issue of lifting sanctions on food and medicine to the countries that our Nation unilaterally sanctions for 3 years. It is a turnaround in my thinking, because I came to Congress in 1995 thinking that unilateral embargoes on food and medicine are in the best interest of our Nation. But I have changed my view.

I have changed my view because I do not believe that food and medicine should be used as weapons in foreign policy against governments or people, I should say, that we disagree with around the world. We disagree with the leadership of Fidel Castro. We disagree with the leadership of other countries that are terrorist in nature. But we must have some compassion and some feeling for the people that reside within those countries.

That is what my amendment was designed to accomplish was to yield our sanctions policy such that we help people and still oppose dictator governments around the world.

I wanted to say here that I have great respect for the passion with which my friends from Florida expressed their views on this issue. I know they care deeply about this policy. We disagree on policy. We are friends. I have great personal respect for them and anybody else who disagrees with me on this policy. But I feel this is the right policy for agriculture. It is the right humanitarian policy for our Nation.

So faced again this year with the potential for having no relief on the policy of sanctions that have been imposed unilaterally by this country on food and medicine, I felt we had to sit down and negotiate some agreement that may not be perfect. And believe me, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this is a perfect agreement; but I believe it is a workable and valid and helpful agreement as we seek to lift sanctions on food and medicine for people of the world and give Congress a chance to be a part of that sanctions relief. Not just the President imposing it, but having the Congress have some help as well in trying to implement this policy.

It was my expectation, and is, that this measure, this agreement that has been reached, and it is a commitment by our leadership, by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, and the leadership of the House that it would be put on the military construction supplemental bill today or tomorrow, that is still my hope, so that we can have a chance to vote for this.

But in lieu of that, I have the commitment that it will go on the Agriculture Appropriations bill in conference, and I will be a conferee, and there will be other conferees as well who feel that this agreement is a fair one.

It is not a perfect one. But if we do not implement this agreement, then I fear that we have no agreement, and the policy to lift sanctions on food and medicine will die for another year, and that is wrong. That is wrong for the people of the world who need food and medicine.

So I would just say to my friends on the other side, and they are my friends in this fight, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), many, many Democrats who worked with us on this issue, it is not what we want completely, but it is an open door, a change in policy for the first time in 38 years, and more with respect to our policy of unilaterally sanctioning people of the world on food and medicine.

It is not perfect, but it is evolving. I think, if we do nothing, we implement and keep that policy as it has always been. I think that is wrong for the world. It is wrong for American farmers. It is wrong for American humanitarian groups.

So I just conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I know that there is criticism of this agreement, but it is workable. It is going to accomplish the objective that all of us who feel that sanctions imposition is wrong. It will lift them. It is a start, and I think it is in the best interest of the Nation.

So I am going to vote for this rule, and I am going to vote for the bill. I am going to fight my heart out along with my colleagues who feel strongly as I do that this is the right policy to lift these sanctions on food and medicine to make sure that it becomes law.

The President mentioned it today in his press conference. I think we are very, very close to getting the White House to agree to this. It is not perfect, but we are working hard to get to this result.

So I know there are Members who want to vote no, and that is their right. But I am going to vote yes because I have faith that the commitment that has been made to me on this issue and this subject will be met.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that, at the end of a daffy day we should be discussing a daffy deal on a daffy rule that will bring a daffy bill to the floor.

Let me first say that I am mystified by the way the leadership of the House is proceeding on this. My understanding of the way one is supposed to use the legislative body is that the committees are supposed to make their recommendations to the full House. Then the leadership is supposed to use the House as the vehicle that makes decisions by determining what the majority view is.

That is the way we work out most of our differences out here. We bring our differences to the floor. We have an honest debate about them, and then we vote, and we see who wins and who loses.

The problem that we are running into in this session is that, time and time again, when committees make recommendations that the leadership worries about, they then proceed to try to twist the rules to prevent the House from working out our differences by preventing us from even voting on them. This is another such case tonight.

What is happening tonight is that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) offered a proposal which I and many others supported on both sides of the aisle which would not make American farmers who are suffering record low prices the first victims of foreign policy decisions. That is a controversial action taken by the gentleman and taken by us. But now we are told that a deal has been struck.

□ 2200

Well, let me describe what that deal is, because I think what the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is buying to take home to his farmers is a bushel basket with no bottom. It is empty.

