McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Fazio
Forbes
Gonzalez
Goss
Hefner
John
Metcalf
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Riggs
Royce
Schumer
Stokes

□ 1146

Mr. DOOLEY of California and Mr. CALLAHAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4569, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 542 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 542

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4569) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 1(b) of rule X, clause 2(l)(6) of rule XI, or clause 7 of rule XXI 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 for a period not to exceed five hours. The bill shall be considered as read through page 141, line 18. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 or 6 of rule XXI are waived. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except: (1) pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate; (2) amendments printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII; and (3) amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each of the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, may be offered only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, 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, and 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 the amendments printed in the report are waived. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield half of our time to the gentleman from Dayton, Ohio (Mr. HALL), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I might consume. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that House Resolution 542 is a modified open rule. It provides for the consideration of H.R. 4569, which is the Foreign Operations and Export Financing appropriation bill for fiscal year 1999.

At the outset, I would note that the rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI, and that concerns the unauthorized and legislative provisions in an appropriation bill, and it also waives clause 6 of rule XXI concerning reappropriations.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The bill will then be open for amendment under the 5-minute rule for a period of 5 hours, and so this bill will be completed today.

Amendments to be offered must have been printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII. Pro forma amendments for purposes of debate are also in order.

The rule also makes in order five specific amendments, each one to be offered at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, and subject to debate equally divided and controlled for a specified period of time. And those times are listed here if Members need to look at it.

Each of these amendments shall be considered as read and must be offered by the Member designated in the report. There cannot be a designee or a substitute. All points of order against these five specific amendments are waived.

The rule provides for votes to be stacked or clustered so as to expedite procedures here on the floor and to permit Members to plan their schedules with some degree of certainty during this long day coming. In each such cluster of votes, a 15-minute vote will precede the various 5-minute votes that follow, in order to give Members time to come to the floor.

The rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

And, finally, Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 542 waives clause 1(b) of rule X, which relates to explanations in the report or rescissions on transfers of unexpended balances.

The rule also waives clause 2(l)(6) of Rule XI, concerning 3-day availability of the report, and also clause 7 of rule XXI, concerning a 3-day availability of printing requirements.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 542 will permit the expeditious consideration of this bill and is very much the same as the rules which have governed consideration of the foreign appropriation bills over the last 5 or 10 years. I call on Members to support the rule. It is a good rule.

Turning now to the bill itself, I would offer just a few brief comments.

This is a $12.5 billion bill, which represents only about eight-tenths of 1 percent of the Federal budget. But what an important eight-tenths of 1 percent that is; nothing less than the foreign policy of the United States.

The Committee on Appropriations is always tasked with striking a difficult balance between scarce resources on the one hand and a great number of pressing and conflicting needs on the other hand. But by their very nature

and their importance, the kind of issues that are dealt with in this bill tend to be less forgiving of mistakes and miscalculations than those in most other bills.

And, of course, this legislation has no built-in constituency for Members of Congress. It is a sobering realization that weighs heavily on the appropriators, and I believe the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), his ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and the whole subcommittee and their staff are to be thanked for the good job they have done on a very difficult, difficult bill.

Certainly in this bill, as in all bills, there are things individual Members will find fault with. There are elements that I disagree with personally. But the appropriators have brought us a bill that deserves the very careful attention of every Member. And once the rule process is over today, we should allow the House to work its will and we will come up with a good piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this may be one of my last opportunities to address the House on the subject of foreign policy. I served on the Foreign Affairs Committee for 6 years prior to becoming chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the world has changed immensely since I came here as a freshman Member in 1978, 20 years ago. Unquestionably, the most world-shaking event since then was the end of the Cold War and the simultaneous disintegration of the Soviet Union, all for the good of mankind. But the world remains a very dangerous place, and we should not forget that.

□ 1200

Saddam Hussein provides ample proof that a dictator need not be guided by a universalist ideology in order to pose a threat to our country and to our allies. Personal megalomania can be more than enough.

Let us never be lulled into complacency or a false sense of security. The world will always be a dangerous place, at least for so long as some people and some nations are free and the others are not. And there are those that would like to take away our freedoms. America must always be willing to pay the price of leadership, and that includes moral leadership, both personally and as a Nation. We must always keep in mind Alexander Hamilton's solemn warning that a Nation which prefers disgrace to danger is prepared to lose its freedom, and they would deserve to do so.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, I urge support for this rule. It is a fair rule. It does deal with the issue of abortion as many of my colleagues know. But we have been very careful to make sure that whether Members are of a philosophy of pro-choice or pro-life that there will be a fair debate on this issue and both sides can enter into that debate.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for yielding me the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is a modified open rule which will allow consideration of H.R. 4569, which is the foreign operations appropriation bill for fiscal year 1999.

As my colleague from New York described, this rule will provide one hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. Though this is technically a modified open rule, I want to make sure my colleagues understand that it severely limits the opportunities for floor debate. The rule requires amendments to be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is a significant limitation considering that the bill was reported two days ago and has been available for only a short period of time. The amendment process is limited to five hours. Again, this is a significant limitation. Under the rule, time spent on voting is counted toward the time cap. This is a controversial bill and many Members will want to offer amendments and participate in floor debate. Under the time cap, some Members may not have the chance to offer their amendments because time will run out.

