Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I am here on behalf of myself, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI). The three of us represent the House on the Board of Regents the governing body of the Smithsonian; it is a great institution, something that has won worldwide acclaim for the collections, for the way in which it interprets the history of the United States as well as other parts of the world.

I rise today in support of H.R. 2195, the Smithsonian Facilities Authorization Act. As a member of the Board of Regents, I am pleased to see this bill brought to the floor today; and I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY), and also the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) for recognizing the importance of a timely passage of this bill and for their efforts to expedite the bill through the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2195 authorizes a trust fund improvement to the Patent Office Building, most notably the courtyard enclosure. These improvements are critical steps in the renovation of the Old Patent Office Building and to reopening the historic building for the public to enjoy. And certainly ''for the public to enjoy'' is a true statement, because people coming to visit the Nation's capital put a visit to the Smithsonian on a high priority on their list of places to see.

Additionally, the bill authorizes funding for planning, design, and construction of the Pod 5 facility at Suitland. This authorization will facilitate the evolving needs of the biological research community at large.

One of the lesser-known functions of the Smithsonian is the preservation of all kind of things that are valuable to research people. We have no idea how much how much their collections are used by the research community; and, therefore, it is important that we have adequate facilities to take care of these.

H.R. 2195 provides the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution with continuous contracting authority for the Pod 5 project which will make future phasing more efficient and economically sound.

Finally, the bill recognizes the efforts of the National Museum of American History to establish Jazz Appreciation Month. Acknowledging the Smithsonian's jazz collections is important to bringing attention to our Nation's oldest and most comprehensive program in this inherently American art form.

Again, I would like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) for promptly seeing this bill through the Committee on House Administration, and I look forward to having it passed by this body.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2195, a bill to provide additional space and resources for the national collections held by the Smithsonian Institute. I commend the Gentleman from Ohio, Congressman REGULA, for introducing the bill, which is co-sponsored by two of our colleagues, Congressmen JOHNSON and MATSUI, who also serve on the Smithsonian Institution's Board of Regents.

The bill authorizes the Smithsonian's Board of Regents to plan, design, construct, and equip additional special use storage and laboratory space for the museum support facility in Suitland, Maryland. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, on which I serve as Ranking Member, has jurisdiction over these activities of the Smithsonian, and the Committee will review and approve any design plans for this facility once they are completed.

The bill also clarifies and refines the role of the Smithsonian in the renovation of the Patent Office Building, while retaining the appropriate roles of the National Capitol Planning Commission and the Commission on Fine Arts. This building houses the Smithsonian's American Art Museum and National Portrait Gallery and is currently closed for extensive renovation. It is scheduled to reopen in 2006. In addition, the bill brings the Smithsonian into line with other executive branch agencies regarding competitive procedures for awarding contracts.

As is current practice, the Smithsonian will continue to submit its construction projects to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee for approval buy Committee resolution.

I support H.R. 2195 and again thank the bill's sponsors for their attention to these matters.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2195.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of H.R. 2195.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1950, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2004 AND 2005

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 316 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 316

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. 1950) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for the fiscal years 2004 and 2005, to authorize appropriations under the Arms Export Control Act and the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for security assistance for fiscal years 2004 and 2005, 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 International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill modified by the amendments recommended by the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce also printed in the bill. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in section 2. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report (except as specified in section 3), may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment except as specified in the report, shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 2 are waived.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time for the chairman of the Committee on International Relations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier considered. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The original proponent of an amendment included in such amendments en bloc may insert a statement in the Congressional Record immediately before the disposition of the amendments en bloc.

SEC. 3. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules out of the order printed, but not sooner than one hour after the chairman of the Committee on International Relations or a designee prospectively announces from the floor a request to that effect.

SEC. 4. 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 316 is a structured rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 1950, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005. The Committee on Rules worked well into last evening in order to ensure a rule that is fair, that grants opportunity to this Congress to debate the major issue of the day in this field. In fact, out of the 75 or so amendments submitted to the Committee on Rules, 42, 42 were made in order by this rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The rule provides for a motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1950 was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), along with the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN). The legislation authorizes $9.6 billion in fiscal year 2004 and $9.5 billion in 2005 to address the need of the State Department and their executive operations. The legislation includes significant language and funding to ensure international security through important assistance programs and activities.

To highlight the need for this critical legislation, Mr. Speaker, we really need to look only 90 miles south of Florida to see the evils of an oppressive dictatorship. The regime there in Cuba is the only dictatorship in the western hemisphere, and it works to subvert the message of freedom not only on the island of Cuba but elsewhere in the world. As we have seen this week, there are reports that the Cuban dictatorship is jamming U.S.-based broadcasting to Iran. This demonstrates the need, once again, to reinforce our message of freedom to the entire world.

□ 1045

I think the world has recognized, at least recently since the very brutal crackdown in March of this year by the Cuban regime, where many of the country's most well-known and many of the most courageous prodemocracy activists were thrown in dungeons, that the nature of the Cuban regime is one that must be condemned and certainly that it must be isolated.

This legislation includes an increase of funding at $15 million for democracy-building programs while authorizing countless other programs such as continued radio and television capabilities to make sure that the message of freedom reaches the people of Cuba. I would like to commend the chairman and ranking member for recognizing the needs for international broadcasts not only for Cuba but for many other places in the world that are still under tyranny.

While I think it is essential to address dictatorships such as the one in Cuba, many other people are also fighting for essential and inalienable rights.

For years designated terrorist organizations in Colombia, for example, have plagued efforts by the people of that country to live in a peaceful democracy. I think proactive action must be taken to ensure that armed rebels in Colombia such as the FARC and the ELN are not continued to be allowed to disrupt peace with impunity.

H.R. 1950 provides funding to further secure, among other things, Mr. Speaker, United States embassies throughout the world in order to maintain a strong diplomatic presence for the United States abroad.