What has happened is that the language which was adopted by a majority in the committee was not protected by the Committee on Rules, and so that language is now going to be stricken on a point of order on this bill in return for a promise that maybe it will be attached to the supplemental bill. The problem is that at this point all four major conferees, Senator STEVENS, myself, Senator BYRD, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), have been made to understand that it is going to be almost impossible to attach that provision to the supplemental because of Senate rules.

As I understand it, if that proposal is attached to a supplemental, it then becomes subject to a point of order under Senate rules. And Senator DODD has already promised that if that language is attached to the supplemental, he will force the Senate to read word by word the entire bill, and that takes us to about next Wednesday. So we can be celebrating July 4th here in the Capitol. That is what happens if this is transferred to the supplemental bill.

So what we have is the gentleman from Washington buying a deal that allows him to possibly transfer this debate to a bill which will go nowhere if this provision is attached to it. That is not going to help a single farmer in America. So I think he bought a very bad deal.

I also think that it puts in jeopardy the passage of the supplemental. Now, I have opposed most of the items in the supplemental. I am deeply opposed to what that supplemental provides for aid to Colombia, for instance. I agree with Senator STEVENS that that is likely to get us into a protracted war. I hope I am wrong. I have been wrong many times before; I hope this is another time. But the problem is that if we attach this provision to that bill, we will have instant controversy; and it will mean that we put at risk the passage of that supplemental. And if we put at risk the passage of that supplemental, the U.S. Army begins to have some real problems because of their drawdowns.

So I do not understand why on earth the House is proceeding this way. If I were the House leadership, I would not even be bringing up this rule tonight because I would not want to put myself in a box foreclosing the possible use of this vehicle for the Nethercutt language. By adopting this rule tonight, we lock the House into a position where they have to either attach this to the supplemental or not. And if we attach it to the supplemental, we create a 50–50 chance that the supplemental is dead as the Dodo bird.

Now, I do not think that moves legislation forward; and it confuses me, as someone who is trying to cooperate to help pass that supplemental, because I have lost at battles, but it is still my duty to try to help the House complete its business in conference.

So in addition to that, there are a number of other problems with this rule, and there are a lot of problems with the underlying bill which I do not have time to get into, including the fact that it shortchanges antitrust, shortchanges food safety, shortchanges the budget for pest and disease control and for agriculture conservation practices. So at this point I am forced to declare my opposition to the bill, to the underlying bill, and to the rule itself.

I would urge the leadership of the House not to put at risk the passage of the supplemental, because the Pentagon needs that too badly, and they are going to have to begin to do a lot of things which are going to embarrass the Congress as an institution if that supplemental cannot pass.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, before yielding to my distinguished friend from Missouri. I think that we, in the words of the gentleman from Wisconsin, saw an example of where we have significant disagreements, but the disagreements have been stated in a respectful way and not in a way that, certainly as before, I considered personally offensive. So I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for that.

As the gentleman from Washington stated previously, a number of us have had very significant and strong disagreements, but I think in a frank and respectful way we have been able to come to an agreement that improves on current law and that is in the national interest of the United States, protecting this country from business transactions which may accrue to the benefit of terrorist states. And I think that in the agreement that we have achieved that is accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), an individual who has been a formidable negotiator, who has been very strong in her views and has demonstrated great leadership in bringing forth what she believes in, and who I have had disagreements with. I wish to publicly recognize the seriousness and the forthrightness with which she addresses issues such as this.

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for those kind words.

I want to say for the record that I hate this rule. I hate the fact that all of us have worked so hard and passed something that would mean a great deal to the American farmer, and still will mean a great deal to the farmer; but I have to say, too, that it is important to move to process forward.

Let me just digress for a minute here. This evening the Faith & Politics Institute held the first-ever Bill Emerson-Walter Capps Civility Lecture Series, and we asked George Mitchell to come and address the group tonight to talk about the peace process in Ireland. He was incredible and so eloquent, and he talked about how it took a year and a half, a year and a half, before he got any movement at all. He sat in a room that long.

Now, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) has done a magnificent job talking and working hard on this issue, as have the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), as well as all of our Democratic friends. There is so much passion about this, as there was so much passion with the British and the Irish in those rooms with Senator Mitchell. And he got them to move forward, as they did. Not in a perfect sense whatsoever, because it took a year and a half.