The rule permits five specific amendments that would otherwise be out of order. Only one of these is a Democratic amendment, even though many Democrats asked the Committee on Rules for waivers. The rule waives the requirement for the committee report to be available for three days prior to floor consideration. I realize the necessity for moving quickly on this bill, but waiving this rule makes it difficult for the public and even House Members to get timely information about the bill. I checked this morning and it is my understanding the committee report is not even available on the World Wide Web.

The bill contains many good provisions. It increases UNICEF funding by $5 million over last year's level. It restores an administration cut of $47 million to the Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund, bringing spending back to last year's level. It also increases Peace Corps funding above last year's level. However, the overall spending levels in the bill are inadequate to handle our international commitments and our responsibility to assist the poor and needy of the world. The bill makes deep cuts in assistance to Russia and the World Bank's Global Environmental Facility, and it reduces aid to Israel and Egypt.

Overall, the bill reduces spending by 2.4 percent below last year's level, and almost 9 percent below the Administration's request. The bill does not include the full Administration request for $18 billion for the International Monetary Fund.

Regretfully, the rule denies a Democratic request to make in order an amendment adding $14.5 billion in credit for the International Monetary Fund. This would bring total IMF funding to the level requested by the Administration. Withholding funds is dangerous because the IMF is already spread thin as a result of the financial crises in Asia, Russia and Latin America. Unless checked, these international economic problems could seriously affect our own economy.

One of the most disappointing provisions in the bill cuts international disaster assistance $55 million below the Administration request. The International Disaster Assistance program helps victims of natural and man-made disasters. Projects funded under this program include airlifting relief supplies to disaster-stricken people in remote locations, supporting supplementary feeding centers for severely undernourished children; immunizing dislocated populations against disease; and providing water purification to reduce deaths from cholera following floods. This is the type of foreign assistance Americans most strongly support and we should be increasing it, not cutting it.

I personally have witnessed our humanitarian relief programs working in countries where wars, famines and disasters threaten the lives of thousands of innocent people. I have seen desperately malnourished babies brought back to life in emergency feeding centers. I have seen people whose farms were destroyed given seeds and tools to feed themselves and rebuild their lives. I have seen children lost to their families in the chaos of war reunited with their mothers and fathers. Everywhere I have seen the gratitude in the eyes of the people we have helped and the respect we have earned as humanitarian leaders.

Later, when the House begins the amending process, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and I will offer a bipartisan amendment to restore $30 million to the International Disaster Assistance account. The money would come from funds freed up when the full Committee on Appropriations cut a program designed to halt North Korea's potential to produce nuclear weapons. I share the concerns that led to these cuts, but I hope that Congress will support the Senate version which gives the President the authority to keep our 1994 agreement with North Korea after certifying North Korea's compliance with it. That is in our national interest, and it is the route supported by our allies in South Korea who would bear the brunt of any attack by North Korea.

Because of the cuts in this bill, the Administration has threatened a veto. Unfortunately there is not much we can do to improve this bill because of the severe funding constraints we are working under. Still I hope that we can offer some improvements during the amendment process.

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

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

At the outset I mentioned my good friend from Dayton, OH (Mr. TONY HALL). He is a good friend, but I think he protests too much when he complains that this rule would not give Members fair opportunity to debate the bill. He was complaining that some Democrat Members were not permitted to have their amendments made in order. The truth is we denied, I think, eight Democrat Members. Most of those Members had not only filed late, but also they were asking for waivers beyond the normal rules of the House. Not only did we deny those eight, we denied 13 Republicans as well. We should be following the germaneness rules of the House. We have certainly tried to do that.

Make no mistake about it, this rule is an open rule. This rule allows any Member of this House over the next seven hours to come to the floor and, under normal rules of the House, offer cutting amendments, they can offer offsetting amendments, they can offer limitation amendments, they can offer striking amendments. And that is what would happen if we brought this bill directly to the floor.

Now, the question was made, ''Well, we won't have enough time to consider all of these amendments.'' I will just tell my colleagues, seven hours from now, we will not have used all the time. We will not use the full five hours. We will not use the full time on this debate on this rule, or even the one hour of general debate. There is hardly anybody here to speak on this matter today. It makes me concerned that people would say that this rule is somehow being very restrictive. It is a totally open rule. I hope everybody supports it.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would just simply say that we have 40 amendments that are printed in the RECORD and we have another five amendments with waivers and we have five hours to consider this. The report was not even out by this morning relative to many of the things that were done in this particular appropriation bill. Many of us are legislating and thinking about a bill of which we do not know a lot about. As a result of that, we feel we do not have the time really to evaluate it and have debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. I want to share the view of the gentleman from New York. It is regrettable that we do not have more people here. This is a very important bill. As the gentleman observed, it is a small amount of money. But it is critically important as the world's leader tries to implement policy. And it is lamentable that we do not have more Members engaged.

I rise today in opposition to this rule. I understand the Chairman's view. But the rule does not provide, in my opinion, for certain essential things. First and foremost from my perspective, the rule does not permit debate and action on funding of the IMF. That is because the rule does not protect an amendment restoring the IMF's funding as it would necessarily have to, in order to be sustained against a point of order.