We made in order, and later today the House will be considering, an amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Ranking Member LANTOS) to authorize the Millennium Challenge Account, a very important initiative of President Bush's. This historic expansion of foreign assistance will serve to bring economic security and some basic tenets of transparency to countries throughout the world. That Millennium Challenge Account will be administered by a government entity held responsible for results and benefiting from the flexibility to provide innovative solutions to the problems of poverty and oppression.

The main goal of that account will be to assure that U.S. foreign aid is targeted towards transparency and breaking down corruption where U.S. foreign aid goes to.

Funding for this important program is phased in under this legislation, beginning with $1.3 billion next fiscal year and continuing with $3 billion in fiscal 2005 and $5 billion in 2006. By the last fiscal year, this challenge account will be financially able to assist all those countries currently counted by the World Bank as what it terms lower-middle-income countries.

I am proud that the Committee on Rules did its job to provide a full and fair discussion through 42 amendments, Mr. Speaker, so we should let the debate begin.

This is a good bill, H.R. 1950, and this rule is fair, and it provides for much debate on many important issues. Through this legislation, the House will continue its important work to fund important State Department actions while, I believe, beginning the journey to relieve burdens on those across the globe that need assistance.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman, again, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member, for their great leadership. As I said yesterday in the Committee on Rules, for me, it is an honor to be able to serve in this legislative body with both of them.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules is a place of great creativity. At times, rules reported by the committee bend, stretch, and outright waive the rules of the House in order to ensure passage of legislation. Many times, substantive amendments that deserve to be debated are denied a vote.

Late last night, the Committee on Rules met to report the rule for H.R. 1950, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act. This is a complex, omnibus bill that brings together no less than seven important pieces of legislation. Specifically, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act includes the State Department Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005, the Global Internet Freedom Act of 2003, the Missile Threat Reduction Act of 2003, the International Free Media Act of 2003, the United States International Leadership Act of 2003, the Defense Trade and Security Assistance Reform Act of 2003, and the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of Fiscal Years 2004 and 2005.

H.R. 1950, as reported by the Committee on International Relations, is a bipartisan bill that authorizes funding for foreign military aid and training programs, programs that reduce the threat of missile proliferation, international broadcasting activities, U.S. contributions to international organizations and multilateral financial institution, and for economic development and humanitarian foreign assistance programs.

Like most other major bills, there are serious points of contention. Several controversial provisions have been included; others have been deleted. This rule has made consideration of H.R. 1950 more complex and more contentious than it needs to be.

The Republican leadership, as it has done in the past, ordered the Committee on Rules to deny consideration of many of these contentious issues in order to protect their members from having to take a tough vote; but before I explain the problems with the rule, let me say that I am pleased that the Hyde-Lantos amendment creating the Millennium Challenge Account and reauthorizing the Peace Corps was made in order. With the adoption of the Hyde-Lantos amendment, this bill will contain one of the most important and ambitious foreign policy initiatives undertaken by the United States to help lift countries out of poverty.

The Millennium Challenge Account is intended to reward poor countries that demonstrate a commitment to ruling justly, investing in people, and promoting economic freedom. It is supported by the administration and by the many nongovernmental development and humanitarian organizations engaged in antipoverty programs around the world.

The Millennium Challenge Account focuses on assistance to low-income countries, has a strong emphasis on the role of women in the design and implementation of these programs, and gives careful attention to coordinating MCA programs with our existing development priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I was relieved to hear from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member, that the funding for the Millennium Challenge Account programs will come from additional foreign aid funding and that it will not rob funds from existing economic development, humanitarian, and food assistance accounts.

I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member, for their leadership on establishing the Millennium Challenge Corporation and its programs. I believe the Committee on International Relations improved the President's initial proposal. Economic growth and prosperity lift people out of poverty and help prevent the chaos created from conflict, misery, and hopelessness. It is in the national security interests of the United States to see these new programs fully funded and implemented once they are established by the passage of H.R. 1950.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to watch the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member, work together. They truly understand the meaning of the word bipartisanship, and their commitment to this ideal should be a model for this Congress.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership does not share the same view as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member.

Mr. Speaker, there are real policy differences that are part of this bill. For example, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) offered an amendment in the Committee on International Relations increasing funding for the United Nations Population Fund, or UNFPA. Many anti-choice Members in this body opposed this provision.

Instead of using the rule to unfairly strike this provision from the bill, the Committee on Rules made the Smith amendment in order. Mr. Speaker, this is democracy. This is how the legislative process is designed to work. Every Member will be able to vote their conscience and vote up or down on whether or not to strike the Crowley amendment from the bill; and while I will oppose this amendment very strongly and very passionately to strike the Crowley amendment, every Member deserves the option to vote their conscience.

Unfortunately, this is a rare break from the way the Republicans traditionally run this body; but rest assured that they have returned to form with the rest of this bill.

Seventy-five amendments were submitted to the Committee on Rules and 42 amendments were made in order, but numbers do not tell the whole truth. This rule must also be judged by the amendments that are not in the rule, by the important issues we have prohibited from debating.

More than 20 very important Democratic amendments were denied the opportunity to be debated and voted on by this body. In one case, an amendment adopted by one committee and stripped from the bill by another was denied the opportunity to be considered. The Republican majority refused to make in order the following amendments. I am just going to name a few of them:

An amendment by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) that would have provided assistance to Afghan women;

An amendment by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) to promote environmental sustainability by requiring environmental impact assessments for millennium challenge projects;

An amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) that urges U.S. leadership by participating in negotiations on climate change to reduce greenhouse gases;

An amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) requesting an IG investigation into the Niger uranium intelligence documents that led to the President's use of this misinformation in making the case for war in Iraq;

An amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) that would have provided funding for removal of land mines and agriculture redevelopment of former mine fields;

An amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) to designate Poland as a participant in the visa waiver program;

An amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) urging the administration to conclude a comprehensive migration agreement with Mexico; and

An amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) urging the President to engage in an open dialogue with the Government of Poland to achieve a final settlement for those Jews, homosexuals, European Roma, and other individuals and groups who had their private property seized by the Nazis during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, these amendments were all offered in good faith, and they deserve the right to be debated and voted by the Members of this body. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the Republican leadership would deny us the chance to vote on these amendments and instead hide behind arithmetic to argue that they are being fair.