We have spent maybe tens of hours talking, and we have gotten a compromise that gives something to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) and to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), and it gives an awful lot to our American farmers. It is not perfect, but it cracks the door open. And if we can just crack the door open a little bit, other things will follow.

So as much as I would love to vote against this rule, I am not going to do that because I think it is more important to not only follow through on our commitment, that when we give our

word, as the Speaker and the leadership have given their word to us, we will in turn give our word to them that that is the most important thing and that this will happen.

I would ask my colleagues who are not as happy about this to remember that little baby steps make a big difference in the long run, and that while we cannot get everything we want today, it does not mean that we will not tomorrow.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

I do not think I have ever risen in opposition to a rule for an agriculture appropriations measure coming out of our subcommittee, but indeed I must do so this evening, mainly because we have to look at this bill in the broader context of what is happening in rural America. The only chances we have to help are this bill and the related supplemental bill, which was to have had funding in it for agriculture.

Unfortunately, the members of our committee have essentially been defanged. We have not been allowed to participate in conference committees occurring on the supplemental bill. This particular bill is $400 million below what was spent in the year of 2000. It is $1.6 billion below what the administration asked for to meet these historic low prices that our farmers are struggling with, the drought problems we are having and the disaster problems. In my part of America, farmers cannot even get tractors into the field because of the water. So the bill is not adequate.

We had pinned our hopes on the supplemental. We had proposed to try to level the playing field of the $400 million that is short in this bill compared to last year's spending and put it in the supplemental. This evening we find out that the conferees, who did not include anybody on the committee but essentially four people negotiating, the leaders in both Houses, absolutely did not consult with any of the other conferees that were supposedly appointed.

My colleagues might remember that last year the leadership decided that they were going to appoint conferees, and then the conferees met and they were dismissed. Well, this year they appointed conferees and we never met. And so now we face this bill which so underfund our programs.

In fact, we will not have enough people in the field, technical assistance for natural resource and conservation service to give farmers to apply for the programs to keep their noses above water. Our rural development programs will be $200 million under. Our pest and disease programs $40 million under for citrus canker for tree replacement in States like Florida, all of the different plum pox problems in Pennsylvania, and so forth. The FDA lab in Los Angeles is canceled in the supplemental; the renovations to the building here in Washington; the money that we need to move people into the new FDA facility in College Park.

This bill is absolutely linked to the supplemental, and this evening we learned that that supplemental is completely inadequate and we have absolutely been divested of our authority as duly elected Members of this House. So I would have to say to the Members to vote ''no'' on this rule. It is our only way to send a message to the leadership of this Chamber that the Members need to be involved at the table.

I would just urge the membership on both sides of the aisle to restore the powers to the subcommittees. No subcommittee likes to be treated in this way. No committee likes to be treated in this way. Vote ''no'' on this rule and allow us to bring a bill to the floor that reflects the will of the majority of the members of the committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I would hope that our colleagues would support the rule tonight. The compromise that has been discussed previously on the floor, I believe, represents a well-balanced approach to a very difficult and thorny and delicate issue that I know is very important to everyone here.

I think it is a well-crafted compromise. Certainly not a perfect vehicle, like many negotiations that end up with a document that is not perfect for either side. But I want to thank tonight the individuals who participated in the many hours of difficult negotiations, starting with our good friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT); the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON); the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Young), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations; and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), who was really the person who helped us reach this compromise.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) and I have been working, as all of my colleagues know, for many years on the issue of freedom for Cuba. We were both born in Cuba, came here to the United States young. We know what it is like to live under a Communist regime, and the districts that we represent, although not homogeneous, certainly heterogeneous districts, but the people, many of whom we represent, are in similar situations.

□ 2215

They lost what little they had in Cuba. And I am not talking about material possessions. I am talking about freedom, democracy, liberty, justice. And so, when we hear in this Chamber and we talk about negotiations with a communist regime, the political is the personal and the personal is the political for us. We thank the Republican leadership for their help in getting us to this point.

A credible case perhaps could be made that in other dictatorships throughout the world there has been a semblance of reform and a semblance of change, and perhaps that is why this body has in other bills voted to have trading relations with those dictatorships. I have not been on that list, but a credible case could be made for some market reforms in other countries.