It is critical, Mr. Speaker, that we fully fund the International Monetary Fund this year. Congress failed to fund the IMF at sufficient levels in Fiscal Year 1998. Those of us who support funding the IMF agreed to wait until a supplemental appropriations bill came before the House. We were guaranteed that the remaining funding for the IMF would be included in a supplemental. It has not been, contrary to that guarantee. Now IMF opponents are trying, once again, to prevent us from providing the full $18 billion that is needed for the IMF.

I also want to support an amendment that will be offered on section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. Last week, the full Appropriations Committee passed an amendment which struck section 907. I opposed this amendment. We find ourselves in a situation where Azerbaijan has for 9 years blockaded Nagorno-Karabagh and Armenia from fuel, food, medicine, and other vital goods. I believe it is critically important that we reinstate section 907, and therefore will support an amendment which will be offered to do so.

I will be joined, I know, by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and others who have been there and know firsthand the situation.

I appreciate what the Chairman of the Committee on Rules is saying in terms of some aspects of this rule being open, but I do not believe that the rule goes far enough to allow us to address critically important issues as we end this session. I would hope that the rule would be modified to give greater latitude for debate and amendment.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. The previous speaker is one of the most astute members of this body. He is of the highest integrity. I like him very much. He is a good Member. He always does his due diligence.

Therefore, I have to be a little critical of him on the IMF issue, because the gentleman knows that we cannot make an amendment in order; it would require a Budget Act waiver. We are not going to get ourselves back into that situation. If we want to consider that on a separate bill, that is fine, but it cannot be a part of this legislation.

Second, the gentleman can be relieved to know that he would have that opportunity on section 907.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. It is my understanding that the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has indicated that this matter of IMF funding will probably be addressed in the conference. What I am saying is I hope that that is the case. It is important that that be done. But if that is going to be done, presumably, therefore, there is the contemplation that this issue will in fact be voted on by this House. It may modify or affect, as the gentleman knows, the rules under which we do it and the points of order that may or may not be able to be raised.

I understand what the gentleman is saying. I am pleased at that. All I am saying is this would be a more timely fashion to do it and send a better message, in my opinion, to all the world.

□ 1215

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the views of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). Certainly, representing an agricultural area with a depressed farm economy, we are keenly interested in full funding of the International Monetary Fund. The signal that sends to the economies in other parts of the world that are such important destinations for American agricultural products cannot be under- or cannot be overestimated. We must move in that respect in a very speedy and deliberate fashion.

I would like to raise a different issue, however, with respect to this legislation, this bill and other matters that we are considering today, this week and next week; and that is, where is the budget resolution? I am pleased that we are able to take up the appropriations bills, I am pleased that we have a continuing resolution so we do not face a shutdown of Federal agencies come October 1, but I am very disheartened by the fact that here we are, 13 days from the beginning of the next fiscal year, and we do not yet have a budget resolution that has been passed by this Congress.

This is a disgrace. We have set up a budget procedure by law. We have told ourselves that we are supposed to follow this. We have told the American people that we will follow this. But tragically, we have gone for 5 months and 2 days past the deadline for having a budget resolution, and we have nothing to show for it. We have to coble together a rule in the Committee on Rules so that these appropriations bills can come to the floor without violating the Budget Act.

The time has passed for us to do a budget resolution. When the budget came up initially in this body, the Blue Dog Coalition had a budget alternative that it wished to have made in order. We were denied the opportunity to present that budget. That budget is fairly close to what I understand is the

operating procedure that is being followed by the leadership.

But the question is: How can the American people trust the United States Congress to fulfill its responsibility in balancing the budget and responsibly dealing with requests for additional funds for disasters, for Bosnia, the International Monetary Fund, for a number of other things, when we do not put together a budget, an elemental document that businesses, local governments, State governments operate with, not only in this country but around the world? It is hard for us to tell other countries how they should get their financial houses in order when we cannot even do a budget resolution in Congress.

I think it is a humbling situation for us to be in, and I urge that the leadership of this body forthwith direct us towards a budget resolution.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), a very dynamic second-term Member of this Congress. He comes to us from the district of a great old friend of mine, Dan Quayle, and he is from Fort Wayne.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this rule, even though two of my preprinted amendments are not going to be allowed. There are many of us who would have liked to have some cracks at the IMF. We understand that with the struggles in the agricultural community, that we really probably do not have any choice at this point but to fund an organization that has been highly secretive, that refuses to cooperate with Congress, that it is not clear it is not wasting money throughout the world. But they have us over a barrel. The question is, how much money are they going to extort out of us? And while we might be able to live with the amount in this bill, it needs to be a minimal amount until they start to cooperate.

So it is not only my amendments, but other amendments on this side of the aisle that we wanted to have in order, and are disappointed that we are not able to do that.

I particularly want to speak briefly on the amendments that I wanted to offer. I have a bill in, cosponsored by the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, that would say as part of us giving money to the International Monetary Fund, if we are going to use American taxpayer dollars, that the countries that get the money from the International Monetary Fund should cooperate with American investigations in the campaign finance violations, much like American banks have to do.

As I have discussed in special order speeches this week, it is critical for my colleagues and for the American public to understand that the investigation of illegal contributions from foreign nationals to American campaigns, with the likely intent to influence American foreign policy, have been stonewalled by the lack of cooperation of witnesses who have critical testimony and documentation. Many of these persons are foreign nationals associated with persons who have already been indicted or convicted by Federal authorities in connection with these illegal schemes. Seventy-nine witnesses have taken the fifth amendment, and more significantly to this particular bill, 18 have fled the country or are avoiding investigators by hiding in foreign countries.