Mr. Speaker, I will urge a ''no'' vote on this rule.

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

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

Every week, pursuant to an idea of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), he and I rise on this floor to speak about the brave men and women who are languishing in prisons in totalitarian Cuba, an island that has been oppressed for 44 years by a totalitarian dictator. So each week I spend a few minutes at least bringing forth specific cases to remind our colleagues and all those who will listen about the horrors taking place just 90 miles from the shores of the United States.

This week, I would like to speak about Rafael Ibarra. Rafael Ibarra heads the 30th of November Democratic Party, an island-wide opposition movement to the Castro tyranny. In 1994, he was sentenced to 20 years in prison and is currently at the prison known as Combinado del Este, after having spent 3 years in an isolation cell in the province of Camaguey, in an area of Camaguey in Cuba, hundreds of miles from his family.

In 1997, his wife at the time, Maritza Lugo, also a highly respected prodemocracy activist, was arrested as well and sentenced to 2 years, leaving their two daughters without parents. On multiple occasions after 1999, Maritza would continue to be arrested and harassed by the regime. Even when Maritza and Rafael were both in prison at the same time, the dictator sought to evict their two girls from their small farmhouse which had become a gathering point for human rights and prodemocracy meetings.

Rafael Ibarra was one of the political prisoners who recently signed the Cuban flag painted on a pillow case and sent it to the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva.

Maritza and her two daughters, at Rafael's request, fled Cuba as refugees in 2002 to the United States so that the girls could be able to live in freedom.

Next year, Mr. Speaker, will mark 10 years that Rafael has been imprisoned, much of that time in solitary confinement. While other fathers have been able to watch their daughters grow and guide them as they become young adults, Rafael has been confined in Castro's gulag for daring to dream and to work on behalf of a democratic Cuba.

Our thoughts and our prayers are with him, as is our solidarity and our profound admiration, and we demand once again the liberation of Rafael Ibarra and all of Cuba's political prisoners.

□ 1100

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules; and I wish to thank him for his courtesy in being here this morning.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule and want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART), for his stellar management of it, as well as my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The Committee on Rules, as was said by both gentlemen, worked into the night to fashion this rule, and it will allow for the consideration of a wide range of very important issues. As was further pointed out by both of my colleagues, 42 of the 75 amendments that were submitted to us were made in order. We have 23 Republican amendments, 13 Democratic amendments, and six bipartisan amendments in that package, which will, I believe, allow us to consider many, many different issues of this important piece of legislation.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), Mr. Speaker, raised a number of important issues on amendments that, quite frankly, have not been made in order; and, obviously, everyone understands that we have to have some kind of constraint on the amendment process as we proceed with 75 amendments, many of which are duplicative. And so we have to put some kind of structure in order. That is the raison d'etre for the Committee on Rules, in fact.

So as he addressed those issues, I was thinking that many of those are important and need to be looked at, obviously focusing on environmental issues, focusing on the issue of the transfer of uranium. These are all questions that should be addressed. I agree with him that they should be addressed, but I would argue that this institution is effectively and very responsibly taking them on. Today, for example, on the issue of the Schiff amendment, we have the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence here in the House, very ably chaired by the vice chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), and in the Senate our colleague PAT ROBERTS is working on this issue; and obviously that is going to be an issue of discussion there and I believe will be responsibly addressing that question.

On other issues which the administration can very effectively address, I know that they are committed to improved environmental quality and other issues that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) brought forward as well.

I want to, Mr. Speaker, talk about a number of very important measures in this legislation which I am particularly supportive of, and I want to talk about a couple of amendments that I am going to be dealing with. First, I had the privilege of cochairing, along with our former colleague Lee Hamilton, who was in fact the predecessor of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), having served as chairman of what was called then the Committee on Foreign Affairs and now the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. Hamilton and I cochaired a task force that was put together by the Council on Foreign Relations and Freedom House, and the particular charge was to look at the U.S. leadership role in the United Nations. We obviously know, leading up to U.N. resolution 1441, before the war with Iraq, and the challenge of trying to put together a multinational coalition in dealing with the liberation of Iraq and the war on terrorism and a wide range of other international challenges that we face, that there has been a question out there about the U.S. leadership role. So this task force, I believe, came forward with some very, very first-rate recommendations, and I am happy that we have been able to include those recommendations as part of this bill.

I introduced, along with the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations, our very able colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the package that is basically described as the International Leadership Act; and it will, I believe, take us down the road towards improving the role of the United States in the United Nations.

Now, many of the recommendations that are there are designed to deal with challenges like the fact, and this is unbelievable, the United States of America's being removed from the Human Rights Commission within the United Nations and one of the most repressive anti-human rights entities on the face of the Earth, Libya, being given the opportunity to preside over that structure looking at human rights. Well, obviously, there is something wrong with this picture, Mr. Speaker; and I think virtually everyone can acknowledge that.

We need to do what we can to encourage self-determination, political pluralism, and the rule of law worldwide; and I believe that those are goals that the United States and most nations that are members of the United Nations share. But, unfortunately, we have not had the kind of success in doing that that we would like, so it is for that reason that we have in this legislation the U.S. International Leadership Act, which will do things like encourage the establishment of a democracy caucus. It will encourage the United States to engage even more actively than we already do under the very able leadership of our first-rate ambassador to the United Nations, John Negroponte. We will be involved in a lot of things that, frankly, are modeled after the work here in the United States Congress, which I hope can be utilized to enhance the U.S. leadership role in the United Nations.

So I want to congratulate both my friends Lee Hamilton and the other great members who served on our task force, along with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS); and I want to say that this has enjoyed strong bipartisan support from our friends, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and others. And so I look forward to discussing this further. I know that the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) will, but I wanted to raise that now at this juncture.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), be allowed to continue controlling the time for our side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Without objection, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) now controls the majority's time.