But what reforms have taken place in Castro's Cuba in these 41 years of tyranny and dictatorship? They are no closer to freer elections. There have not been any free elections in Castro's Cuba for 41 years. The violations of human rights continue to this very day. While we are here discussing this issue, dissidents are being rounded up and thrown in jail, opposition leaders are persecuted and prosecuted, people of religious faith who want to practice their religion are also rounded up and thrown in jail on bogus charges, child prostitution continues to be the order of the day. And we wink and nod and continue to believe that we could have faith in such a regime.

In fact, foreign firms who go to Cuba to do business, by law, are not allowed to pay the worker directly. They must pay Fidel Castro in dollars, and Castro then pays the worker in actually worthless pesos. The Cuban worker is a slave. And those who deal with business with the Castro dictatorship, they are here to talk against slavery. In the United States, of course we would abhor that. But yet, slavery is the norm of the day in Cuba, and we are supposed to accept that because we have a global marketplace and everything is all right.

Everything is not all right in Castro's Cuba, and that is why my family came to the United States. That is why so many hundreds and thousands of Cubans die trying to come to the United States. And thank God that there is this wonderful country where people with very dissimilar views can come together and fashion a compromise because we have democracy, because we have discussions, and because we have an open system.

So I hope that, in celebration of that open system, our colleagues would accept the compromise. I thank the Republican leadership and so many on the other side who have helped us to get to this point. I hope that we adopt the rule tonight, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule.

I believe the original provision authored by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) to lift sanctions on food and medicine deserves a real debate and should not be stripped out of this bill on a point of order.

This language, which is so far past the test of democratic debate, is going to disappear. It will be replaced by language worked out in back rooms by a handful of people. That deal will come before the House attached to some conference report or another in a way that denies amendment and debate.

Why? Because a small group of Members has, in my opinion, a counterproductive obsession with Cuba. They appear to be determined to smother all debate, choke off free speech, undermine our democratic legislative process so that no measure that might affect U.S.-Cuba policy, even one as modest and as reasonable as the original provision of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), will ever see the light of day.

They are afraid of what might happen should the House be allowed to work its will. They are afraid of the democratic process of free, fair, and open debate.

Ironically, what we are witnessing today on the floor of this House is something we would expect to see in Cuba and not in the United States of America. No one knows what the outcome might be if there was a fair vote to limit sanctions on food and medicine to Cuba and these other countries. It might win or it might lose. But I do know we should not be afraid to find out. I do know it deserves a debate and a vote. I should add, that is what makes our country so wonderfully unique.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) for his leadership and the bravery that he has shown on this issue. He has forced his leadership to take a step in the right direction. I know he has agitated them to no end, so I respect him very much.

But I cannot accept this deal. It is full of ugly and gratuitous measures that continue to put a wall between Americans and the people of Cuba. The financing of sales of food and medicine and medical devices to Cuba is far more restrictive than the other countries.

And who does it hurt? It hurts small- and medium-size American farmers, American pharmaceutical companies and manufacturers of medical devices by making sales of food and medicine to Cuba as difficult as possible.

It also shuts down the possibility of increased travel by American citizens to Cuba, which is something that dissidents of Cuba have urged more of.

Mr. Speaker, we in the House will not be allowed to debate this back-room deal. We will not be allowed to amendment it or vote on it. We will not be able to exercise our democratic rights.

If my colleagues care about freedom and democracy not only in Cuba but in the United States House of Representatives, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the statement made by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) who just spoke, no, there is no comparison between what is going on here this evening and what goes on in Castro's Cuba.

I wish that I could show the gentleman a card that I carry with me from a political prisoner. He snuck it out of prison and sent it to me. I wish I could show it to him. I will not because making public his name would cost him, in all likelihood, his life.

That political prisoner is in a gulag because of an opinion, a belief. No, there is no comparison between what is going on this evening here and what goes on in Castro's Cuba.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, a gentleman who has been in Cuba many times.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, young Elian Gonzalez finally got back home to Cuba with his dad. I really think that this young man has, more than any one thing in recent history, caused the American people to focus on Cuba.

I think the worst indictment that I can make about the deals that are being cut in the Committee on Appropriations is that most Americans really do not care, they do not care about Cuba, and anybody that wants to cut a deal, cut a deal, if it does not pass in the House, it will pass in the conference. What arrogance, our foreign policy, our trade policy is going to be because half a dozen people got together and decided what makes them feel good. They are going to determine who the dictators are and how foreign nationals are being treated.