Mr. James Riady is the deputy chairman of Lippo Group in Indonesia, and investigators from the other body have suggested that he has a, quote, ''long-term relationship with the Chinese intelligence agency. Riady is also reported to have called DNC fund-raiser, John Huang, our man in the American government,'' end quote. He is now living in Indonesia and refuses to cooperate with investigators.

Ng Lap Seng, a Chinese Communist Party official, wired more than $900,000 in money to Charlie Trie for conduit contributions. He lives in Macao and has refused to be interviewed.

Ted Sioeng and his network of business associates gave $400,000 to the Democratic Party and 150,000 to Republicans.

All these witnesses have refused to cooperate.

My amendment would have expressed our intent that no country should receive American taxpayer assistance to the IMF unless it is cooperating fully with American investigations, both with Congress and the Justice Department, so we can find out whether our elections have been influenced by foreign governments; whether there has been a compromise in our government and in our leadership of our country of decisions, because of foreign money. And the best way to find out these things is often by tracking the money. And when we track the money in the New York banks and when we track the money through those international countries that are cooperating, and then run into stonewalling in other countries, why should our taxpayer dollars go to these countries to help bail out their economies if they are not going to cooperate with us when we are trying find out whether our government has been put up for sale? It is a slap in the face to the American taxpayer for these countries to demand our financial assistance and then slam the closed door on our investigations into critical matters affecting our own national security.

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

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I say to my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), that yes, I do strongly support his amendment, and I would like to have made it in order, which I could have done. However, in doing that, we would have had to waive various rules. We would then have had to perhaps give the same consideration to other Republicans and other Democrats, and it just would not have been fair to do that. I think the gentleman understands.

Let me just further state that when it comes to the IMF, a lot of us have very serious concerns about it; not against the IMF itself, but against their policies. One of their policies is to go around the world, suggesting and demanding that these countries which are going to receive prospective loans raise taxes.

Well that goes against everything we believe in, and that is not going to get the free market economies going in these countries. They are going to have to cut taxes, they are going to have to shrink the government and go to a free market economy.

The other thing is accountability. This arrogant IMF organization refuses to be accountable to even the United States of America, which pays about 20 percent or more of the annual contribution to IMF. And I just want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the committee, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and others for the reforms that they have written into this legislation, because that goes a long way towards forcing the IMF to be accountable to the people and the taxpayers that put up the money. I want to commend the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. SOUDER. Reclaiming my time, I too want to congratulate the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for the progress that we have made and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) for his support of this legislation. I understand the difficulty here. I hope indeed, if in some kind of conference report or end-of-the-year deal there is a bump-up in IMF spending, that we also can look at some of these other amendments that Members were deeply concerned about and the other matters that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) raised.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to House Resolution 642. My argument today is not with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules. He is just doing his job. My argument today is with the leadership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly a year since the request for more IMF contribution has come to the Congress, and in that time while the other body has acted, the House has continued to fail to act. And what has happened? We have seen more nations fall to contagion, the problems spread to Russia,

to Latin America. We have seen the U.S. stock market erase all the gains for the year. We have seen U.S. economic growth decline by at least 2 percent because of the Asian situation. We have seen the stock market today drop 200 points because of the spread to Latin America, not necessarily based on fundamentals but based on a lack of confidence in the markets, and particularly in emerging markets. And it comes right back here.

Now just a couple of weeks ago, we saw the chairman of the Federal Reserve give this speech in Berkeley, California, where he said the U.S. economy would not be isolated from this, and now the problems of a potential world economic crisis are lapping, the waves of it are lapping on the shores of America.

Now I want to point out to my Republican colleagues the irresponsibility in this area. Two years ago, when we came close to defaulting on the U.S. debt, my Republican colleagues held up a comment from the firm of George Soros and his lead analyst saying that technical default in U.S. treasuries would not be that big of a deal, and certainly it would. Unfortunately we did not do that. But Mr. Soros testified before the Committee on Banking and Financial Services the other day, and here is what he said:

> Congress bears an awesome responsibility for keeping the IMF alive. I am convinced that the attitude of the Congress is already an important element in the failure to deal with Russia.

Their own person saying this.

Now we can go through the politics, and we can talk about the problems with the IMF, and we have tried to do that on the House Committee on Banking and Financial Services, but it has been nearly a year. How long will we fiddle and allow the world to burn and not deal with the problem at hand, and how much will the American workers and the American investors, the men and women who all of us claim to represent, have to suffer because this House will not act?

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this gag rule.

Mr. Speaker, the foreign operations appropriations bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation the House will consider this year. As a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I have sat through many hours of hearings, two markups, in the process of bringing this bill before the House today. But there are 420 Members of this House who are seeing the bill for the first time today, and they deserve a lot more respect for their input than this rule gives them.

The rule before us imposes a ridiculous time limit of 5 hours for the complete consideration of this bill and stricter limitations on certain specific amendments. As a comparison, I would ask my colleagues to look at how much time this body took to debate and amend the foreign operations appropriations bill for FY 1998. Last year it took us 3 days, 15½ hours, to finish the bill, over three times as long as we have been given today.