There was no objection.

Mr. DREIER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, let me say that there are a couple of other issues that are very, very important that need to be addressed here. One of them has to do with the challenge we have been dealing with in California, and it has to do with the issue of extradition.

Very tragically, last year a constituent of my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), happened to be near the area that I represent, Irwindale, California. He was with the Los Angeles Sheriff's Department and he was, unfortunately, killed. His murder was reportedly by a Mexican national, who, after murdering Deputy Sheriff David March, shooting him point-blank, fled to Mexico. We have been dealing with the challenge of trying to extradite this man who we believe is responsible for this murder back to the United States so that he can face justice here.

We know that there is a challenge within the Mexican constitution. They prevent extradition to countries that have a death penalty. And while I happen to personally be a proponent of the death penalty, we know that is a hotly debated issue here in the United States. But for that reason, because of the prospect of this individual facing the death penalty, he has not been extradited; and, in fact, the request has not formally been made for his extradition.

But there is another decision the Mexican Government made, and it had to do with the Supreme Court in December of 2001. They came down with a ruling that said that life imprisonment is, in fact, cruel and unusual punishment, and that has played a role in hindering the opportunity for this individual to be extradited back to the United States to face justice.

The gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) has an amendment, which I will be strongly supporting, that basically calls on both countries to try and bring about a resolution to work this issue out. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have been working closely with the very able Mexican ambassador to the United States on this issue; and I am convinced that within the leadership of Mexico, President Fox and other leaders obviously want justice. And so the McKeon amendment simply encourages a resolution to that which I hope will take place in the near future.

Having spent time talking with family members of Sheriff March and others in Los Angeles who have spent a lot of time focusing on this issue, it is very clear that justice is a priority. And I want to say that I hope that with passage of the McKeon amendment it will help us in our attempt to deal with this question.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to be offering an amendment here which will deal with the overall issue of migration. I know there was a lot of discussion in the Committee on International Relations on this. I know the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) worked on this, the gentleman from California (Mr. GALLEGLY), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), and others; and I am joining, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), with whom I am privileged to serve as cochairman of the U.S.-Mexico Caucus, which was established at the encouragement of Ambassador Bremer, and our goal has been to focus on the overall issue of trade between Mexico and the United States and the fact that we have seen tremendous benefits that have come about because of the passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

In fact, we have seen trade between our two countries move from 1993, prepassage of the North American Free Trade Agreement, at about $83 billion, to around $230 billion. So virtually a tripling of the trade between our two countries. So the U.S.-Mexico Caucus has been charged with looking at the real benefits and ways that we can actually enhance the relationship between our two countries.

So the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) and I have joined as coauthors of an amendment which will deal with the overall issue of migration and encourage action on that, and I am hoping that we will be able to enhance the level of bipartisan support we have for this measure. It does, in fact, rectify something that I believe should not have been in the measure that was reported out of the Committee on International Relations with the United States basically calling on the Mexican Government to privatize Pemex, which is the oil company in Mexico.

We all recognize that there are problems within the operations of Pemex. In fact, I have yet to talk to a Mexican who has said to me anything other than that there are problems with Pemex. But I do not believe it is correct for the United States Congress to basically provide as a contingency for dealing with our very important migration policy, which Secretary Powell and this administration obviously want to address in a very responsible way, I do not believe that that should in any way be contingent upon our seeing Mexico deal with their challenge with Pemex. We want them to do that, but we obviously are not going to tie our goal of dealing with migration to a resolution to that.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a very fair rule. It is a balanced rule that, as I said, allows 42 of the 75 amendments that were submitted to us to be considered. This legislation has some problems with it. I will admit it is not perfect. And I know there are some in the administration who have raised understandable concerns about a number of issues. But I believe that we can work very positively towards dealing with a number of those with the amendment process that has been put into place.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire about how much time remains on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 22½ minutes, and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time to speak on this rule.

One of the pleasures of serving on the Committee on International Relations is the spirit of bipartisanship that is exhibited by our committee chair, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS); and the give and take on the committee to deal with issues that truly should be bipartisan in nature that deal with international affairs of our country.

I heard the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules speak to the need for international leadership and some concerns he had in the United Nations. Well, I am sad that the rule that is before us today does not permit us to debate one of the most significant issues of international leadership that the United States should be involved with, and that deals with global warming.

□ 1115

It is sad that the Committee on Rules would not permit the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) to reinstate his amendment that passed with a bipartisan vote on our committee on perhaps the single most important environmental issue of our day, global warming.

I know that some of the consultants from the Republican establishment are talking about talking differently about the environment. We are not supposed to talk about global warming. It is climate change. We are supposed to have questions about whether or not it is occurring. The fact is that the consensus of the scientific community is that global warming is happening, it is impacted by human activity, and the United States is missing in action.

One can disagree with the approach of the administration turning its back on Kyoto and not providing an alternative. I am less concerned about what they are doing with Kyoto than the fact that we are not engaging the international community. I hope the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) will speak on this rule. It is critical.

The American public understands that the climate is changing. Global warming is impacting all of us. I do not think it is any accident that there were 562 tornadoes in the month of May, more than any month in record; that in India's pre-monsoon season, we are seeing a spike in temperature, leading to hundreds and hundreds of deaths; that the hottest 10 years in recorded history have occurred since 1990. We as Congress need to embrace this debate. We should not be afraid of it.

I am sad that the Committee on Energy and Commerce stripped this language from the bill. That is the right of their committee leadership, but we ought to have the right on the floor of this Chamber to deal with the single most important environmental issue of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that this rule be rejected, but I strongly hope that this is the last time that Congress is going to be missing in action on the issue on global climate change, that we will have free and open and forthright debate. The American public deserves it, not just on this bill but on each environmental issue that follows to deal with this matter.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New

Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), who is the distinguished chair of our Democratic Caucus. He had four amendments brought before the Committee on Rules, and three were not made in order.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

I am outraged that particularly two amendments which I sponsored and which passed with bipartisan support in the Committee on International Relations will be stripped from this bill by legislative tricks designed to protect Republicans so the American public cannot see their anti-Mexican and anti-environmental beliefs. Let me emphasize that these amendments passed the Committee on International Relations.