What happened to the old-fashioned way where we used to have hearings, we used to have witnesses, we used to have votes on the floor? I have never heard a deal being bragged about so openly. But, fortunately, this little Elian has been able to show America that some people are more concerned by the passionate dislike of who runs Cuba than what is in the best interest of the United States of America, what is in the best interest of our farmers, what is in the best interest of our trade, and they can cut a deal.

If I had known this, why would I work so hard on permanent trade relations with China? I would have gone to the Committee on Appropriations and picked half a dozen people. The way to do these things is go to the Committee on Appropriations and say, hey, can we cut a deal? Let us send some food and technology to these Communist Chinese, forgetting what kind of government they have, and run it out to conference if they do not like what happens in the House.

We cannot say that we have such passion in our heart that we distort what this institution is about. Today if we do it for Cuba, who is going to pick the next country that we have a dislike for?

And it is insulting to say that Americans cannot travel to Cuba. Americans should be able to travel any place that we want because we are the best ambassadors ever for this great country. And I refuse to believe that Castro and those little Communists can influence us. The truth of the matter is we should be influencing them with our American flag, with our know-how, with our productivity and being able to say we are not afraid of their incompetent government.

But if my colleagues think the way to do it is to cut a deal and say, do not talk to anybody, do not trade with anybody, use food, use medicine as a tool to show how much we dislike their form of government, how many forms of government do we dislike where deals are cut? The Communists in North Korea? The Communists in Vietnam? The Communists in Red China? No deals are being cut for those Communists. But we have to have a special deal, our farmers have to suffer, our exporters have to suffer, our tourism has to suffer, and Americans have the indignation to know that they are not trusted because a handful of people want to cut a deal and restrict the President of the United States from being able to determine who visits what.

Well, I hope this deal thing is not that contagious. I hope it is contained. I hope that maybe the other House does not allow this thing to spread over there to say that we will vote on this rule because we know ahead of time what the law is going to be.

Shame.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish that once, just once, the colleagues who get up and with such passion, and the word ''passion'' has been used so often this evening, talk about their objection to financing and credits and trade with that brutal dictatorship that has oppressed a noble people, our closest neighbors, for 41 years. Just once I wish, Mr. Speaker, that they would come and demand and ask for free elections, the rule of law, the liberation of the political prisoners, including the political prisoner who had the courage to sneak out a card to send me.

What is wrong about demanding, just once the liberation of those people in a gulag rotting away because of their belief and support for the rule of law and for democracy?

Why not ask for the legalization of political parties and labor unions and

the press, the press that has the freedom in this country and in so many other countries in the world to cover what we say without censorship?

Never, Mr. Speaker, never do we hear any of these colleagues who come and defend with such passion that dictatorship 41 years in power. Not even when I was away, not even once have we heard them come and demand the rule of law in elections.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, for as long as I have been in Congress, I have worked to lift sanctions against Cuba. One hundred, sixty-seven Members from both sides have cosponsored H.R. 1644, my legislation, to lift the embargo on the sale of food and medicine without restrictions.

I and many others of my colleagues applauded the efforts of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) to include other countries in the removal of sanctions on food and medicine.

Unfortunately, this agreement is the result of negotiations that took place without the participation of many of the people deeply involved in this issue over a long period of time. However, the good news is that a door has been opened that will never, ever close again.

□ 2230

Elian Gonzalez, who left today, helped us to put aside some of the hate in Miami and to move forward. We will keep pushing that door and that door until it falls and it opens forever. When Juan Miguel Gonzalez stood at the airport today and looked at the American people and in both English and Spanish said thank you for giving my child back to me, thank you for having your system work on my behalf, and try to work with each other so that we can have better relations in the future, Juan Miguel had no understanding, I am sure, the legacy that he and his little boy have left behind.

This door is open, and it will never, ever close again. We will trade with Cuba as much as we can now, and we will lift the embargo soon. People can stand here and accuse people of being bad Americans and supporters of the Castro regime. I am a supporter of Juan Miguel Gonzalez. I am a supporter of Elian Gonzalez. I am a supporter of children in Cuba who have never harmed my child; and their father, this Congressman, should not harm them at all.

The bad news is that this was a back room deal that is going to be hard in some cases to enforce. The good news is that we have 170 people over here that are going to stay on the State Department, Treasury Department, the administration, joining Members from the other side, to make sure that every possible opening in that door works to our advantage and to the advantage of the Cuban people.