The rule also denies the House an opportunity to debate the issue of additional funding for the International Monetary Fund. Whichever side of the issue my colleagues stand on, it deserves a full debate by this House. I, for one, strongly support the administration's request for IMF funding, and I believe that the leadership is playing a dangerous political game by not allowing a vote on this issue today.

□ 1230

The ongoing economic turmoil in Asia and Russia is having a serious impact on Wall Street and other markets around the world, and we must provide the IMF with the resources it needs to respond to the economic insecurity in Russia and Asia as it promotes badly needed reforms in these countries.

Finally, the rule violates an agreement that we had with the Republican leadership on the international family planning issue. By allowing a second degree amendment to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi)'s amendment, the Committee on Rules turned its back on an agreement it made just 1 week ago. On this matter alone, we should reject the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up for their right to have a full debate on this important legislation, and I urge a vote against this terrible rule.

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

I would say to the gentlewoman that I really am taken aback by her remarks. I harken back to only last year when we were having the arguments on both sides of the aisle about the issue of pro-life or pro-choice. The gentlewoman knows that she and others came to me, and I stood up for them, even though I am on the other side of the issue philosophically.

We are doing the same thing this year, only in reverse, from what we did last year.

When I hear criticism like this, it really hurts, because when one is sincere about trying to help and bring these issues together so that we can debate it, it does not sit well to hear that kind of criticism.

Let me go back to talk about this rule. The Democrats controlled this Chamber for 40 years. In the last 2 years that they controlled it, during the 103d Congress, they brought this same bill to the floor, and guess what?

The gentlewoman says that this is a gag rule. But the Demoncrats brought it to this floor with a completely closed rule; they required the amendments to be filed with the Committee on Rules, and they selectively picked just a few and then brought that to the floor. Nobody could work their will.

This rule is just the opposite. This rule makes all of the regular amendments in order. One can offer striking amendments, cutting amendments, offsetting amendments, limitation amendments under the regular rule. Nobody is held back. It is an open rule. All we did was make in order several others to go with it. So nobody is shut out; everybody is allowed. We ought to know that. We ought to be fair about this debate on the floor that we will have on the issue of pro-life and pro-choice. No one is going to change their mind.

I have been here for 20 years; I have never seen one Member of this Congress, on either side of that issue, change their mind on a vote on this floor. We all know how we are going to vote, so let us have the open debate on it and let us let the chips fall where they may. I just had to say that to my very, very good friend from Westchester, New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to my good friend from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, we have always had a collegial relationship, and I just want the gentleman to know that everything I have said is meant to be fair and not to personally attribute anything to our good chairman.

However, I would just like to say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) that it was my understanding, as we had a meeting in the committee, that there would be an opportunity to offer an amendment, because on the committee we did not have full debate on the pro-life/pro-choice issue, because as the gentleman said, people know where they stand on this issue, and we thought we would defer the debate to the floor.

It was my understanding that we would have the opportunity to offer a substitute and we would have a full debate on that, and then the Members would use it as an opportunity to vote, either for or against.

So I am sorry if there is a difference of opinion, but I do believe that was the agreement that we thought was made, and so we did not have a debate in the full committee. We thought the debate would be here and that there would not be a second degree.

So I certainly respect the gentleman's views, but I just wanted to present to the gentleman my understanding. It was certainly the spirit of the agreement that, in my judgment, was violated by allowing the second degree.

I thank the gentleman very much. I wish the gentleman well, and I know we will continue to work well together.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, that is a much better explanation.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I think the membership should know very clearly that an agreement was made to allow the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) to offer an amendment. Nothing whatsoever was stated as to whether or not a second degree amendment to that would be permitted or not permitted; it just was not on the table.

Moreover, the agreement was to prevent what might have been an hour or so of debate in the committee. If it were up to me I'd debate it all day. Let me say also that in the committee, because we had whipped on this, we believed that we would have won by more than just a few votes in committee, and that any substitute that would have been offered would have been defeated. I do do reasonably good vote counts when I do work an issue. So not getting a roll call vote in committee was just to expedite the bill. I think that should be made very clear. Nobody has violated an agreement.

Let me just say for the record, because this I find very disconcerting, many of my friends on the other side of this issue time and again have demanded and received the ability to second-degree pro-life amendments that this Member and other Members have offered on the floor. Every time we have done it, the second degree amendment comes in, we live with it, that is the way the process goes. The shoe is just on the other foot.

I get, for the first time in my 18 years as a Member of Congress, an ability to second-degree an amendment that is being offered on the other side of the issue I see absolutely no unfairness in this whatsoever.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I say to my good friend, we are just running out of time. If the gentlewoman would please get her time, and I will try to yield. But I just have to say to all of my colleagues, we are talking about an agreement that was made here and an agreement that was made there. I am Chairman of the Committee on Rules, and if I am not included in those agreements, there is no agreement.

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

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, now the gentleman is speaking the truth. Nobody was intending to honor the agreement in the first place, I guess, but the agreement was not honored.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would advise all Members that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has approximately 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise to speak against this rule, and also against the funding for the IMF. However, it is critical that this body be able to speak to and debate this measure, wherever one stands on the International Monetary Fund.

The Committee on Banking and Financial Services, on which I sit, held several days of hearings on the Russian economic crisis and expanding economic turmoil internationally. The witness's testimony in our committee discussions were consistent with much of the news in our daily media. Major parts of Asia are in severe recession and going into a depression. Indonesia, in spite of or because of the IMF, is in extreme difficulty. Russia, in spite of or because of the IMF, is in severe crisis, and these two areas are affecting Latin America and the United States.