With their treatment of my Mexican migration amendment, Republicans have once again shown the real feelings of their party towards Hispanics. My amendment simply called on the United States to stop waiting and to support the President's own commitment in September, 2001, to ensure that migration is ''safe, orderly, legal and dignified.''

While we waited, 19 migrants from Mexico and Central American, including women and children, died this May from asphyxiation and heat stroke in a truck crammed with people. Over the past 5 years, more than 2,000 migrants have died crossing the U.S.-Mexican border. This is not a story of numbers and statistics. This is a story of real human beings literally dying.

As the President mentioned, it is in the economic and national security interests of this country to conclude, not to begin, we have been debating this and the administration has been negotiating this for 2 years, to conclude a migration agreement with Mexico.

My amendment recognized that Mexican immigrants make an invaluable contribution to this country, as immigrants have done throughout the history of the United States. Mexicans pick the fruit and vegetables that end up on our tables. They work in the service industry on the East and West Coast, they pluck chickens in Arkansas, and let us not forget that some who died in the war in Iraq were originally undocumented immigrants.

However, my amendment was gutted by the Ballenger amendment, which should be called the Halliburton amendment since it cynically links migration policy to oil. In fact, it says that any migration accord between our countries should also include an accord to open Petroleos Mexicanos, or PEMEX, to investment by U.S. oil companies. What, in God's name, does that have to do with migration policy?

But guess what? The Republicans finally figured out that their amendment was a huge error and made in order an amendment to strike the Ballenger provision and replace it with a watered-down version of my original amendment.

Imagine the reaction of the Republican leadership, not to speak of the diplomatic consequences faced by this administration, when it realized that my simple amendment using the President's language to advocate for a conclusion of a migration accord with Mexico was hijacked by Republican extremists and turned into a ''migration for Mexican oil'' agreement.

The callousness of that so-called Republican compassion equated U.S.-Mexico migration policy with U.S. access to Mexican oil, and Republicans were unable to spin their way out of this outrage but instead quickly provided another amendment that did away with this embarrassment but provided no further incentive to conclude, not convene, but conclude a migration accord.

Now I would like to turn to my amendment on global climate change and tell a similar story about an amendment that passed the Committee on International Relations in a bipartisan vote and was removed from this bill by bipartisan tricks designed to hide the Republicans anti-environmental stance on global climate change.

My global climate change amendment simply says that the United States should take the lead in the world in the fight against global warming, not Kyoto, not anything else, a lead in the world against global climate warming. This is not a new idea. This is an amendment which previously passed in the House. Both sides of Congress have supported it. This very amendment unanimously passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Democrats and Republicans alike, this year. And last week it was sent to the Committee on Energy and Commerce so it could be stripped from the bill. The real goal is to save Republicans from taking a public stand on global climate change.

What is the Republican leadership afraid of when it thwarts the bipartisan will of the Committee on International Relations or of any committee? Only through its procedural, back-door dealings was it able to reverse a decision made by this committee; and by doing so, it has staked out its opposition to the majority will of the committee, the American people and the world community.

In this Chamber of democratic ideals, the House of Representatives is supposed to be the place where we take a stand on the issues. If Members disagree with my amendments, that is fine. Then stand up and vote against them, but do not sneak them out of the bill. The American people should be able to find out where Members of this House stand on global climate change, stand on concluding a Mexican migration agreement. The truth is that Republicans are so embarrassed by their own policies they will not let these two provisions remain in the bill or even allow a vote on the floor, the marketplace of ideas, the greatest democratic institution in the world. That is fundamentally shameful. Therefore, this undemocratic rule, this unfair rule should be voted against, and I hope my colleagues will join us in doing so so we will have an opportunity to vote on global climate change in a real amendment or resolution on Mexican migration accord.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has offered a very strong statement, much of which I agree with. I believe that it is very important for us to vigorously pursue our goal of putting into place a comprehensive migration accord, and I think it is the right thing to do.

I will admit that I do not believe it was the correct thing for that Ballenger amendment to have been included in the legislation, and that is one of the reasons that in the role that I play on the Committee on Rules we chose to take and make the following amendment in order which I believe very responsibly deals with our shared goal and the goal that, as the gentleman pointed out, the President of the United States has on this.

The amendment reads as follows, ''(1) that the United States and Mexico should as soon as is practicable commence negotiations in an attempt to reach a migration accord that is as comprehensive as possible and which addresses the key issues of concern for both nations; and (2) that as part of any migration agreement between the United States and Mexico, the issues of extradition of violent criminals and law enforcement cooperation between the two nations be addressed.''

Mr. Speaker, I have raised these issues of concern on the issue of extradition, and I have been working with my California colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), on this issue dealing with a particular case in California. I do believe, as the gentleman said, the President does want to responsibly move ahead with this.

On the second issue of global warming, I have no doubt that this administration is very committed to dealing with that. We made a determination when 75 amendments had been submitted to us that we would include 42 of them, so there has been nothing secretive about this process. It is very open. We, in fact, are discussing it right now on the floor of the House of Representatives.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would be here lauding and applauding your initiative on the Mexico migration agreement if in fact you would have a single but very powerful difference in your wording; and that is, instead of, after 2 years of significant talks and negotiations, speaking about a commencement, that we would be

talking about a conclusion. Then I would be here supporting your amendment.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I hope we bring about an expeditious conclusion to this. Obviously, that is our goal. Secretary Powell has indicated his support of our amendment, and we know full well that he wants to deal with this.