It is over. It is over. Mark it on the calendar. The day Elian left, he took with him the sickness of the embargo and he threw it away at sea. Elian's tragedy is going to be our sanity, because starting today we will do what is right and some day when that little boy grows up some reporter will go to him and say, do you know that you played a role in these two people coming together? And he will know what happened, and his father, that 31-year-old articulate, direct, but compassionate man, who had the courage and the strength to say I will wait the system out, if they had taken my child, I would not have been the diplomat that he was.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, recently this House passed significant legislation to open up trade with China, a Communist nation, in direct contradiction to the policy we established with that bill and to the policy established in H.R. 4461, the agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal year 2001. This rule will limit our efforts to allow limited trade with Cuba and several other nations.

Let me hasten to add that the sanctions that would be lifted by the agricultural appropriations would be related to food and medicine, a very limited trade but yet significant. Our American farmers would welcome this trade opportunity.

Putting aside it is bad policy to use food and medicine as political leverage, this House, by a substantial margin, engaged with China trade, which is in the right direction, rather than isolation. We should do that for Cuba. Why not trade with Cuba? Cuba is only a few miles away; and China indeed is many, many thousands of miles away. This rule is a bad rule.

Mr. Speaker, recently, this House passed significant legislation, designed to open up trade with China—a communist Nation.

In direct contravention to the policy we established with that Bill and to the policy embodied in H.R. 4461, the Agriculture Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 2001, this rule limited our effort to allow limited trade with Cuba and several other nations.

Under this Rule, the provisions in the Agriculture Appropriations Bill that would lift current economic sanctions against Cuba, Libya, North Korea, Iraq and Sudan, would be subject to a point of order.

That means that one Member of this House—for any reason or for no reason—will have the ability, the power to overturn the policy trend of trading with other nations, notwithstanding their governmental structures.

Let me hasten to add that the sanctions that would be lifted by the Agriculture Appropriations Bill would relate only to food and medicine, a very limited trade policy. Our American farmers would welcome this trade opportunity.

Putting aside the fact that it is bad policy to use food and medicine as political leverage, this House, by a substantial margin, voted to engage China in trade, rather than pursue isolation.

We are willing to trade with China.

Why not Cuba?

China is thousands of miles away.

Cuba is a stones throw away.

Under this Rule, points of order against legislating on an appropriations bill are waived generally.

However, several provisions are specifically left without waivers.

Those unprotected provisions include Title Eight of the Agriculture Appropriations Bill, and that Title consists of the ''Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act of 2000.''

If Title Eight remains in the Bill, the President could not impose sanctions against Cuba and the other countries, unless Congress consents.

It seems to me that such a process provides adequate oversight, in the event our Government finds it prudent to sanction one of these so-called ''rogue'' nations.

Mr. Speaker, we can well expect that the food and medicine trade provisions of this Bill will be struck.

Similar provisions were struck from the Fiscal Year 2000 Agriculture Appropriations Bill.

I understand that some Members feel strongly about the practices of those governments in Cuba, Libya, North Korea, Iraq and the Sudan.

I too feel strongly about some of their practices.

But, this House took a bold step recently, an historic step.

Why then today, should one Member, for good reason or bad, be able to reverse that step, change that policy position?

There is no good answer, Mr. Speaker.

I urge my colleagues to stand for consistency in our foreign policy—Reject this Rule!

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. It does not protect a decision that was made by members of the Committee on Appropriations to take vital steps towards sanction reform, to lift the ban on food and medicine to innocent citizens of the Sudan, Libya, North Korea, Iran and, yes, Cuba. I worked hard, along with my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), along with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), to work to make sure that we could lift these sanctions to be able to help American farmers, to be able to sell their products abroad, because they are suffering from low prices today.

This rule ignores what we did, two votes in the subcommittee and in the full committee. Let me say, while we worked hard with our colleagues, we were not, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and I, included in the deal, in the negotiations. This is

not a compromise. It is a capitulation. That is what this is about.

The Republican leadership has made a promise that sanction reform is going to be attached to some other future legislative vehicle, but that vehicle remains a mystery. We are going to leave sanction reform by the wayside. There is too much at stake for our farmers, and our foreign policy should not punish people who suffer under repressive regimes.

These unilateral agricultural sanctions hurt the most vulnerable in target nations. Imagine, my God, food and medicine we want to deny to people. Who are we, for God's sakes?