We know that it has been harmful to people who are not part of the political and economic oligarchy, particularly women and children. The $6 billion disbursed in Indonesia has been estimated to match the corrupt appropriation of this money by Suharto and his extended family.

In Russia, IMF bailout has gone into the maze of corruption, the Mafia, and oligarchs.

In Africa, in Haiti, in Mexico, in developing countries that have arranged for IMF loan programs, the developing economies have had to shift their priorities from food crop production to cash crops, thereby creating local food shortages and making the poor even more dependent on cash that they do not have. IMF loan repayment policies mandate that priorities shift from the most minimum education and health care programs to paying interest on the loan.

Mr. Speaker, these issues, believe me, these issues deserve a full and fair debate on this floor. I urge a ''no'' vote against the rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and in opposition to the underlying bill, particularly the provision that would repeal section 907 of the Freedom Support Act. An amendment will be offered today which I have cosponsored that would strike this repeal provision.

Mr. Speaker, Azerbaijan has done nothing to comply with the basic requirement of section 907 that it lift its blockade of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh, blockades that have caused severe hardship for the Armenian people. The Government of Azerbaijan has blockaded Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh for 9 years. The blockade has cut off the transportation of food, fuel, medicine and other vital supplies, creating a humanitarian crisis requiring the United States to send emergency life-saving assistance to Armenia.

Next, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in opposition to an amendment expected to be offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON). This amendment cuts humanitarian foreign assistance to India. As a result of the underground nuclear tests that India conducted in May, the President was required to invoke severe sanctions pursuant to the Glenn amendment of the Arms Export Control Act. These sanctions terminated much of the development aid that the U.S. provides to India; however, it protects humanitarian programs from the sanctions.

Passage of the Burton amendment would only serve to hurt India's poor and not have any impact on the government.

The United States and India have conducted several rounds of bilateral talks that have been labeled as ''positive'' and ''successful quiet diplomacy.'' This positive direction would be substantially disrupted by passage of the Burton amendment.

In light of the progress in the ongoing U.S.-India talks, now would be the worst time to enact the Burton amendment.

Again, Mr. Speaker, this rule should be opposed and the underlying bill should be opposed, in part because so much effort is put into legislation, if you will, on appropriation bills.

I share the opinion that was expressed yesterday by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), when he addressed the Committee on Rules and said that to the extent that this legislation actually includes authorizing language that has not been reviewed by the full Congress, it should be defeated.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule. I will not vote for the bill. The day I vote for a foreign aid bill in this House, I guess the House will cave in. But I am not going to offer any amendments to cut it.

I want to compliment the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and I think he has brought another good bill, if there can be a good foreign aid bill, to the House. But I will have an amendment that says when we give money to a country and that country is going to buy a product and they do not build the product, they do not make the product, they should buy the product from us unless they can buy it from some other developing country at less than 10 percent our cost. It is a limitation.

I want the amendment in the bill. It makes the bill friendly to American workers who are busting their buns to give money overseas while we have people dying in the streets in America.

The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has done a good job. I will not offer to cut it, and that is rare for me, because I think he has made some responsible moves. I want to credit our Democrat ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), as well.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Appropriations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding and for his presentation of this rule, which I rise with great reluctance to oppose. My reluctance springs not from the substance of the rule, that is easy, but reluctance springing from my respect and regard for the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

The chairman is my friend, and this is probably the last rule which we will be contending with each other over. I want to take the opportunity to say what a pleasure it has been to serve in Congress with the gentleman. The gentleman knows of the respect that I have for him, and that is why it is very difficult for me to oppose the gentleman on this rule. But the gentleman made it easy, because I think this rule is a contortion and, in my view, violates the agreement that we had with our committee.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we are in a situation, and it seems like an annual event, where we get an agreement with the Republican leadership of this House that we will have free and fair debate and vote on the international family planning issue. No matter where one stands on that issue, Members understand the unfairness that is contained in this bill.

□ 1245

The record of our Committee on Appropriations was clear. When our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), spelled out very clearly how our rights were protected on this issue on the floor or in any other arena that it would be taken up.

My complaint is not with our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. LIVINGSTON), nor is it with my colleague and the distinguished chair of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN). It is a joy to serve with both of them, and I respect them highly.

My complaint is with this Republican leadership of this House which, after agreements are made in our committee, has to go and run and check with the far right to see if it was okay.

We specifically conveyed to the Republican leadership that a second-degree amendment was not part of the agreement. They knew that. The reason my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) says, well you usually get the second degree, why are you complaining if I do. The point is that, in the interest of comity and cooperation, we said, okay, proceed and put the gentleman's language in the bill if we get a chance to amend it on the floor.

So, indeed, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has a privileged position. His language is part of the legislation. Why should he have two bites at the apple, especially when that is in violation of our agreement.

So one of the casualties of this will be, of course, the trust that we can have working together in the Committee on Appropriations, because, clearly, we should be talking to the far right wing if we want to be sure about what the arrangement will be when we come to the floor.