I want to say this issue of immigration is something that we can address in a bipartisan way. I would urge my colleagues to realize that as we proceed to work to pass this rule and move ahead with this legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), a distinguished member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, control of one's reproductive autonomy is a fundamental human right. But the basic right is meaningless without the knowledge and means to exercise reproductive autonomy. The United Nations Population Fund, known as UNFPA, works with governments and nongovernmental organizations in over 140 countries, supporting programs that help men, women and young people to plan their families, undergo pregnancy and childbirth safely, avoid sexually transmitted disease, including HIV/AIDS, and to combat violence against women.

Each of these principled goals is embraced by the United States and many countries around the world. In fact, as we have heard throughout the Presidential trip to Africa, the President has committed $15 billion to fight the pandemic of HIV/AIDS on the African continent.

The Committee on International Relations recently adopted an amendments by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) which would facilitate U.S. contributions to the United Nations Family Planning Fund. The Crowley provision clarifies current law which bars U.S. funds from any international organization the President determines ''supports or participates in the management'' of forced abortion or sterilization. Crowley's proposal provides strict safeguards against the use of any kind of coercion in U.S.-funded family planning programs; second, clarifies the current law to enable U.S. funding to be used to help to end coercion in China; and provides badly needed maternal health and other services in poor countries.

□ 1130

This language is necessary because Congress authorized U.S. funds for UNFPA, but the President refused to release them. Just last year, the President blocked $34 million for UNFPA activities around the world. The opposition to this funding is premised on the false notion that UNFPA supports coercive abortions in places like China. UNFPA does not provide abortion services anywhere in the world. Not one penny of UNFPA funding is used to promote abortion. Unfortunately, this fallacy diverts attention from the real issues and blurs underlying opposition to comprehensive family planning. All UNFPA activities are based solely on voluntary participation. UNFPA rejects coercion in any form in its activities and works to end the coercive practices of others.

The Chinese Government's so-called one-child policy unofficially involves some coercive abortion and involuntary sterilization practices. The United States and United Nations do not tolerate these practices. We stand on the side of human rights and work to put an end to these abuses. The U.N. population fund program in China was developed with the express purpose of moving China away from coercion and toward delivery of voluntary reproductive health services to its people, just as it did in India in the early 1990s.

UNFPA has operated in 32 Chinese counties and the government of China has agreed in each one of these counties it would lift all birth quotas and recruitment targets; improve the delivery of voluntary family planning information and services; eliminate the use of coercive measures; allow independent confirmation that targets and quotas have been lifted; allow independent investigation of any reports of coercion and suspension of the UNFPA program in any county where violations have occurred; and allow regular independent monitoring to ensure compliance with the principles of informed choice and voluntary participation.

This is a remarkable achievement. No Main Street human rights organization has ever accused UNFPA of being complicit in China's human rights violations. In fact, in May 2002 President Bush sent a three-member State Department team to China to investigate claims against the work there. The team found ''no evidence that UNFPA has knowingly supported or participated in the management of a program of coercive abortion in the People's Republic of China.'' The team recommended that the $34 million which has already been appropriated be released to UNFPA.

Cutting off funding harms millions of women and children in the poorest nations on Earth and does nothing to help women in China. The officials of UNFPA estimate that the loss of the $34 million would prevent 2 million unwanted pregnancies, nearly 800,000 induced abortions, 4,700 maternal deaths, nearly 60,000 cases of maternal illness or disability, and 77,000 infant and child deaths. Just this morning, The New York Times published an editorial strongly supporting the Crowley language and strongly opposing efforts to remove that language.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the editorial for the RECORD. I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the efforts of UNFPA to provide the meaningful exercise of fundamental human rights. And I vehemently oppose any efforts to defund UNFPA which would result in harm to the health of women, men and children around the world. Please vote against the Smith amendment which would strip the Crowley language.

[From the New York Times, July 15, 2003]

POPULATION—CONTROL POLITICS

The House of Representatives faces a crucial vote today affecting the health of women in 140 poor countries. Through the authorization of the State Department budget, the House can restore tens of millions of dollars in vital American aid for the United Nations Population Fund or, for a second year in a row, cut it off in the mistaken belief that the fund colludes with coerced abortions in China.

The Population Fund is the largest agency in the world focused on women's reproductive health. There was a brief, unremarked ceremony yesterday in the Afghan capital, Kabul, that illustrates what the fund does. With help from the fund, the Khair Khana Hospital, once filthy and overcrowded, was reopened with a large staff, modern equipment and the possibility of helping Afghan women with complicated pregnancies deliver their babies safely.

The Population Fund helps women give birth safely. It fights such debilitations as obstetric fistula, a hideous and difficult complication in pregnancy. Indeed, it is just the kind of organization and work the United States should be supporting. Instead, conservative Republicans stripped the fund of American support last year because of false accusations that the U.N. Population Fund has either stood by or helped with coerced abortions in China.

Today's vote on the State Department budget includes a restoration of the organization's funds, thanks to an amendment by Representative Joseph Crowley, a New York Democrat from Queens. Opponents, who mistakenly believe—or cynically advertise—that they are protecting Chinese women and unborn babies, want to kill the amendment.

The opponents, led by Christopher Smith, a New Jersey Republican, unfairly describe the Population Fund as an organization with a ''long history of complicity in human rights violations'' engaged in an ''attack on women overseas.'' These are irresponsible, unsubstantiated accusations. They have helped persuade numerous members of Congress that it is wiser to deny the organization American support.

The fact is that Population Fund performs no abortions and is working to end coerced abortion in China. An American investigating team sent by the administration last year found ''no evidence'' that the fund ''has supported or participated in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization in China.'' In previous years, Congress has supported the fund with the stipulation that no American money be spent in China. That is unnecessary, but if that is what it takes to get the fund the $50 million it deserves from Congress this year, it is a compromise that should be explored.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), who had a very important amendment last night that was not made in order.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlemen for yielding me this

time. I wish to speak today on three amendments before the Committee on Rules, two of which were approved for the debate today and one which was not. I want to thank the Chair of the Committee on Rules for his work in supporting an amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) that would urge reconsideration of Mexico's extradition policy which currently precludes the extradition of Mexican nationals to face charges in the United States that may carry life imprisonment or the death penalty.