Just 2 weeks ago in this body, or several weeks ago, we talked about permanent trade relations with China; and we said that China that abuses human rights, that pirates our intellectual properties, that proliferates nuclear warfare, is all right but Cuba is not. It is mindless. It is absolutely mindless and disingenuous. Vote against this rule.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has 1¾ minutes.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule about the agricultural appropriations bill. The underlying bill is about America. It is about its land and its people. It is about the farmers that grow our food. It is about how we treat that food, how we deliver it, how we give it to poor people, how we give it to the school lunch program, school breakfast program, how we give it to women and infants, how we deal with poverty in America. That is what this bill is about.

The people who produce that food came to this committee and they said, why can we not sell that food and sell our medicines to other countries? Why do we have sanctions against the products that we do such a good job in raising? Why do we not lift those embargoes that we have created in our country, embargoes against Sudan, against Libya, against North Korea, against Iran and, yes, against Cuba?

Yes, these countries have been problem countries; but we have never, as the richest, most powerful Nation in the world, used the food as a weapon to hurt women and children.

So this bill is about people. It is about food, and it is about medicine. This debate on this rule is a sham, because what the Committee on Rules did is they undermined the whole intent of bipartisan debate in the subcommittee, of bipartisan debate of the vote in the full committee; and the Committee on Rules comes along and waives all points of order except for one, and that is the point of order that deals with this issue.

They waive another point, but they take care of it in another part of the bill.

It is interesting what the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) just said. Elian went home and he is free, and here the United States Congress is held hostage. It is a bad rule.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the House for its deliberation. I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) on one thing he said today. Today is an important date. It is a date that is infamous. It is the only time that the United States has sent back over the Berlin Wall a child whose mother died to bring him to freedom, and in that sense I agree that today is a date that will be remembered by history.

Mark my words, yes, soon we will have trade with Cuba. Soon there will be a Cuba whose concentration camp doors will be open and you, yes you, will have to see what you have been purposefully ignoring. There will be, there will be a——

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will be seated. The Clerk will report the words.

□ 2245

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the word ''purposely.''

Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) seek recognition?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw my request that the gentleman's words be taken down, with the expectation that there will be no words used on this floor which can in any way be interpreted as attacking another Member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The demand of the gentleman from Wisconsin is withdrawn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I do not attack other Members, I attack injustice. I attack oppression. I believe in those words, ''In God We Trust,'' not ''In Gold We Trust.'' I believe that the people who have come here and defended the embargoes against South Africa, and I defended the embargo against South Africa, should not have the double standard that they show.

I believe that Cuba will be free, and I believe that the American people will be proud of this Congress having stood with the freedom and the aspirations of the Cuban people. This is an important rule.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 179, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

YEAS—232

Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
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
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—179

Abercrombie	Hall (TX)	Oberstar
Ackerman	Hastings (FL)	Obey
Allen	Hill (IN)	Olver
Baca	Hilliard	Ortiz
Baird	Hinchey	Owens
Baldacci	Hinojosa	Pastor
Baldwin	Hoeffel	Payne
Barcia	Holden	Peterson (MN)
Barrett (WI)	Hooley	Phelps
Becerra	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Bentsen	Inslee	Price (NC)
Berkley	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Berman	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Rangel
Berry	Jefferson	Reyes
Bishop	John	Rivers
Blagojevich	Johnson, E. B.	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Jones (OH)	Roemer
Bonior	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Borski	Kaptur	Rush
Boswell	Kennedy	Sabo
Boyd	Kildee	Sanchez
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Sanders
Brown (FL)	Kind (WI)	Sandlin
Brown (OH)	Kleczka	Sawyer
Capps	Klink	Schakowsky
Capuano	Kucinich	Scott
Cardin	LaFalce	Serrano
Carson	Lampson	Sherman
Clayton	Lantos	Shows
Clyburn	Larson	Sisisky
Condit	Lee	Skelton
Conyers	Levin	Slaughter
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Coyne	Lipinski	Snyder
Cramer	Lofgren	Spratt
Crowley	Lowey	Stabenow
Cummings	Lucas (KY)	Stenholm
Davis (FL)	Luther	Strickland
Davis (IL)	Maloney (CT)	Stupak
DeFazio	Maloney (NY)	Tanner
DeGette	Mascara	Tauscher
Delahunt	McCarthy (MO)	Taylor (MS)
DeLauro	McCarthy (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
Dixon	McGovern	Thurman
Doggett	McKinney	Tierney
Dooley	McNulty	Towns
Doyle	Meehan	Turner
Edwards	Meek (FL)	Udall (CO)
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Udall (NM)
Eshoo	Millender-McDonald	Velazquez
Etheridge	Minge	Visclosky
Evans	Mink	Waters
Farr	Moakley	Watt (NC)
Filner	Moore	Weiner
Ford	Moran (VA)	Weygand
Frank (MA)	Nadler	Wise
Frost	Napolitano	Woolsey
Gejdenson	Neal	Wynn
Gephardt		
Gonzalez		