It takes the rug out from under our own committee leadership and any commitments they make to us in committee. When that commitment was made, it specifically mentioned that the leadership, the Republican leadership of the House was a part of the agreement. So here we go again. That is just one point, the point of unfairness, which of course seems to be the banner of the day around here.

But this rule, even if that unfairness were not an issue, and let us for a moment put it aside, I call this rule a rule suitable for ostriches. Let us put our heads in the sand on all of the troubled spots in the world.

For example, Korea, North Korea, the rules committee would not allow an amendment on Korea. International environmental issues, we cannot have an amendment on that issue. The list goes on and on. Africa, we cannot have an amendment on what is going on in Africa.

Even with those amendments that were made in order or those which under the rule can be submitted because they were printed in the RECORD, there is a very, very narrow amount of time with which those issues are to be debated.

If we subtract the time for the amendments that the gentleman provided time for in the amendment, there are 2 hours, only 2 hours to discuss disasters of the whole rest of the world, Ireland, Africa, disaster assistance, the list goes on and on. The International Monetary Fund. That takes me to that point.

Members in this group, in this body are divided on the issue of the International Monetary Fund. Wherever we are on that issue, I think it is fair to say that this House should be debating that issue.

Some of my Republican colleagues said to me, do not worry about the IMF. If you support the IMF, we are going to put the $14.5 billion in in conference. Oh, really. Do my colleagues think that is appropriate, a $14 billion appropriation in conference without this body having the opportunity to debate it pro and con?

I think that that is not right. It is hard to imagine how such a distinguished group of people who are interested in the economy of our country could say that the International Monetary Fund should not be debated on this floor.

So it is for reasons of substance, reasons of fairness, and reasons of timing that I oppose this rule. I just want to make the further point in terms of timing that, not only is the timing of restricting all the debate on the amendments to 5 hours unfair, but it is also about the timing, of the jamming, of the railroading this bill onto the floor before Members are even versed as to what the issues are that are contained in it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair advises Members that the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON) has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has 3 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have to clear up a couple of things. The gentlewoman mentioned that amendments were going to be restricted to 5 minutes. That is not true. We are under the 5-minute rule. We can go for 30 minutes on any amendment.

Secondly, the gentlewoman is saying that Members are not going to have a chance to work their will. I have examined all of the amendments that were printed in the RECORD. There were a vast number of amendments. Only about 10 or 11 of them are allowable, that are germane to the issue. We are going to allow all of those. If the gentlewoman tells me that is going to take 5 hours to debate 10 amendments, there is something wrong around here.

Secondly, the gentlewoman has been critical of the Republican leadership and that this message was conveyed to them. I want to know who in the leadership it was conveyed to. I am a part of the Republican leadership and I am chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, If the gentleman will yield, it was the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY).

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, just a minute and I am going to get to him. No one approached me. However, I approached the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) who is our whip and is a Member of the Republican leadership and serves on the Committee on Appropriations.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said, ''Yes, I said I would go to you and try to get you to make in order a Pelosi or her designee's amendment.'' The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) did that. He mentioned nothing to me. I called the gentleman, and he knows nothing about any second-degree amendment. There was no discussion whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Robbinsville, New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, first let me say, and I think it is unfortunate and unhelpful when my good friend, the gentlewoman from California refers to prolifers as the far right—in this case me.

Let me just say that I am conservative and very proud of it, but I take a back seat to no one on human rights. I

have been in this body for 18 years. I have been all over the world, very often with my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and other committed leaders in human rights.

I have chaired more hearings in my subcommittee—international operations and human rights that have ever been held ever on human rights. I have been to Asia, Africa, Eastern and Central Europe, the Middle East, Central and South America—all on behalf of human rights. Gulag labor abuse and exploitation of child workers. We have worked on religious freedom. When it comes to child survival, going back to the early 1980s, I led the effort and offered amendment after amendment on this floor and in committee to beef up the child survival account.

As a matter of fact when Reagan's Administration wanted to zero out the $25 million child survival account, I put $50 million and reauthorized that account to continue immunization, oral rehydration, breast feeding, and growth monitoring. I take a back seat to no one on humanitarianism and on human rights. If that is ''far right,'' I accept the label, but I think the gentlelady's use of the term is to engender ridicule and disgust. Moreover, name calling undermines the caliber of debate and does grave injury to the comity of the House when people make such reference.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so I can agree with him?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything that the gentleman has said, and I salute him for everything that he has done. The gentleman is so right. He takes a back seat to no one on all of the issues he said. I want him to know that I was not referring to him. I was referring to elements outside of this body.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, there were no elements. I was the one who was in conference with our leadership on this.

Let me just say that mention has been made that somehow this rule is unfair on pro-life issues. Nothing can be further from the truth. Let me state to Members that, in the full Committee on Appropriations, my good friend, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), offered to compromised Mexico City policy, which allows the President to waive one of the two mainstays of that pro-life Mexico City policy. It is a clear concession by the pro-life side. It is a compromise.

The Committee on Appropriations accepted the Wicker amendment. In order to expedite consideration of that bill, they decided that there would be a voice vote. We would have gladly had the vote and the debate in the committee.

There was no mention that a perfecting amendment would be offered or not be offered. But let me remind Members of the history. Every time I have offered this amendment, the Mexico City amendment, it has been second degreed. I accept that. On May 24th, 1995, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) offered the second degree. June 28th, 1995, in the foreign ops bill, Jan Meyers offered the second degree. I accepted that. That is the process. We all live under the same rules. June 11th, 1997 the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) second degreed the underlying amendment that I had offered.

Last year, September 4, after the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) offered an amendment, it was a second degree, and that was the second second degree. The first one that had been proffered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD), was deemed that it was not good enough. That is what held up that process and we acceded again and allowed a second degree amendment to the Smith amendment to be offered.

Now the shoe is on the other foot and some folks are crying foul. Really that does not pass the straight face test. It strains credulity to make that argument on the floor here. Every time the gentlewoman has offered her second degree, I have accepted it. Now I get to offer the second degree and to say foul does not cut it.

I hope Members will vote for this rule.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say that we have some problems with some of our Members here relative to the rule. It is controversial. The bill itself is controversial. I want to say from the start that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) on some of the things that he has committed himself to on child survival activities, the Peace Corps, UNICEF, basic education, he has been a real champion. He has kept that money very strong for it. In some cases, he has increased the money.

What I would like to say, though, about foreign operations both here and in the Senate is that it continues to get cut in many different categories. In 1985, the development assistance account was cut by 40 percent. Over the past couple of years, a number of the categories have been cut. So many people in our own country believe that foreign appropriations, as part of our total budget, is so out of whack that when we have debates with people, I remember the debate I had last time I ran for reelection and one of my opponents was asked a question, all of us were asked a question, you know we spend too much money on foreign aid and what do you think we should do?

One of my opponents said, ''Well, I think we should cut it back. We spend way too much money.''

I said, ''Really?'' I said, ''Well, what percentage do you think we spend of our total budget on foreign aid?''

She said, It ''has to be somewhere between 25 and 27 percent.''

I said, ''Really?'' I said, ''Would you believe it is really eight-tenths of 1 percent of our total budget?''

''It cannot be.''

I said, ''I am telling you that is the truth.''

What we are talking about today, the part that I like best, the humanitarian aid, is even less than that. This is good aid. It helps people that are sick. It helps people that are facing floods now in Bangladesh. It helps people that reunite children that have become temporary orphans as a result of civil war. It helps children be immunized.

At one time, we had 40,000 people die every day in this world and over the past few years that has gone down to about 35,000. 35,000 people will die today, 35,000 people died yesterday and 35,000 will die tomorrow because of civil war, because of lack of food, because of drought, because of famine, because of a lot of things, and our aid goes to help those people.

We are not making a mark here in the past couple of years because our aid for foreign aid continues to go down. I even understand in the Senate that what is happening over there, they are going to lower the status of the foreign aid committee over there. It does not have the status it once used to. In almost every country of the world, to be on the foreign affairs committee is a great distinction. It is the number one committee in most parliaments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has expired.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, if we compare ourselves with the 17 major nations of the world, we rank seventeenth in our appropriation to foreign aid.

We need to do better. We need to quit running from this issue. We need to stand up and support it. There are a lot of changes that need to be in this bill as it comes before the House today. I hope we can make the changes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I close, I heap accolades on the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL). I know of no Member, and I have served with him since the very beginning, who has done more for human rights and to alleviate hunger throughout this world than the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) has. We all should salute him.

Let me just speak a little further on what he was speaking about, because the American people sometimes do not

understand that the foreign aid budget is not much. It is only eight-tenths of 1 percent of the Federal budget. The truth of the matter is, they are incensed when they see monies that we give to foreign nations and have these foreign nations then turn around and vote against us consistently in the U.N., vote against American foreign policy, whether it is a Democratic President or a Republican President. The American people resent that. They resent greatly, when they see IMF funding and other international organizations giving American taxpayer dollars to Russia. They see it going in the front door and going out the back door even faster. The American people resent that.

Of course, that is why I have to again commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the other Members for the reforms they are writing in to this legislation. It goes a long way in holding the IMF accountable not only for our policy but also so that we can see where our tax dollars go.

□ 1300

Finally, let me just say about the rule itself, every Member should come over and they should vote for this rule. This rule is not restrictive in any way. There were 40 amendments filed and I have a list of them right here. Only 10 of these amendments are germane to the issues and are allowed under the rules of the House.

Any Member that has done his due diligence will have his amendment time on the floor. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) can negotiate with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and they can determine how much time might be allowed on a particular amendment. With only 10 amendments that are made in order over a five-hour period, every Member should have the opportunity to work their will.

Mr. Speaker, let me commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and their staffs for an excellent piece of legislation. Let us come over here and pass the rule and get on with it, because we have very important legislation to deal with in the next 13 days.

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 (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 188, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 446]

YEAS—229

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Graham
Granger
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kim
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manton
Manzullo
Mascara
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Oxley
Packard
Pappas
Parker
Paxon
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Redmond
Regula
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Traficant
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—188

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barrett (WI)
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gordon
Green
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hefner
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hooley
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Kolbe
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (CA)
Minge
Moakley
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith, Adam
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson
Thurman
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—17

Becerra
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Capps
Cunningham
Gonzalez
Goss
Gutierrez
Hilliard
Mink
Paul
Poshard
Pryce (OH)
Riggs
Scarborough
Schumer
Whitfield

□ 1321

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

Messrs. MASCARA, GREENWOOD, LAZIO of New York, and STUPAK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Messrs. UPTON, HORN, and BOEHLERT 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 446, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members