The addition by the Mexico Supreme Court of the life imprisonment clause fundamentally means that, for the most serious crimes in the United States, we are unable to extradite those who flee south of the border to seek refuge. That is not in our interest. It is certainly not in the interest of the people of Mexico to have fugitives from justice free south of our border.

Second, I want to thank the committee for their approval of an amendment that I offered calling attention to the problem that we have had in our nonproliferation efforts to obtain the assistance of Russian scientists, to bring Russian scientists into the United States for the purpose of improving our nonproliferation joint efforts. These have met obstacles, in part understandable as a result of September 11, but we cannot allow the September 11 visa changes to get in the way of our broad security interests by bringing these scientists in who are working on nonproliferation itself.

But most significantly, I want to comment about the one that got away and that was an amendment that I had offered calling for an investigation into the claim that Iraq was trying to obtain uranium from Niger, the claim that made it into the State of the Union address. There is a request on the Senate side, it is a bipartisan request, that the Inspector General of the CIA and the Inspector General of the State Department work together on an independent investigation of how that claim rose to the level of the State of the Union, now something the White House says was not substantiated and did not belong in that address.

This is, I think, critical for three reasons. First, the Congress made the most important decision it can undertake, the decision to authorize the use of force on the basis of our intelligence. Second, in the ongoing war on terrorism, it is essential that we have good intelligence if we are to prevent another September 11. If we have a problem with our intelligence agencies, we have got to find out about it and now. Finally, our standing, our credibility around the world, the willingness of other nations to cooperate with the U.S. in the war on terrorism will be dependent on whether they feel they can rely on what we represent to them about our intelligence and the quality of our intelligence.

As this is perhaps the most graphic example of intelligence gone awry, it is something that merits our most serious investigation and attention. I recognize that the intelligence committees in the Senate and the House are working on this issue, and they are doing good work. However, as the Senate concluded on a bipartisan basis, this investigation by the two IGs does not detract from what the Senate committee or the House committees are undertaking, but in fact supplies that information to both committees. This is complementary to the work that is already going on and I think it is essential.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I congratulate my friend on his statement and I believe that we clearly do have the shared goal of trying to address that concern that was raised from the State of the Union message. The reason that we did not make the amendment in order was very simply that we do believe that the work that is being done by both the Intelligence Committee in the House and the Intelligence Committee in the Senate will effectively address this. I know that the ranking minority member of the Intelligence Committee in the Senate, Senator ROCKEFELLER, has already had a lengthy discussion as I heard on the radio this morning with the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet; and I know that this is an issue that will be addressed in their committee tomorrow. I believe that we will be seeing attention focused on it within our Intelligence Committee. I know that, in a bipartisan way, concern has been addressed from members of the Intelligence Committee that the establishment of this could in fact play a role in undermining them. That was the reason that we did not make the amendment in order.

But I want to say to my friend that I do believe that since the ratio was 2 to 1, I hope that my friend will come down in support of the rule based on that. Two amendments he liked, one he did not; so I hope that he will join with us in supporting the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I went to Oslo, Norway, and met with Palestinian women and women from the Knesset in Israel. The overwhelming impact was the positive input and collaboration that came about by women being involved in the peacekeeping process. I am disappointed that the Committee on Rules in its wisdom could not have been more generous to be able to include language that would have encouraged the utilization of women in international peacekeeping matters around the world. We have seen the impact, the difference. We know that women understand the loss of life and the enormity of the impact of crises involving war against families. I look forward to working with the chairman and ranking member of the committees to engage in that process.

I think it is also disappointing that we do not have language that speaks pointedly to the crisis in Liberia where thousands are dying and a million have already died, to encourage the White House to move more expeditiously as it relates to a peacekeeping/humanitarian organization there in Liberia. What is the hesitancy to wait on the 3 million that have died in the Congo or the 1 million that have died in Rwanda?

I am also frustrated that we do not understand that a little island close to our shores, Haiti, is literally dying on the vine and that the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) was not made in order to provide assistance immediately to Haiti. It is certainly disappointing that we have not had an opportunity to meet with the President and to move forward the resources that are needed to help rebuild Haiti, a nation that engaged and helped us in the Revolutionary War. It is imperative that we begin to look at those issues.

And then I would say that the Committee on Rules did itself an enormous disservice in not being able to attack head-on the credibility that this Nation now faces with respect to the reliance on our intelligence by the lack of accountability on the Niger reference, that Iraq was about to buy uranium from Niger and do it imminently, if you will, to suggest that we needed to have a preemptive attack against Iraq. I think it is ludicrous that this body would not put forward an amendment that would allow the truth to be told to the American people: who had the information about the purchase in Africa, why was the comment in the President's speech, why did he use the word ''recently,'' and whose hands can be found on this information.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who chairs our Committee on Veterans Affairs' and has long worked on so many of these very important issues.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, later on today when this bill comes up for consideration, I, along with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), will be offering an amendment to strike language that is in the underlying bill, the Crowley amendment, which was adopted very narrowly in committee. The Crowley amendment would fundamentally change the Kemp-Kasten amendment that has been in effect for 18 years. The Kemp-Kasten language is anticoercion language that says very simply that our country will not contribute money to any organization that supports or participates in the management of a coercive population control

program. Under the Kemp-Kasten language last year, Secretary of State Colin Powell, after his due diligence, made a finding that took the money from the UNFPA, the U.N. population fund, and sought to reprogram each and every dollar of that to an organization or to programs that provided family planning or maternal health care programming. Secretary of State Colin Powell said:

''The PRC has in place a regime of severe penalties on women who have unapproved births.'' Let me just remind my colleagues, in China you have got to get permission by the government in order to have a child. They have unapproved births and approved births. If you are unapproved, if you are out of plan, as they say, if you have an illegal child, a heavy fine is imposed upon the mother until she gets an abortion. If she has that child, somehow escapes the family-planning cadres, she then is severely criticized as well as fined. Sometimes up to 6 years' worth of her salary and her husband's is taken by the government as part of that fine. Secretary Powell goes on to say that the regime plainly operates to coerce pregnant women to have abortions in order to avoid the penalties; and, therefore, this amounts to a program of coercive abortion. He points out, and I quote, ''UNFPA's support of, and involvement in, China's population planning activities allows the Chinese government to implement more effectively its program of coercive abortion.''