NOT VOTING—24

Boucher	Gordon	Oxley
Clay	Hall (OH)	Pelosi
Clement	Hefley	Pickett
Cook	Markey	Shuster
Danner	Martinez	Stark
Dicks	Matsui	Stearns
Fattah	Miller, George	Vento
Goodling	Murtha	Waxman

□ 2303

Messrs. DEUTSCH, WEXLER, ROTHMAN, and MCINTYRE 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken tomorrow.

SENSE OF THE HOUSE CONCERNING USE OF ADDITIONAL PROJECTED SURPLUS FUNDS TO SUPPLEMENT MEDICARE FUNDING

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 535) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning use of additional projected surplus funds to supplement Medicare funding, previously reduced under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 535

Whereas Congress is responsible for oversight and spending under the Medicare program;

Whereas the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 was passed in response to major economic concerns about inflation in costs in the Medicare program;

Whereas the savings resulting from enactment of that Act exceeded the estimates at the time of enactment and has resulted in payment rates for classes of providers below the rates previously anticipated;

Whereas the Congress adjusted some elements of the Medicare program in the Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999;

Whereas a significant number of Medicare+Choice organizations is withdrawing, or considering withdrawing, from the Medicare+Choice program because of inadequate reimbursement rates;

Whereas the Medicare prescription drug bill pending in the Congress will delay the date by which Medicare+Choice organizations must decide whether to remain in the Medicare+Choice program from July 1, 2000, to October 1, 2000; and

Whereas, because of improved economic performance, it is anticipated that the Congressional Budget Office in its mid-year re-estimates will project dramatically increased non-Social Security surpluses above those assumed in the adoption of the most recent Congressional Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2001: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that, upon receipt of such mid-year CBO re-estimates, the House of Representatives shall promptly assess the budgetary implications of such reestimates and provide for appropriate adjustments to the Medicare program during this legislative session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 535 is an important resolution because just as we have discussed, and the House has passed, Medicare modernization and prescription drugs for seniors, there are still other areas of Medicare that continue to need adjustment.

If we have additional surplus money, we want to make sure that we alert both the seniors who are the recipients and the providers of that Medicare care that we believe a high priority is to make sure that a significant portion of that surplus is reserved for reinvestment back into Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control the time and yield further blocks of time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we have had a discussion between Democrats and Republicans that I think the American people would prefer to see us avoid in the future. Yesterday, we had some bipartisan efforts of people reaching out across the aisle to work for betterment of this country.

Resolution 535 is one of those resolutions that we can do this. This is a chance for us to reach across the aisle in a bipartisan effort to show that Medicare really is a priority of this body; and hopefully, in the future we will find the funds to be able to do all of things that both sides and America would like us to do.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON). Let me point out to every Member, this Member has fought hard to raise this issue, to articulate the issue that we have to continue to do better for our seniors when it comes to Medicare. She has been a constant champion of the fact that Republicans and Democrats need to put their differences aside and truly work for our seniors in America.

□ 2310

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) for his kind words.

Mr. Speaker, when it became clear that we were going to do a prescription drug bill, there is a part of this bill in title 3 that we did not get a chance to talk about much today, and that has to do with some changes that are needed for Medicare to provide some urgent relief to hospitals in this country, particularly in a program called Medicare+Choice. About half of the citizens in my district in New Mexico choose Medicare+Choice. It is kind of managed care for Medicare. They have the Lovelace Senior Plan or the Presbyterian Senior Plan.

The problem is that the reimbursement rates for Medicare+Choice and for most of the other Medicare programs in the State of New Mexico are terribly low. In New Mexico, if one is a part of the Lovelace plan, Lovelace gets about $370 per member per month to cover one's health care in the rural parts of New Mexico. It is about $430 a month if one is in Albuquerque. That compares with a reimbursement rate in