Let us not rig this program, this test, Mr. Speaker. The Crowley amendment would fundamentally change this anticoercion language that we have had on the books for some 18 years. I ask my colleagues, those who support abortion and those who do not, there should at least be a consensus that coercion is absolutely unconscionable and unacceptable and we will not in any way directly or indirectly facilitate its use.

□ 1145

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we all remember when this President came before our House and, in a burst of excessive honesty, told us perceptively that we faced an axis of evil: three nations posed a great threat to the United States. His phraseology deliberately harkened back to the 1940s when we also faced a tripartite axis of evil. But what if President Roosevelt had led us in an invasion of Italy, forced Mussolini into hiding, and pretty much left it at that—ignoring what was going on in Berlin and Tokyo?

It is easier to find weapons of mass destruction in Iraq than it is to find a policy toward Iran here in Washington.

So I went to the Committee on Rules with two amendments. One I identified as an important amendment with 18 cosponsors, including the gentleman from New Jersey who just spoke, including our ranking member, including senior Republicans and Democrats on the Committee on International Relations. This amendment would deprive the tyrants in Tehran of money and would provide money for those fighting for democracy.

Then I put forward a second amendment which I clearly identified as unimportant, something that could be ignored by the Committee on Rules if they chose, a mere resolution.

What did the Committee on Rules do? They killed the important amendment. They killed a chance to really discuss our policy toward Iran. And then they took the sense of Congress amendment, stripped out a little part of it, and put it before this House. They did nothing to save the House's time. We are still going to debate one of my amendments dealing with our policy toward Iran—the unimportant amendment. But the important amendment will not come before this House.

Today in Tehran terrorist acts are being planned. Iran is the number one state sponsor of terrorism according to our State Department. Today in Tehran they plan to complete nuclear weapons within a few years. I believe those nuclear weapons will be smuggled into American cities and either exploded or used to blackmail America. When that happens our constituents will ask, what did the People's House do to prevent the empowerment of tyranny in Tehran? The answer will be, the Committee on Rules would not let us do very much of anything, but they would let us vote on sending a good luck card to the students fighting for democracy in Tehran.

Please vote against this rule and give us a chance to debate the most important foreign policy issue before us today, and that is Iran and its nuclear weapons.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has 1¼ minutes left; the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 1 minute left.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from California whether he has any additional speakers?

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would say it is my intention to close the debate here single-handedly.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I will close single-handedly for our side, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would urge my colleagues to vote no on this rule. It seems to be a radical thought in this House for us to actually spend whatever time it takes to debate the issues. I cannot understand why in the People's House the Republican leadership seems to be working overtime to try to deny us the right to debate the issues that people care about. Seventy-seven amendments were offered in the Committee on Rules last night. Forty-two were made in order, of which only twelve are Democratic amendments. We can do much better. And there are some very important issues.

We heard about the Schiff amendment which deals with the African uranium issue. I know there are some people in the White House and some people in the leadership here in this House who do not want to discuss this issue, but it is important because it gets to the issue of credibility. It is about whether the American people can have confidence in what their government tells them. It is about whether what the United States says is respected around the world.

So if some of my colleagues do not want to ask the tough questions or get to the truth, then fine. They can vote no on the Schiff amendment. But at least give us the opportunity to vote up or down on some of these very important issues.

The American people deserve an open process. They deserve a process much better than what we are getting right now. This rule, unfortunately, does not allow us to debate a lot of very important issues; and I would urge my colleagues in the strongest possible terms to vote no.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is a very fair and balanced rule. As was said, 75 amendments were submitted to us; 42 of those 75 were made in order. We are going to be debating a wide range of issues.

The question that was just raised by my friend from Massachusetts is one that will be very effectively addressed by the majority and the minority on our House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. To try to portray a concern about that other amendment is partisan. I will tell the Members that there are minority members on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence who believe that we did the right thing here.

There are concerns that exist with this legislation, but I do believe with we should allow for a full debate, and we are going to be doing that. The establishment of the International Leadership Act, very important; dealing responsibly with the issue of migration, very important; dealing with the millennium challenge issue which the President has put forward and enjoys bipartisan support; these are all important issues that we will be able to move forward with once we pass this rule and pass this legislation.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule.

While I am extremely pleased that my amendment to help women and girls in Afghanistan was included, I am disappointed that an amendment to help all women and girls in MCA eligible countries was not ruled in order.

My amendment would have simply ensured that the equal rights of women and girls are

included in the Millennium Challenge Account principal objectives.

Statistics show that when we help a woman out of poverty, we help her family out of poverty.

Women are key to sustainable development—a primary goal of the MCA.

Countries that actively discriminate against women and girls should not become eligible to receive MCA funding.

If we had included women and girls as part of the principal MCA objectives, we would have made a much more powerful difference in ensuring that our programs have the greatest impact.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the rule.

Mr. DREIER. 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. MCGOVERN. 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.

Pursuant to clauses 8 and 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 316 will be followed by a 5-minute vote on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2330, which was debated yesterday.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 201, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 360]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Ballance
Becerra
Bell
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Majette
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—11

Berkley
Conyers
Gephardt
Hayworth
Janklow
Jefferson
Millender-McDonald
Myrick
Owens
Oxley
Pitts

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW) (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1214

Messrs. RANGEL, SPRATT, and MARSHALL, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. NEUGEBAUER changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to recommit was laid on the table.

BURMESE FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2330, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2330, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 2, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballance
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Collins
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay