United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 12, 2000 No. 89

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 12, 2000

I hereby appoint the Honorable GIL GUTKNECHT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

All powerful God, may we prove ourselves responsible for the task You set before us this day as Your servants.

We accomplish Your holy will when, as we persevere in doing good, we put to silence the idle chatter of the foolish.

May great works of justice rise from us to drown out all negativity and discontent.

Let us live as free people never using our freedom as a pretext for evil.

Rather, as servants of God, may we honor all people, love the communities we serve and fear—only You, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. LAMPSON. 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. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TERRY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

REA REDIFER

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to congratulate a constituent of mine, Mr. Rea Redifer, an artist of the Brandywine tradition, on a lifetime of artistic accomplishment.

Mr. Redifer, who comes from Chester County, Pennsylvania, is a watercolorist, but he is also a writer and filmmaker who has focused his work around the life of Abraham Lincoln and the Civil War. He has won literary awards and even an Oscar nomination for his work.

His portraits of Lincoln are favorites of mine. A print of one hangs in my office. His paintings capture not only the likeness of Lincoln, but also the soul of the man. In Mr. Redifer's images we can see both the sadness and moral fortitude of the President.

I am glad to have arranged an exhibit of Mr. Redifer's work to be displayed in the Capitol for the next couple of weeks in the Rotunda of the Cannon House Office Building. I encourage all of my colleagues, congressional staff, and tourists to take a few moments to stop by and enjoy Mr. Redifer's fine artistic accomplishments.

Again, I congratulate Mr. Redifer on his wonderful artworks, and thank him for sharing them with us here at the Capitol.

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION

(Mr. LAMPSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, on June 29 and July 6 two articles appeared in the Washington Post about Joseph Cooke and his fight to regain custody of his two children.

Both articles, in error, stated that Joseph Cooke, whose children have been held in German foster care for over 8 years, was recently allowed a 2-hour visit. Unfortunately, Joseph did not get to see his children. However, his mother, Patricia, did get to see her grandchildren, but did so at a drastically limited time.

For 8 years this family struggled silently, attempting to bring about justice on their own. In February, Joseph joined me at an event where for the first time he spoke publicly about the abduction and wrongful retention of his children. It was a difficult day, but one that led to the outpouring of support and attention from the media and the American public that this issue deserves.

The retaliation by the German Youth Authority and the Weh family, and

Printed on recycled paper.

their attempts to control the behavior of wronged American parents, is exactly why we need to continue pressing for action on this issue. We cannot let American parents be bullied into keeping their mouths shut. The German Youth Authority should be ashamed of itself for using access to one's children as a means to avoid bad press.

THE MEANING OF THE TERM ''A DO-NOTHING CONGRESS''

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been wrestling with the phrase of ''a do-nothing Congress.'' If by ''doing nothing'' the Democrats mean that we are protecting the social security trust fund from being raided to pay for other big government programs, then they are right.

Or if they mean we have stopped racking up the national debt and borrowing money from our children, yes, I guess they are right there, too.

If they call us ''the do-nothing'' Congress because we have worked to lower taxes on married couples and our Nation's seniors, then I guess they are right there.

But if the Democrats' best argument for saying that we do not do anything is that we have worked to restrain Federal spending, to protect the retirement security for seniors, stop increasing taxes on hard-working Americans, then I am willing to take that as a compliment from my friends on the other side.

UNCLE SAM GIVES MONEY AND TECHNOLOGY WHICH CHINA USES TO THREATEN AMERICA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, let us see if this makes sense: Uncle Sam gives billions to Russia, Russia uses our money to build missiles and warships, Russia then sells those missiles and warships to China, China then aims those Russian-made missiles, built with American cash, back at Uncle Sam.

Now, if that is not enough to ignite our plutonium, Uncle Sam is about to give more billions to Russia. I ask, is Uncle Sam a masochist or what, here?

The truth is, the policy ''Trust but Verify'' has turned into ''Pay and Pray.'' Beam me up. I yield back China's buying and spying and Russia's crying and lying.

AMERICA MUST PERSEVERE IN DEVELOPING A MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM

(Mr. WICKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, perseverance is a good thing, especially when it comes to national security. When our children fall off their bikes, we teach them to try again. When the Wright Brothers moved to Kittyhawk with a dream of flying, it took them 3 years of effort before their first flight. When President Kennedy set the goal of putting a man on the moon, it took us 8 years before Neil Armstrong took one giant leap for mankind.

We must now have the same perseverance toward developing a missile defense system. We have had three tests, the most recent of which was a disappointment, but the need to defend ourselves has not disappeared. Iran and North Korea are not going to stop developing nuclear weapons, and we should not stop developing a defense for a missile attack.

With determination and American ingenuity, we can develop a national missile defense system. I urge the President not to tie the hands of future administrations. We must persevere because the safety of Americans is at stake.

POLITICS OVER POLICY IN THE PRESIDENT'S OIL RESERVE STRATEGY?

(Mr. TERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, this administration has now proposed stockpiling 2 million barrels of heating oil for the Northeast. He justifies using our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is our Nation's national security emergency oil reserve, because of a ''national emergency facing the Northeast.''

Mr. Speaker, I believe the national emergency seems to be that a certain senatorial candidate cannot get above 43 percent in the polls.

There is no arguing that the oil reserves are low, but at the same time, the price of natural gas has doubled across this Nation, which is the primary heating source in my State of Nebraska. The President has never visited Nebraska, but let me assure this administration that it is also cold in Nebraska.

Mr. Speaker, the American people can decide if this is another example of politics over policy.

THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY, AN INJUSTICE IN OUR TAX CODE

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to talk about an injustice that exists in our current Tax Code. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the marriage penalty tax. This insensitive provision actually increases taxes by up to $1,400 on working Americans like Ron and Judy Kingman out in rural Nevada, taxes on them simply because they chose to get married. How unfair can it be?

Mr. Speaker, over 25 million American couples are currently subjected to this tax. We can do better and we will do better. These couples should be able to use that tax overpayment toward a downpayment on a home, child care expenses, or investment for their own retirement. This money does not belong to the IRS, it belongs to our families and they deserve to get it back.

This week we have the opportunity to ease the marriage tax burden for married couples in this country. I urge my colleagues across the aisle to join in our Republican efforts to end the marriage tax penalty.

Let us do the right thing. Let us reform this tax. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

URGING MEMBERS' SUPPORT FOR LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE SCIENCE AND MATH EDUCATION IN AMERICA

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, America is a wonderful country. I am very proud of the U.S.A. We are the best country in so many different ways. And I believe we should be the best in everything. We have the resources, the knowledge, and the energy to achieve it.

Today I want to mention one thing in which we are not the best. In fact, we are letting our kids down. The majority of jobs available today in our economy are jobs in science, math, engineering, technology, and, of course, computers. Yet, our science and math education in this country is among the worst of the developed countries, as demonstrated by test after test. Ninety-three percent of Americans are aware of this and say that they want better math and science education.

I happen to be a nuclear physicist. I have also worked in elementary school science education. Because of this, and because of my concern about education in this country, I have sponsored three bills which will improve math and science education in this country. I urge my colleagues to join me by cosponsoring these bipartisan bills; I guarantee they will help to improve math and science education in this country, and should make us the international leader in this category, just as we are in so many others.

I urge Members' support of these bills. Join with me and Governor George Bush in advocating improvement of math and science education in this country.

□ 1015

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask a simple question: What has the support of the Republican party and the support of 80 percent of the American people? The answer is very simple, the repeal of the marriage tax penalty.

This ridiculous tax provision forces 25 million couples to pay an average of $1,400 each in extra taxes every year just because they are married for a working family. This $1,400 would be used to buy a home computer or used for 3 months of childcare, but instead of using this money for their family, these couples are forced to give it to the government.

Our Nation was founded in part because our Founding Fathers grew tired of unfair and ridiculous taxes. Well, I can think of no more unfair or ridiculous tax than the marriage tax penalty. This penalty must be repealed.

Surely everyone can agree that married couples should not be subject to extra taxes just because they are married. Married Americans deserve to be treated fairly. Let us repel the marriage tax penalty today.

MARRIAGE PENALTY

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today the House is going to vote to end the marriage penalty. Right now married couples pay more in taxes than two single people living together; that is just not right.

Washington must stop penalizing the cornerstone of the American family. We should encourage marriage, not penalize it. We must restore families and the American dream.

Last year, President Clinton labeled the marriage penalty relief risky and even vetoed it. This year Democrats are encouraging him to veto it again. In my district alone, this bill will help end the marriage penalty for over 150,000 Americans. The President and his Democrat friends should stop playing election-year politics.

I say to the President, why do you not help us put American families first? Let us do it now.

STEPS TO PROTECT AND PRESERVE SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in Savannah, we are blessed. My wife's grandmother, 97-year-old Betty Carswell is still alive and in good health. She is on Social Security and she needs it.

When I was a boy, growing up down the street my good friend Ross Fox's dad died, and when he died, leaving Mrs. Fox with two young boys to take care of, Social Security was there to protect them. Yet today Social Security is in trouble.

By the year 2030, it will be out of money. There are six positive steps we can take, however, to protect and preserve Social Security. Number one is to have some principles, to say that the benefits for current retirees and near retirees will not be increased; number two, to lock away the Social Security surplus so that the money will not be spent on roads and bridges but used only for Social Security; number three, taxes for Social Security should not be increased; number four, the government should not invest Social Security funds in the stock market; number five, modernization of Social Security should not change the disability and survivors' components for friends like Ross Fox, who lose their loved one, their parents; number six, a portion of the Social Security account should be personalized so that younger people on a voluntary basis would have the option of putting theirs in an interest-bearing account which earns more money than Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, we can do this. We can have a good voluntary program to set up to protect and preserve Social Security. Our seniors need this and our future generations.

HOPE AND PRAY FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

(Mr. CARDIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express appreciation to President Clinton for bringing together the prime minister of Israel, Mr. Barak, and Mr. Arafat at Camp David. I know that we all hope and pray for peace in the Middle East. Mr. Barak has shown tremendous courage in putting peace first, in trying to find a way in which we can find true and lasting peace in the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that Mr. Arafat and Mr. Barak will understand the historical significance of this meeting and will take advantage of this opportunity so that at least we can look forward to the future of peace in the Middle East.

OUTRAGEOUSLY HIGH DRUG PRICES

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that every senior citizen knows about and, frankly, if we have had town hall meetings, we know about it as well, and that is outrageously high drug prices. My 82-year-old father, for example, takes a drug called Coumadin. It is a blood thinner. In the United States, the average price for that drug is $30.25, but the Europeans for the same drug made in the same plant under the same FDA approval pay only $2.85.

Mr. Speaker, in the information age, we can no longer keep this secret. Americans are paying double, triple and sometimes quadruple the prices that people around the rest of the world are paying for the same drugs, and it would be easy for us to say shame on the pharmaceutical companies. But the truth of the matter is this administration has had 8 years and what have they done about this? Well, they have sent thousands of threatening letters to senior citizens when they tried to import legal drugs into the United States.

Shame on the FDA. Shame on our Justice Department and shame on us. It is time for this Congress to take action to make certain that American senior citizens have access to world market prices for prescription drugs that they need. No senior should have to choose between getting the food they need and the drugs that they need as well.

STRIKE THE GAG RULE

(Mrs. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the gag rule has created a policy that increases the number of abortions and it also threatens the lives of many young women.

Last year, this body added in law an international family planning gag rule for other countries that is unconstitutional in America. What happened? Thousands of young women were denied the information they needed to plan or postpone their pregnancies, so thousands of 13-year-old girls, 14-year-old girls and 15-year-old girls got unsafe and often fatal abortions.

These abortions could have been prevented. No U.S. funds are used for abortions. International family planning saves women's lives so we should all support on both sides of the aisle an effort to strike the gag rule.

PERSONAL LOCKBOX BILL

(Mr. SANFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to bring to everybody's attention the fact that today I am introducing a bill called the personal lockbox bill. I think it is built on common sense, because one of the things I have consistently heard from folks back home is the very simple idea that the first part of saving Social Security is making sure that Social Security taxes stay with Social Security. That is what this bill does because it takes the Social Security surplus, whatever

that happens to be, and simply rebates it back to the people paying Social Security taxes, not to go out and fix up the car or buy a refrigerator with it but instead to go into their own personal Social Security savings account that would be held by a fiduciary like the local bank.

Mr. Speaker, the individual could not get their hands on the money until they turn 65, but they would get a monthly statement and for the first time, because of the private property rights that come with an account like that, for the first time have a firewall created between political forces in D.C. and their Social Security surplus.

DEFENSE OF NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of our National Missile Defense System. Last Saturday, the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization conducted a flight test over the Pacific. Unfortunately, a missile anomaly occurred which had nothing to do with the concept being tested. The booster simply did not separate from the kill vehicle and, therefore, the kill vehicle was not freed so that it could function.

Opponents of a National Missile Defense System thus have no basis for saying we should abandon our efforts. This was only the third of 19 planned tests. Successes and failures are to be expected as we perfect any defense system. This was not a concept failure.

Mr. Speaker, developing a missile defense system is one of the most civilized things we can do. When deployed, and God forbid, we need to use it, it only protects. It protects the people we love and does not destroy our enemy. This is the ultimate in defense.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called rogue nations are developing their capabilities to attack our people. As outlined by the Constitution, we, in Congress, have the obligation to provide for the defense of this country. We must go forward. We should not yield to political pressures. We must develop the National Missile Defense System.

U.S. ATTACKED BY KOFI ANNAN AT NOTRE DAME COMMENCEMENT

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in this year's commencement speech at Notre Dame, Kofi Annan, the head of the United Nations, bitterly attacked the United States.

He said the U.S. was one of the ''least generous'' Nations in helping the world's poor. Actually, the exact opposite is true. No nation on the face of this Earth has even come close to the U.S. in what it has given to poor people around the world.

Mr. Annan called the U.S. ''shameful.'' Actually, U.S. taxpayers pay one-fourth of all U.N. costs and most of the costs of the so-called U.N. peacekeeping missions.

Mr. Speaker, most of our tax money for the U.N. is wasted to pay high salaries to U.N. bureaucrats who pay no Federal income taxes.

Interestingly, Mr. Annan has refused to release a copy of his financial disclosure as required by law or a copy of his own personal charitable giving for the past 5 years as requested by the Freedom Alliance.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Annan is the one who should be ashamed, not U.S. taxpayers.

SKYROCKETING GASOLINE PRICES

(Mr. SCHAFFER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great time of year to vacation in beautiful Colorado, but gas prices are still high. Energy Secretary Bill Richardson is on record saying that the Clinton-Gore administration was ''caught napping'' on the issue of skyrocketing gasoline prices.

Because of the administration's failed energy policies and inattention, Americans are being forced to pay outrageous prices at the gas pump, some cases $2.35 a gallon.

We all know how dangerous it can be when a driver falls asleep at the wheel, and now we can see how dangerous it is when an entire administration falls asleep at the wheel.

While this administration was napping, domestic oil production decreased to 17 percent, and this increased dependence on foreign oil has helped put us to this current predicament.

Perhaps, Congress should start a caffeine IV for Secretary Richardson and the other Rip Van Winkles over at the White House who are responsible for this policy diaster.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Clinton-Gore administration to wake up. The slumber party is over. Americans are tired of getting gored at the pump.

ACCUSATIONS OF A ''DO NOTHING CONGRESS''

(Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, many of our friends in the Democrat party have been spending a lot of time lately accusing this of being a do nothing Congress, and I guess coming from a Democrat that is a tremendous compliment.

Do you know what it means when they accuse us of doing nothing? It means we are not raising taxes, that means we are not spending enough of the surplus. We have not raided the Social Security surplus. We are not making government regulations burdensome enough.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my friends I consider the definition of ''doing nothing'' as a badge of honor. And do you know why? Because my Democrat friends and the Vice President have a funny definition of accomplishments.

They do not consider it an accomplishment to end the unfair penalty on married couples. They do not consider it an accomplishment to end the earnings limit for working seniors. They do not consider it an accomplishment to say that the Federal Government or the IRS should not take half your farm when you die, half of your business when you die.

They do not consider it an accomplishment to make prescription drugs available and affordable to our senior citizens in the country. This is what we have done over the last several months.

Democrats may not consider these things to be accomplishments, but millions of Americans who work every day, get up, they pay their taxes.

DEATH TAX

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the House passed a repeal of the death tax last month. We will continue to work to see that this unfair tax is repealed.

The American dream is about the opportunity of every citizen to build a better future for themselves and their children through hard work and personal initiative. It means building your own business, pouring your own sweat into a small farm to turn a profit, saving each day so you can leave something to your family.

Yet it is these Americans who are working so hard, playing the rules and paying taxes who, upon their death, become the victims of a tax that discounts their dedication, punishes their entrepreneurship, and denies their dying wishes.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of this death tax, only one-third of all small businesses and family farms are passed on after the first generation. This is not right. Where is the logic?

Why does the government have to grab someone's life savings out of their hands once they die? It is time we eliminate the death tax and reinvest in America, so the dreams and values of these folks can be carried on to future generations. We need to make sure that death tax gets buried.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Ms. DEGETTE. 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 354, nays 50, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—354

Abercrombie
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (FL)

NAYS—50

Aderholt
Baird
Bilbray
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Capuano
Clay
Crane
DeFazio
Deutsch
English
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Holt
Hulshof
Kucinich
LoBiondo
McDermott
Moore
Oberstar
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Ramstad
Rogan
Sabo
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Weller
Wexler
Wu

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—29

Ackerman
Archer
Baker
Barton
Bateman
Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Costello
Forbes
Frost
Johnson, Sam
Knollenberg
Leach
McNulty
Obey
Owens
Oxley
Paul
Sessions
Sisisky
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Souder
Vento
Whitfield
Wise
Wynn
Young (AK)

□ 1052

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

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ISRAEL CANCELS SALE OF AWAC SYSTEM TO CHINA

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been quite a bit of interest in the last couple of months about the Israeli sale of an AWAC system to China. It was going to be a major discussion on the floor of the House today. I know many Members were concerned about that issue.

I wanted to tell them that I just received a call from the ambassador telling me that Mr. Barak has canceled the AWAC sale to China.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4810, MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 545 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 545

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4810) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; (2) the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Rangel or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE) is recognized for 1 hour.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 545 is a modified closed rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4810, the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000. For those Members who think they are experiencing deja vu, let me clear up any confusion. It is true that the House has already voted to provide relief from the marriage tax penalty. In fact, on February 10 of this very year, the House passed legislation that is identical to H.R. 4810 by a bipartisan vote of 268–158. Prior to that, the House twice passed marriage tax relief as part of a larger tax bill which the President unfortunately vetoed. So this is actually the fourth time that the 106th Congress will debate and vote to provide tax fairness to married couples.

It probably baffles the American people that it takes this much effort to

correct such a blatant inequity in the tax code, but rest assured the Republican majority is determined to keep at it and give the President another chance to sign this bill into law. Today, we will consider the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act under a reconciliation process which we hope will speed this legislation's path to the President's desk.

Under the rule, the House will proceed with 1 hour of general debate on the bill which will be equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. Even though the House has already thoroughly debated this issue and passed this legislation, the Committee on Rules decided to give the minority an opportunity to offer a substitute amendment which will be debated for 1 hour. The substitute amendment which is printed in the Committee on Rules report may be offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) or his designee. All points of order against consideration of the bill and the amendment are waived. Not only will the minority have the opportunity to offer a substitute but they also will have the option of offering a motion to recommit, with or without instructions. So I think we can all agree that this rule is quite fair in its generosity to the minority.

Mr. Speaker, 'tis the season for holy matrimony and as wedding bells chime across the Nation this summer, many couples will celebrate their unions without suspecting that the Government has in store for them a tax on their marriage. If these newlyweds listen to the family-friendly rhetoric in Washington, they might think the Government is toasting to them as they create their new families. But instead of sending sentiments of congratulations and best wishes, the only thing the Government plans to deliver is a bigger tax bill. So let us hope these couples do not run out and cash the wedding checks that they receive from Grandpa Joe and Cousin Jane because they still have to pay Uncle Sam.

That is right, Mr. Speaker. The Federal Government sees marriage as an opportunity to increase taxes. Newlyweds may see their taxes rise by hundreds or even thousands of dollars based solely on the fact that they have walked down the aisle and said, ''I do.'' It is hard to understand why the decision to make a solemn commitment to another individual through the institution of marriage has anything to do with the rate at which one is taxed, but we should know by now that the Government has no qualms about taking every opportunity to make a grab for more of our hard-earned money. In fact, each year 42 million working Americans pay higher taxes simply because they are married. This policy is unfair and discriminatory, not to mention the fact that it undermines one of the most fundamental institutions of our society. And it makes little sense to add to the tax burden of newlyweds, especially when marriage is often a precursor to added financial responsibilities such as owning a home or having children.

□ 1100

I think we all know that despite all of our glowing talk about a robust economy, many families find that it is hard to make ends meet. Both spouses must work. Under the current Tax Code, working couples are pushed into a higher tax bracket because the income of the second wage earner, often the wife, is tacked a much higher rate.

Because of the marriage penalty, 21 million families pay an average of $1,400 more in taxes than they would if they were single or just living together. What kind of message does that send?

The Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act will bring fairness to the Tax Code by doubling the standard deduction for married couples, expanding the 15 percent bracket so more of a couple's income is taxed at a lower rate, and increasing the amount that low-income couples can earn and still be eligible for the earned income tax credit. This fix will mean lower taxes for 25 million American couples, and that is 59,000 couples in my district alone.

But my Democrat colleagues will claim that we are doing too much, though I am not sure there is such a thing as too much fairness, Mr. Speaker. Still, they will want to differentiate between married couples and penalize some couples for their vows, but not others.

Under the Democrat's plan, the Government does not have to give these families as much money back, so the Government can keep and spend more. They may claim that this is a more responsible approach; but, Mr. Speaker, I would remind my colleagues that the Government is experiencing a budget surplus. We have already taken the Social Security and Medicare trust funds off the table and made a commitment to paying down the debt, and we still have money left over. If we cannot afford to fix this glaring inequity in our Tax Code today, then when would my Democrat friends suggest that we do it, and how is it responsible to let this penalty on marriage continue when the Government is swimming in surplus cash?

I do not claim to understand the logic, but this rule will give the Democrats the opportunity to make their case and offer their substitute.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a fair rule that will give the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act the momentum it needs to move through the Senate and to the President's desk, so that he has another opportunity to do the right thing and give working families this needed break. There is absolutely no reason to continue this unfair policy, no more excuses.

It is time to either defend the marriage tax or eliminate it. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. PRYCE), for yielding me the customary half hour. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we all agree the marriage tax is unfair. It punishes people for getting married just when they are thinking of starting a family, and it really needs to be abolished. The question is how to abolish it.

There is a Democratic bill; there is a Republican bill. The central difference between the two bills is who is benefited.

The Republican bill will benefit the richest 25 percent of Americans, including a lot of people who do not even pay the marriage penalty in the first place. The Democratic bill benefits working families who really need it, working families with children who are trying to save for a home, who are trying to put their children through school, who are trying to make ends meet. They should not have to pay additional taxes just because they are married; and unless they are very rich, the Republican bill just does not work for them.

The reason the Republican bill will not work, Mr. Speaker, is because it increases the standard deduction without adjusting the alternative minimum tax. That means that millions of families would see no net reduction under the marriage penalty whatsoever under the Republican bill.

In yesterday's Washington Post, in the editorial, Mr. Speaker, it said, ''The cost of the bill is high: The bulk of the benefit would go to people already quite well off, and there are better uses for the money, to shore up Medicare, for example.''

By the year 2008, the year that the Republican bill finally goes into effect, 47 percent of American families with two children would get no relief whatsoever. The tax will have a new name, but it will cost a lot. Mr. Speaker, that is not what the American families need.

Millions of low- and moderate-income families, especially those with children, need help; and the Republican bill just does not do it.

The Democratic bill will, Mr. Speaker. The Democratic bill will focus its efforts on low- and moderate-income taxpayers by increasing the standard deduction for married couples until it is twice the size of the single people's deduction. It will also reduce the marriage penalty in the Earned Income Tax Credit and change the alternative minimum tax so that all of the promised tax cuts actually do take effect. It will mean real help to working families who need it.

Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's editorial in the Washington Post, the title was ''A Phony Issue.'' It says ''Congressional Republicans scheduled a vote

this week on a sizable tax cut, mainly for the better off, which they misleadingly describe as relief from the marriage penalty. The President has rightly indicated that he will veto this bill as it is likely to be presented to him. That suits the sponsors perfectly, and that vote is mainly intended as a frame for the national,'' well, that is something else. But I think the Washington Post says it much better than anyone else.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Republican bill.

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

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from Columbus for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that my friend from south Boston, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules, and we are going to do our darnedest to see that he stays right in that spot, just as my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), will remain in his very important key spot as ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means as we move into the 107th Congress.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object.

Mr. DREIER. To object? I am happy to yield, if the gentleman wants to debate the issue.

But the fact is my friend from south Boston has talked about the Democratic bill, and I am proud to talk about the bipartisan bill, because what we have done here on this marriage penalty issue is we have put together a very strong bipartisan package, and there is recognition on both sides of the aisle that this issue needs to be addressed.

Republicans and Democrats alike voted strongly for this bill when we brought it up in February, and I suspect that later today when we cast the vote on this, we once again will see strong bipartisanship. So I am happy to have the leadership on the other side talk about their Democratic bills, and we on the Republican side are proud to embrace bipartisanship, because we know that that in fact is the best way to get things done for the American people.

Even in an election year, even in a election year there are some very basic principles that the American people share, and fairness happens to be one of them. That is what this is all about, is trying to bring about a modicum of equity; and we are doing it specifically to address the concern of those who are most impacted.

If you look at the cost for women, minorities, they are penalized greatly because of this marriage tax; and if you look at the cost, it is about $1,400 on average for those who are in that middle- and lower-income area.

So it seems to me that we have got a strong effort that has been put together here by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) and others on the Committee on Ways and Means who have been championing this issue for a long period of time.

It is all about equity and fairness. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? That is exactly what this rule is about too. The rule is a very fair one. It is a very equitable one. It allows my very good friend from New York (Mr. RANGEL) to offer his substitute motion. As was the case in the beginning when we took the majority in 1994, we are going to guarantee the motion to recommit.

So my Democratic colleagues will have two bites at the apple, and we will have one bite for the bipartisan package that we are moving forward here. It seems to me it is extraordinarily fair. We have turned ourselves inside out to accommodate the minority, and I know some of my Republican colleagues may not be too ecstatic about that, but we have done that; and I believe that in this instance, it is the right thing to do.

At the end of the day, Democrats and Republicans alike will join in support of the measure, so I hope the Democrats and Republicans alike will overwhelmingly support this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I do not disagree with the chairman. This is a fair rule; it is just not a fair bill. We get two bites at the apple, but they get five bites at the money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to my dear friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to spoil the reputation of the chairman of the Committee on Rules by complimenting him on this floor too often, but it is strange and unusual that we would get a fair and equitable rule like this, and I would just like to rise to the occasion to compliment him.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time we have given this identical rule. It is not out of character at all. We gave you this rule in February, so you know we are just continuing a long pattern of providing you with a great opportunity.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to strike that from the RECORD. This is the second time you have been fair.

Mr. Speaker, this gives us an opportunity to take a problem that we recognize as a serious problem of equity, and that is if two people filing separately can get a better tax break than someone that is married, then it is not the fair thing to do.

Why have we not taken care of this a long time ago? Why did we not follow former Congresswoman Barbara Kennelly from Connecticut as she led the fight to do it? One of the reasons was that it is difficult to be equitable when you do not have the funds to do it.

To talk about 3 or 4 years ago patching up something that the Tax Code was really unfair about and paying $100 billion in lost revenue was something unheard of. But now that the Clinton-Gore team's economic policy has clicked in and we find every day an increase in the revenue that we expect, it makes a lot of sense that we can come together, Republicans and Democrats, and see what we can do to repair an inequity in the law.

That is the problem. We do not come together, we do not discuss anything, and the Republican majority is so bent on making political statements that they are not concerned at all with what the President signs. All they are concerned with is that they are able to pass the bill in the House.

They learned a lot from their mistakes in the past, and that is putting together these tremendous irresponsible tax cuts of some $800 billion without even thinking about our Social Security system; paying down the national debt; repairing Medicare; and one of the things we are so concerned about, and that is allowing our older people who have access to health care but do not have access to the money to pay for the prescription drugs that are so important for their health.

All we are saying is why can we not deal with the Government's budget the way we do our own? We just cannot take the irresponsible, close-to-$1 trillion tax cut, and cut it up and say we are going to deliver it in small pieces. No. What we should do is to find out have we taken care of Social Security, are we working together to deal with the Medicare problem, do we have some kind of a bill that we can assure the people of the United States that, when we leave here, there would be an affordable drug program? Are we paying down the national debt? Then are we doing the things that we are sent here to Congress to do?

Already we have passed close to $500 billion in tax cuts. All at one time? Oh, no. The public relations divisions of the Republican Party have taken care of that. It does not come out of the tax writing committee; it comes out of the Speaker's office, out of the Committee on Rules. But if you want to talk about the Patients' Bill of Rights, they talk about tax cuts; you want to talk about minimum wage, they talk about tax cuts; you want to talk reforming pensions, they talk about tax cuts.

□ 1115

So here we are with the marriage penalty, both of us wanting to bring equity, but they enlarged the tax bracket for the 15 percent bracket, which causes us to lose another $100 billion in revenues and, worse than that, after 10 years, there is an explosion of the revenues that we lose. Should we give a tax cut? Yes, but not in these pieces that we come here with. We should have a comprehensive program that would do all of the things that we wanted to do. Why is it that every time our Republican colleagues steal a good idea from us, every time we agree with our colleagues that we should be working together, they have to pile on it an irresponsible tax cut to such an extent that it promises a veto.

So here we are again. We have a substitute, by any standard, that is fair. No one can challenge that what we do is take care of the inequity as it relates to the penalty.

In addition to that, we make certain that we make adjustments in the alternative minimum tax so that no one loses a benefit that is in the lower income, unlike the Republican bill. We make certain with the tax credits, the refundable tax credits, that the lower income people get a better break with that. So we do not concentrate, as our Republican colleagues do, on those that God has already blessed and they are still trying to give them additional fiscal blessings through the tax system.

Let us try to work together, not as Republican leaderships with Democrat minorities, but as representatives that truly represent the interests of the people of this country. When we do this, we will see that the President will join in and we will not have just House-passed bills, but we will have bills that will be accepted by the Senate and signed into law by the President of the United States.

The President has said, if you want to deal with this subject, put the drug issue as relates to affordable prescription drugs on your calendar, deal with it in a real way, the way we are going to do it, and we can do business.

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

I appreciate the gentleman's instruction about what we should be doing as a Congress, but I am not sure where he has been, because he says we have not addressed Social Security. Well, have we? Of course we have. We have a lockbox. We have locked away the Social Security Trust Fund for the first time. Have we addressed Medicare? Yes, we have done the same thing. We have locked away those funds for the first time. Have we addressed prescription drugs for our seniors? Yes, we did. We voted on it just about a week ago.

So, Mr. Speaker now, once again, we will give the President his chance to sign the Marriage Penalty Tax Relief Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) who has worked so hard on this legislation.

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of the accomplishments of this Congress. We balanced the budget, the first time in 28 years; we are now balancing it for the 4th year in a row. We stopped the raid on Social Security just this past week. Sometimes I think my friends on the other side of the aisle have amnesia, because we have already passed prescription drugs, provided prescription drugs for our seniors, we are paying off the national debt with a plan we have adopted by the year 2013, already paying down the debt by $350 billion; and we are also working to make our Tax Code more fair, particularly more fair for working and middle class families.

We have often asked in this House, many of us, a pretty basic, fundamental question. That is, is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code, married working couples pay higher taxes because they are married? Do we think it is right that 25 million married working couples, on average, pay $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married, compared to identical couples with identical incomes who live together outside of marriage. That is wrong.

We are fortunate that in February this House passed legislation with overwhelming bipartisan support, legislation that was initiated by myself and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. DANNER), a Democrat, a bipartisan bill that had 233 cosponsors. It passed this House in February with the support not only of every House Republican, but 48 Democrats broke ranks with their leadership and voted to eliminate the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples.

Unfortunately, in the Senate, the Democratic leadership has used every parliamentary procedure possible to block this legislation. We are now forced to move through the reconciliation process so that the majority can rule in the Senate.

The bottom line is, we want to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It is wrong, it is unfair.

Let me introduce Shad and Michelle Hallihan. This is a photo of them when we introduced the bill a year-and-a-half ago to wipe out the marriage tax penalty. Shad and Michelle are two Joliet township high school teachers, they suffer the marriage tax penalty because they are both in the workforce and, of course, the marriage tax penalty of $1,400 that they suffer is a lot of money in Joliet, Illinois, the south suburbs of Chicago. Mr. Speaker, $1,400 for Michelle and Shad Hallihan, that is a year's tuition at our local community college, Joliet Junior College, which is our Nation's oldest. It is also 3 months of day care for a child.

That is why I think it is important to introduce a new photo of Shad and Michelle Hallihan. Since they were married at the time that we introduced the legislation, they have since had a baby, and if Al Gore and my friends on the other side of the aisle had their way, the child will probably be grown and out of college by the time we eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Shad and Michelle have a little boy by the name of Ben. Little Ben has brought a lot of joy to their life, but because of the marriage tax penalty, there is $1,400 that goes out of the pocketbooks of Shad and Michelle and comes to Washington, money that they can use to take care of little Ben and $1,400. That is about 3,000 diapers. That is a lot of diapers for little Ben. Over 18 years, that $1,400 a year, if they just set that full amount in a college fund, that is over $25,000 that Shad and Michelle can invest in little Ben and little Ben's future for college. So the marriage tax penalty is real money for real people.

Shad and Michelle, the way they suffer the marriage tax penalty is the marriage tax penalty occurs when you have a husband and wife who are both in the workforce, they combine their income when they are married, file jointly, and when they combine their income, that means they are pushed into a higher tax bracket. If Shad and Michelle had chosen to stay single and just live together, they each, because of their income, would file in the 15 percent tax bracket. But they chose to participate in the most basic institution in our society which is marriage, and Shad and Michelle, because they are married, now pay in the 28 percent tax bracket. They suffer the marriage tax penalty.

We believe it is wrong. We want to help Michelle and Shad Hallihan as well as little Ben to make sure he has a future and they have the resources for this.

Mr. Speaker, under our bipartisan proposal, we do several things. We help those who do not itemize their taxes by doubling the standard deduction for joint filers at twice that of singles, and that helps about 9 million couples of those who suffer the marriage tax penalty. Those are the nonitemizers. Well, the rest, subtracting 9 from 25, that leaves 18 million couples who itemize their taxes who suffer the marriage tax penalty and they are people who are average folks, middle class, but they probably own a house. So if you own a home, you probably itemize your taxes, and the only way you can receive marriage tax relief is if we provide marriage tax relief as part of our proposal.

We do that by widening the most basic bracket, the 15 percent bracket so you can earn twice as much in the 15 percent bracket if you are a joint filer as a single person, and that is how we help Michelle and Shad Hallihan as well as little Ben prepare for his future by widening the 15 percent bracket.

I would also point out in our legislation that we provide marriage tax relief for those who participate in the

earned income tax credit, ensuring that they also participate and receive marriage tax relief. We also protect those who use the child tax credit for the alternative minimum tax. So we help both itemizers as well as non-itemizers, poor working families, and protect those from the AMT.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we need to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. I want to thank my friends on the other side of the aisle, particularly the 48 who joined with us, and I invite more Democrats to join with us in our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

I would point out that under the Democratic proposal, Michelle and Shad Hallihan would not receive any relief. If one itemizes their taxes, they would receive no relief under the Democratic proposal. If one is a homeowner and middle class and itemize your taxes, you receive no marriage tax relief under the Democratic proposal. Democrats say they do not want to help special interests, so I guess they say if you are middle class and you own a home and you itemize your taxes, you are stuck and you are still going to suffer the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, we have a bipartisan proposal that helps those who itemize, primarily homeowners; we help those who do not itemize, we help those on earned income tax credit, and we help those who may suffer the alternative minimum tax. It is a good bipartisan proposal. I urge adoption of this rule, and I invite strong bipartisan support of our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that they are not to characterize actions in the other body.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to engage the gentlewoman from Ohio. When I make the remark on behalf of the minority that we would like to see Social Security and Medicare taken care of and the gentlewoman asked the rhetorical question, where have I been. We in the minority, we on the Democratic side do not really believe it is taken care of when the gentlewoman says that the Republican plan is to do something next year. I mean the Republicans have been in the majority now for half a dozen years, and they have not come close to sharing with us where we are going to go to pull the Tax Code up by the roots, to reform Social Security and privatize it, to reform the Medicare system.

So what I am saying is that our Republican colleagues are pretty good on supporting the ideas we come up with, but in terms of the record, if what they are saying is that they have taken care of Social Security, the rest of the country does not know it.

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

Once again, I do appreciate the instruction from my friend in the minority, but in the 6 short years that the Republicans have been in charge of this place, we have done more to shore up Social Security and Medicare and provide relief for seniors than in the 40 years preceding when the Democrats controlled the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), our distinguished colleague.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the rule and I support the bill.

America is supposed to be family oriented, family friendly. Who is kidding whom here today? America's tax policy penalizes achievement and penalizes marriage. America's tax policy promotes dependency and promotes promiscuity. America's tax policy actually subsidizes illegitimacy.

In addition to killing jobs, IRS commissioner after commissioner made the statement, and many Members have quoted it, the Tax Code is used as a behavior modification economic program, and I agree; behavior modification through and by a Tax Code of devious and manipulative machinations that should have no place in our country. If the founders wanted a Tax Code to modify behavior, they would have hired Sigmund Freud to write this thing.

Now, as far as what has been done in the last 6 years, there have been some significant reforms. The Republicans have included significant tax reforms, wage attachments have gone from 3.1 million in 1997 to 540,000 in 1999. Property liens have gone from 680,000 under the old plan to 160,000 under the new reformed plan. And listen to this, America: property seizures before the IRS reform bill passed here in this Congress through the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, property seizures in 1997 were 10,037; 10,037 Americans lost their homes, their farms. In 1999, after the reform, 161.

Now, how could we make the claim that nothing is happening? I think it is out of hand. The Tax Code is out of control. In fact, I think the IRS is so screwed up, they could not find their posterior from some hole in the ground.

Finally, we should throw the income Tax Code out and, yes, tear it up by its roots, with a simple final retail sales tax, with the proper exemptions to save, and those people on the bottom end of the ladder and those seniors.

□ 1130

Let me close by saying this, and why I support this bill. Congress should promote marriage. Congress should reward marriage. Congress should promote family. Congress should reward family. A Congress that overtaxes married couples does not reward nor promote family nor marriages.

I yield back the fact that we have in fact placed in the Tax Code mechanisms that seem to reward all that is wrong and penalize all that is right. I think the American people see it, the American people know it.

I am very comfortable voting for the rule. I will vote for this bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I think, yes, the Washington Post editorial said it all titled ''A Phony Issue.'' Again I will quote: ''Congressional Republicans have scheduled votes this week on a sizeable tax cut mainly for the better off, which they misleadingly describe as relief from a marriage penalty. The President has rightly indicated that he will veto the bill as it is likely to be presented to him.''

As I said before, Mr. Speaker, by the year 2008, the year that the Republican bill fully goes into effect, 47 percent of American families with two children would get no relief whatsoever. The tax will have a new name, but many of the people it is intended to help it will not help.

This is not a bill that really helps all the people and does not change the tax brackets for the very rich so they get an added bonus under the so-called marriage penalty tax. I urge Members to vote for the rule and vote for the Rangel substitute.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to urge my colleagues to support this rule, the customary rule provided for tax legislation. The House has already passed virtually identical legislation to eliminate this marriage tax penalty. All we are doing today is using the reconciliation process to speed this legislation to the President's desk so we can give him a second chance to sign it.

Mr. Speaker, our society values marriage as a fundamental institution that strengthens our moral fiber. Marriage teaches us about love, family, commitment, and honor. How can we promote these ideals if we continue to allow the government to impose an unfair, discriminatory, and immoral tax penalty on individuals solely because they are married?

Today we have another chance to send a strong message, which is the right message, to hard-working families by voting to end the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) who has been a champion of this legislation comes to the floor constantly with his charts of Shad and Michelle, and anybody who follows this legislation probably has come to know them as household names.

When he started, Shad and Michelle were just getting married. Now Shad

and Michelle have a son. Let us get this signed into law before Shad and Michelle are grandparents. I urge a yes vote on the rule and on the bill.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. 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. PEASE). The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. 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 Chair announces that he will reduce to 5 minutes votes by electronic device, if ordered, on two motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings de novo were postponed yesterday which will immediately follow the vote on House Resolution 545.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 16, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—16

Conyers
Doggett
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gutierrez
Hilliard
Hinchey
Jackson (IL)
Kucinich
Miller, George
Oberstar
Obey
Pallone
Sabo
Udall (CO)
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—11

Ackerman
Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Forbes
McNulty
Owens
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Vento
Wynn

□ 1155

Ms. WOOLSEY changed her vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. PAUL, REYES and DAVIS of Florida changed their vote from ''nay to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on two of the motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed on Tuesday, July 11, 2000 in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

S. 1892, de novo;

H.R. 4169, de novo.

H.R. 4447 will be voted on later today.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote in this series.

VALLES CALDERA PRESERVATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 1892.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1892.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 377, noes 45, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—377

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin

Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—45

Archer
Bartlett
Brady (TX)
Chabot
Coble
Coburn
Cook
DeMint
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Ganske
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Graham
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Hostettler
Hunter
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kingston
Largent
Lewis (KY)
Manzullo
Paul
Pombo
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Terry
Thornberry
Toomey
Vitter
Wamp
Whitfield

NOT VOTING—12

Ackerman
Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Forbes
Houghton
McNulty
Owens
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Vento
Wynn

□ 1206

Messrs. WAMP, GRAHAM and LEWIS of Kentucky changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no''.

Messrs. STEARNS, HILLEARY and TANCREDO changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye''.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARBARA F. VUCANOVICH POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4169.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4169.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HILL of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—418

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen

Skelton	Taylor (MS)	Walsh
Smith (MI)	Taylor (NC)	Wamp
Smith (NJ)	Terry	Waters
Smith (TX)	Thomas	Watkins
Snyder	Thompson (CA)	Watt (NC)
Souder	Thompson (MS)	Watts (OK)
Spence	Thornberry	Waxman
Spratt	Thune	Weiner
Stabenow	Thurman	Weldon (FL)
Stark	Tiahrt	Weldon (PA)
Stearns	Tierney	Weller
Stenholm	Toomey	Wexler
Strickland	Towns	Weygand
Stump	Traficant	Whitfield
Stupak	Turner	Wicker
Sununu	Udall (CO)	Wilson
Sweeney	Udall (NM)	Wise
Talent	Upton	Wolf
Tancredo	Velazquez	Woolsey
Tanner	Visclosky	Wu
Tauscher	Vitter	Young (AK)
Tauzin	Walden	Young (FL)

NOES—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman	Doyle	Owens
Bachus	Evans	Slaughter
Campbell	Forbes	Smith (WA)
Carson	McNulty	Vento
Chenoweth-Hage	Metcalf	Wynn

□ 1213

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I was unavoidably absent on a matter of critical importance and missed the following votes:

On approval of the journal, I would have voted "yea."

On H.Res. 545, providing for consideration of H.R. 4810, the Marriage Penalty Reconciliation Act, introduced by the gentlelady from Ohio, Ms. PRYCE, I would have voted "yea."

On the bill, S. 1892, the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act, introduced by the gentleman from the other body from New Mexico, Mr. DOMENICI, I would have voted "yea."

On the bill, H.R. 4169, Naming the U.S. Post Office in Reno, Nevada as the Barbara F. Vucanovich Post Office, introduced by the gentleman from Nevada, Mr. GIBBONS, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 386, 387, 388, and 389. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 386, 387, 388, and 389.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY RELIEF RECONCILIATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 545, I call up the bill (H.R. 4810) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 545, the bill is considered read for amendment.

The text of H.R. 4810 is as follows:

H.R. 4810

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE, ETC.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000".

(b) SECTION 15 NOT TO APPLY.—No amendment made by this Act shall be treated as a change in a rate of tax for purposes of section 15 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN STANDARD DEDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 63(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to standard deduction) is amended—

(1) by striking "$5,000" in subparagraph (A) and inserting "200 percent of the dollar amount in effect under subparagraph (C) for the taxable year",

(2) by adding "or" at the end of subparagraph (B),

(3) by striking "in the case of" and all that follows in subparagraph (C) and inserting "in any other case.", and

(4) by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(6) of such Code is amended by striking "(other than with" and all that follows through "shall be applied" and inserting "(other than with respect to sections 63(c)(4) and 151(d)(4)(A)) shall be applied".

(2) Paragraph (4) of section 63(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

"The preceding sentence shall not apply to the amount referred to in paragraph (2)(A).".

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 3. PHASEOUT OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN 15-PERCENT BRACKET; REPEAL OF REDUCTION OF REFUNDABLE TAX CREDITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to adjustments in tax tables so that inflation will not result in tax increases) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(8) PHASEOUT OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN 15-PERCENT BRACKET.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2002, in prescribing the tables under paragraph (1)—

"(i) the maximum taxable income in the lowest rate bracket in the table contained in subsection (a) (and the minimum taxable income in the next higher taxable income bracket in such table) shall be the applicable percentage of the maximum taxable income in the lowest rate bracket in the table contained in subsection (c) (after any other adjustment under this subsection), and

"(ii) the comparable taxable income amounts in the table contained in subsection (d) shall be ½ of the amounts determined under clause (i).

"(B) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the applicable percentage shall be determined in accordance with the following table:

"For taxable years beginning in calendar year—	The applicable percentage is—
2003	170.3
2004	173.8
2005	183.5
2006	184.3
2007	187.9
2008 and thereafter	200.0.

"(C) ROUNDING.—If any amount determined under subparagraph (A)(i) is not a multiple of $50, such amount shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $50.".

(b) REPEAL OF REDUCTION OF REFUNDABLE TAX CREDITS.—

(1) Subsection (d) of section 24 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(2) Section 32 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (h).

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 1(f)(2) of such Code is amended by inserting "except as provided in paragraph (8)," before "by increasing".

(2) The heading for subsection (f) of section 1 of such Code is amended by inserting "PHASEOUT OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN 15-PERCENT BRACKET;" before "ADJUSTMENTS".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2002.

(2) REPEAL OF REDUCTION OF REFUNDABLE TAX CREDITS.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

SEC. 4. MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF FOR EARNED INCOME CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 32(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to percentages and amounts) is amended—

(1) by striking "AMOUNTS.—The earned" and inserting "AMOUNTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the earned", and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(B) JOINT RETURNS.—In the case of a joint return, the phaseout amount determined under subparagraph (A) shall be increased by $2,000.".

(b) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—Paragraph (1)(B) of section 32(j) of such Code (relating to inflation adjustments) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined—

"(i) in the case of amounts in subsections (b)(2)(A) and (i)(1), by substituting 'calendar year 1995' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof, and

"(ii) in the case of the $2,000 amount in subsection (b)(2)(B), by substituting 'calendar year 2000' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) of such section 1.".

(c) ROUNDING.—Section 32(j)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to rounding) is amended by striking "subsection (b)(2)" and inserting "subsection (b)(2)(A) (after being increased under subparagraph (B) thereof)".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider an amendment printed in House Report 106–726 if offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) or his designee, which shall be considered read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes of debate on the bill.

□ 1215

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

GENERAL LEAVE

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

may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4810.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, here we are again. We are here again moving this Congress to do the right thing for married couples by eliminating the marriage tax penalty in the Tax Code.

This bill is identical to H.R. 6 that passed this House in February. Why are we here again? Because the blocking techniques of the Vice President, as President of the Senate and the minority leader in the other body, have prevented our bill from even being able to come up for a vote on the floor. And then they have the audacity to say we are a ''do-nothing'' Congress. They are forcing us to come back again and pass this bill under reconciliation, which procedurally cannot be blocked from coming up on the floor of the Senate by their delaying tactics.

I was somewhat surprised to see recent campaign ads touting Vice President GORE'S support for fixing the marriage tax penalty in the year 2000, because it sure does not match the Clinton-Gore White House 8-year ''do nothing'' record of stonewalled opposition to fixing this unfair tax. Since 1993, the Clinton-Gore White House has sent 25 million married couples an expensive gift from the IRS: A bill for $1,400 a year. That is not exactly the traditional Happy Anniversary card.

So here we are, at it again, trying to fix this once and for all. And this is a bipartisan bill, with 48 Democrats in the House voting with us in February on a bill that is the most complete and fairest way to get this job done. But despite this bipartisan support, I have a feeling we will still hear excuses from Democrats today as to why we cannot do it.

For whatever reason, they may say we should not help stay-at-home moms and dads. And, yes, this bill does that. But their plan actually denies relief to these important parents. In fact, the Democrat plan leaves millions of married couples at the altar, and that is wrong. Raising a child is the single most important job in the world, and we are right to provide families with relief who have only one wage earner.

Democrats will also complain that this is too much tax relief. Of course, they say that about almost every tax bill that we bring up. But again they are wrong. Fairness demands it because it is wrong to take money from the pockets of wage-earning Americans just because they are married. The money should not be coming to Washington in the first place.

Then they might say, oh, we should wait; the timing is just not right to fix the marriage tax penalty. And they are wrong again. We should fix the marriage tax penalty right now. Married couples should not have to wait 1 day longer to be treated fairly by the Tax Code.

So, Mr. Speaker, this all comes down to a matter of principle. The fact that married couples pay more in taxes just because they are married is simply immoral, it is unfair, it is unjust, and today, once again, we are moving to overcome the blocking tactics of the Democrats in the other body and to fix the marriage tax penalty and return a small sense of decency to the Tax Code.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they are not to characterize actions in the other body.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

I wish we did not characterize the actions of the President of the United States. I thought that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was about to discuss tax policy with us, but he was not discussing principle, he was discussing politics. He was talking about the budgetary policies of the President and Vice President GORE.

I think we should be reminded that the only reason that we can even deal with reforming and providing equity for some of these tax provisions is that because of the Clinton-Gore budget policies we are now able to think in terms of surpluses instead of just deficits.

I would like to remind my colleague, too, that not one Republican ever voted for the Clinton-Gore 1993 budget. And when the vote was tied in the Senate, it took the Vice President to split that tie.

Now, when it comes to whether we are doing this thing in an irresponsible way, I used to think that that is what the Republicans were trying to do. When they had this $792 billion tax cut, they did not talk about paying down the national debt, they did not talk about our responsibility to Social Security, they did not talk about Medicare or affordable prescription drugs for our aged, and I, at that time, thought it would be irresponsible for them to move forward and just get enough political votes to pass a bill. I have changed my mind. It really is not irresponsible. It may be political.

But I have discovered that my Republican friends do not ask for these irresponsible cuts until first they find out that the President is going to veto it, and only then do they come out with not tax law but they come out with political statements. Whether we are talking about the minimum wage bill, the Patients' Bill of Rights, affordable prescription drugs, or whether we are talking about pension benefits, we can rest assured that when we Democrats try to work with them to remove the inequity to make the tax system more simple so that people can find it easier to file, they will find some way to entice the President to veto the bill.

Do they come back and ask to override the veto? Never, never, never, never. All they want to say in Philadelphia is that they passed the bill and the President vetoed it. I hope that the American people realize that the Congress, as any business or any family, before we just deal with revenue losers, we ought to take a look at the total package and the total responsibility.

I am so pleased that the President is willing to give my Republican friends a second chance by reconsidering getting a decent, affordable press description drug bill, and then he would consider reviewing once again the bill that they have sponsored in terms of removing the marriage penalty.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) will manage the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER).

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I would say to the previous speaker that if he votes against this legislation, he will deny about 30,000 married couples in the 15th district in New York relief from the marriage tax penalty, and that is just not fair. We believe it is time to eliminate the marriage tax penalty once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I am so proud of the accomplishments of this Congress. I am proud that we are now in the process of balancing the budget for the 4th year in a row. We locked away 100 percent of Social Security and stopped the raid on Social Security. We are on track to pay off the national debt by 2013, having already paid down the national debt by $350 billion. Just this past week we passed and sent to the Senate legislation providing prescription drug coverage available for all seniors under Medicare.

I am proud of those accomplishments. And of course part of our agenda is not only to accomplish those accomplishments, but also to bring fairness to the Tax Code. We have often asked in the House Chambers, many of us, is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code 25 million married working couples, on average, pay almost $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married. Now, is that right, is that fair, that if a couple chooses to participate in the most basic institution in our society, marriage, that they are going to pay higher taxes if they work?

Unfortunately, under our Tax Code, that is true. If a husband and wife are both in the workforce, both the man and the woman are in the workforce, a two-income household, under our Tax Code they will file jointly and, because

of that, they will pay a marriage tax penalty. That is just wrong. We have made this a priority, to eliminate the marriage tax penalty suffered by 25 million married working couples.

I was proud a year and a half ago, when we introduced a bipartisan bill, legislation sponsored by myself and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. DANNER), Republicans and Democrats, that 233 Members joined as cosponsors of our legislation to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. And I was so proud in February when this House passed our legislation with a bipartisan vote, which included every House Republican as well as 48 Democrats who broke rank with their leadership and supported our efforts to wipe out the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples.

In the well, Mr. Speaker, I have a photo of three constituents from Joliet, Illinois, Shad and Michelle Hallihan. When we first introduced our bill almost a year and a half ago to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, Shad and Michelle were newlyweds. Because of delays put forth by the other party, using every parliamentary procedure to block passage in the Senate of our efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, time has gone on, and now Michelle and Shad have a baby by the name of Ben.

For Michelle and Shad Hallihan, two public school teachers from Joliet, Illinois, the marriage tax penalty is real money. Michelle and Shad, their combined income is in the low $60,000 range, about $62,000. If they filed as single, chose not to marry, lived together and filed as single people, they would each pay in the 15 percent tax bracket. But because they chose to get married, Michelle and Shad Hallihan pay a marriage tax penalty.

Of course, when we think about Joliet, Illinois, $1,400 is a year's tuition at our local community college, Joliet Junior College; it is 3 months day care at a day care center for little Ben; and it is also a washer and dryer for their home. It is real money for real people.

I would point out that Ben, who is growing very rapidly, by the time he is 18, if we eliminate the marriage tax penalty for Michelle and Shad Hallihan, $1,400 over 18 years is over $25,000 that they can invest in a college fund for Ben for his future. It is real money for real people, and that is why we need to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

I am proud our bipartisan proposal, which is essentially identical to what we passed out of the House earlier this year in February. And of course now we are working to protect ourselves from a filibuster in the Senate, which is why we have to vote on it again today.

We do several things. We help those who itemize and those who do not itemize. We help those who are poor working folks who utilize the earned-income tax credit. And we also protect parents from the AMT's impact on the child tax credit. We double the standard deduction for those who do not itemize to twice that of singles. That helps those who do not itemize their taxes.

And for those who do itemize, I would point out that it is likely they, of course, own a home, so that they have a mortgage and property taxes that they use to deduct, as well as to give money to their church or synagogue or institutions of faith and charity. So they itemize their taxes. And the only way to provide marriage tax relief for those who itemize is to widen the 15 percent bracket. So that those who are in the 15 percent bracket as joint filers can earn twice as much as single filers in the 15 percent bracket.

We provide marriage tax relief for those on earned-income tax credit, and again I would point out that we protect those who benefit from the child tax credit, the $500 per child tax credit from AMT.

The bottom line is we want to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It is an issue of fairness for 25 million working couples, 50 million Americans; people like Michelle and Shad Hallihan, parents of little Ben.

Now, my friends on the other side of the aisle have realized they needed to respond and they are now offering an alternative, but I would point out that those who are middle class and homeowners are stuck with the marriage tax penalty. Under their proposal, middle class homeowners who itemize receive no marriage tax relief. They are left out because they think those individuals are rich, because they own a home. That is just wrong. We believe that suffering the marriage tax penalty is wrong no matter who the individual is. If couples are suffering the marriage tax penalty, it should be eliminated. That is the bottom line.

Mr. Speaker, let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty. Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty in a way that benefits every one of those 25 million couples who suffer the marriage tax penalty. We have bipartisan legislation.

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

□ 1230

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I favor a marriage penalty tax relief bill. That is why I say to my colleague on the Committee on Ways and Means, I am for the Democratic substitute, and I can face the thousands of voters in my district, whose numbers the Republicans like to cite for each of us in the House. We know our districts, and I know this bill that I am supporting; the Democratic substitute is the answer.

They are desperately, on the Republican side, trying to escape the ''do nothing'' label. It sticks and it sticks, and it will continue to be adhesive as long as they simply send bills that will be vetoed. They will never escape that label.

Why will this bill of theirs be vetoed if it were to pass? First of all, half of the relief in their bill goes to those who do not pay a marriage penalty. So they attach the marriage penalty label, though more than half of the money does not apply to that situation.

Secondly, many families with kids will not get the full relief that the bill promises because of the way they have shaped it.

Thirdly, the lion's share, and this is important, of the money goes to the top quarter of the tax filers.

Fourthly, look at the out-year projections. Assuming the AMT is eventually applied, and the chairman of the committee has promised that, the 20-year cost of their bill is $700 billion. $700 billion. That plays lightly with the future of my grandchildren and with the need to address Medicare and Social Security.

So if this bill is not what it says it is, if it is tilted against low- and middle-income families, if it shortchanges millions of families with children, and if it could break the bank, why this bill?

The answer is contained in the chairman's original speech. Pure politics. Philadelphia is what is on their mind.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee said, here we go again; and I say, there they go again passing a bill that will be vetoed by the President of the United States.

We can do better. The Democratic substitute does better, and that is why so many of us are going to vote for it and against the Republican bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the previous speaker, if he votes against this legislation wiping out the marriage tax penalty, he will vote to deny 120,000 married taxpayers in the 12th District of Michigan relief from the marriage tax penalty. That is just not fair. We need to work together to eliminate the marriage tax penalty as it affects everyone once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today this House can take another important step toward tax fairness for the American people.

When couples stand at the altar to marry and each says ''I do,'' not contained in their vows is any acknowledge of an additional payment in taxes. And yet that is what we have, my colleagues, for average Americans, for working Americans, a penalty in our Tax Code, roughly $1,500 a year.

Rather than talk about politics or political conventions or gamesmanship, Mr. Speaker, to the American

people this is not a game. These are people who work hard, who play by the rules, who every week sit around their kitchen table trying to make ends meet; and they need to be able to keep $1,500 of their own money.

Now, it is true my friends on the left, in a half-hearted way, offer a substitute. But again it points out, I guess, a legitimate difference, Mr. Speaker. My friends on the left honestly believe that the highest and best use of the money of the taxpayers of America is in the coffers of Washington, D.C., spent by Washington bureaucrats.

And that is fine. They are certainly entitled to that point of view. And to the extent that they now join us in talking about debt relief and paying down the national debt, they now join us in talking about prescription drug benefits, they now join us in wanting to strengthen and save Social Security, we appreciate that.

What we say, Mr. Speaker, is not for partisan purposes. In fact, we hold out the hand of bipartisanship with bipartisan sponsorship of this legislation. We invite our colleagues to join with us for real marriage penalty relief for America's working couples.

And, Mr. Speaker, we do something more. We invite the President of the United States to join us. Because here is a chance to do something good for every working couple in America, to strike this blow for tax fairness.

No, far from being irresponsible, this is one of the most responsible things we can do in a bipartisan fashion to reaffirm our belief in the institution of marriage, to reaffirm that we value the contribution of working families, to reaffirm that the money belongs to the people, not to the Washington bureaucrats.

Join with us, my colleagues. Mr. Speaker, let us again pass this marriage tax penalty relief. The American people deserve a divorce from high taxes. They deserve to have a chance to hold on to more of their own money.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, just before I launch into my formal remarks here, when I was listening to the Republican leadership talk about tax equity and talking about the metamorphosis of their tax proposals over the last 6 or 7 years, has there been a greater hoax perpetrated on this House than their argument that they were going to simplify the Tax Code, they were going to pull it out by its roots, they were going to fundamentally restructure the Tax Code of America? Well, under their sponsorship and stewardship, thanks to them, it is more complicated than ever.

Yesterday, the Washington Post ran an editorial about the marriage tax penalty. It was accurate in its analysis, but no one is going to pay much attention because we have moved beyond worrying about tax policy. The marriage penalty and the marriage bonus, the singles penalty and the singles bonus, all derived not from some nefarious scheme embedded in our Tax Code but from the fact that we have a progressive tax system.

If two individuals, one working and one not, get married, their total tax payment under the current system goes down. They have a marriage bonus. They had a singles penalty.

If two individuals get married, both working and both making about the same amount of money, they have a marriage penalty. They had a singles bonus. It stems from the progressive nature of our tax system.

Putting that aside, we made a clear decision to get rid of the marriage penalty. That decision should be advanced on a broad bipartisan basis. However, that is not the choice here. The choice is to send the President a bill he will surely veto.

The President has said he would sign a Republican version of the marriage tax cut if they would accept his version of a prescription drug benefit for senior citizens. The Republican leadership said, no thanks, because it does not fit the Philadelphia political agenda.

But what is most annoying is the fact that the Republicans are using the alternative minimum tax to deny millions of Americans any relief under their bill. The promise of their bill is to cut taxes by about $250 billion, but that will result in an increase in the alternative minimum tax of $65 billion. That is why this bill is said to cost $180 billion.

Make no mistake, it is deliberate. The interaction between the regular tax system and the alternative minimum tax is well known. Taxpayers in a State like Massachusetts claiming State and local tax deductions will most certainly be denied the promised relief that we have been told under the Republican version of this bill because personal exemptions and State and local tax deductions are not deductible against the minimum tax.

The Democratic substitute makes sure that everyone who is promised relief in the bill actually gets it. Our proposal is far superior, and the President will sign it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I say to the previous speaker, elimination of the marriage tax penalty is not only an issue of tax fairness, it is an issue of tax simplification, and that if he chooses to vote against this legislation, he will vote to deny 122,000 married taxpayers in the 2nd District of Massachusetts relief from the marriage tax penalty. That is not fair.

I invite him to join the 48 Members of the Democratic party on the other side of the aisle who voted with Republicans to eliminate the marriage tax penalty once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) a very distinguished and senior member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, marriage is a cherished institution in America; and we ought to promote it, not discourage it. So we intend to do just that today.

Right now married couples pay more in taxes than two singles living together. That is just wrong. Washington needs to stop penalizing the cornerstone of our society, the American family.

This year my wife and I will celebrate 50 years of marriage. My wedding day was one of the happiest in my life. And back then, I have to tell my colleagues, I was not worried about having to hold the wedding reception at the IRS office.

Today, in my district alone, 150,000 Texans are penalized for just being married. By repealing the marriage penalty, we are going to restore the American family tradition and the American dream.

Republicans in the House have spent the past few years passing tax bills to eliminate the marriage penalty, but every time the Clinton-Gore administration vetoed them all.

Enough is enough. It is time to repeal the taxes on American values. Let us start by saying ''I do'' to repealing the tax on marriage.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come to sign this legislation and, for once, put American families first.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), referenced an editorial in the Washington Post, and I include for the RECORD the editorial from July 11 entitled: ''A Phony Issue.''

[From the Washington Post, July 11, 2000]

A PHONY ISSUE

Congressional Republicans have scheduled votes this week on a sizable tax cut mainly for the better off, which they misleadingly describe as relief from a ''marriage penalty.'' The president has rightly indicated that he will veto the bill as it is likely to be presented to him. That suits the sponsors perfectly, in that the vote is mainly intended as a frame for the national nominating conventions that will be held during next month's congressional recess.

The Republicans seek to score political points as the tax-cut party. But on this one, the merits are on the president's side, and our sense is that the politics may be as well. The marriage penalty is a phony issue; the cost of the bill is high; the bulk of the benefit would go to people already quite well off, and there are better uses for the money—to shore up Medicare, for example. The president can be expected to make good use of all

those points; he has set his own stage for that in advance.

The tax code does not penalize married couples. To the contrary, as a matter of long-standing policy it is tilted in their favor. A married couple at a given income level owes less income tax than a single taxpayer at the same level. The so-called penalty arises when two single people, each with income, marry. Their combined income is likely to move them into a higher tax bracket. That's what the fight is about; the issue is not the treatment of marriage but the progressive nature of the income tax. The marriage issue is a veil. If the sponsors succeed, you can bet their next target will be the ''singles penalty'' that they themselves will have helped to accentuate by lowering the taxes of married couples relative to single payers. The widow's penalty, they'll call it.

The proposed cuts are not even confined to people paying a ''penalty'' as the sponsors define it. About half of married couples—those in which one spouse earns the bulk of the income—receive a marriage ''bonus'' in that their taxes are less than if both were single. But they too would benefit; the sponsors hardly want to be accused of slighting the ''traditional'' family in which the mom stays home. About half the savings in the bill would go to such families.

The cost of the legislation would be a quarter-trillion dollars over 10 years. The president has said he would trade the Republicans. This bill for his Medicare prescription drug benefit, which carries a similar price tag. It's the wrong trade; a drug benefit does not redeem the defects of this bill. The politicians, including the president, say there's plenty of money for both, but the budget surpluses to which they point are projections only, and in some ways highly artificial. Among much else, they assume that future politicians will exercise precisely the kind of discipline that these are prepared to abandon. An easing of fiscal discipline would likely also cause the Federal Reserve to tighten monetary discipline; this is a vote for higher interest rates at one remove.

The marriage penalty is little more than a slogan, a bumper sticker masquerading as serious tax policy. The vote this week is a political stunt that would mainly solve a nonproblem while weakening the government's ability to fulfill its long-term obligations. The right vote is emphatically no.

Mr. Speaker, this editorial lays it out very clearly. And that is why we are here. We are all here about politics. This is not about any kind of policy.

The editorial says that they know that they are going to send this bill to the President, he is going to veto it, and that ''that suits the sponsors perfectly, in that the vote is mainly intended as a frame for the national nominating conventions that will be held during next month's congressional recess.''

Now, this bill was written for me. I came to Congress, I was divorced, and I married somebody who has a job. This bill gives me a great tax benefit because our combined income is up around $100,000 because that is as high as it goes. If they have a combined income of $60,000, that is their wife makes 30 and they make 30, they will get $218.

But my wife and I, because we make considerably more than that, we are all the way up to the maximum, we will get a benefit of $1,150. Oh, and we do not have any kids. That is important. If they have kids, they are going to lose this on the AMT.

The Treasury says that by 2008, half the people in this country who are getting the benefit will lose it because if they have kids they lose it under the AMT.

□ 1245

Now, the reason I am going to vote against this bill, which would be in my particular financial interest, in my pocket, is this: I have a mother. I have a mother who is one of the 9 million widows in this country who lives on $8,000 a year. She is not getting anything from this. And this majority has consistently refused to deal with Social Security, which my mother lives on. That is her only income. They have refused to do anything about shoring up Medicare, which is the only health care system she has. And they will not give her a financial benefit for her prescription drugs.

Now, the President has made a deal, I think a bad deal, but it is not a bad deal for my mother. He says, we will take the Republican plan if you will give my mother a real pharmaceutical benefit. The Republicans say, ''Nope, we ain't doing that.'' We are going to give your mother a little voucher and send her out there and let her look around for some insurance company like all the HMOs that have been pulling out of the State of Washington, and we are going to say, find one that will stand still long enough to give you a pharmaceutical benefit.

That is not a real benefit. I want my mother to have the benefit the President has promised. So I am going to vote for the Democratic alternative and hope the Republicans come to their senses.

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

I would remind my good friend and colleague from Washington State that it was a Republican Congress that for the first time locked away 100 percent of Social Security and Medicare, stopping the raid. It was a Democrat Congress that raided the Social Security trust fund for 30 years.

I would also say to the previous speaker that if he votes against this effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, he will vote to deny 106,000 married taxpayers in the seventh district of Washington relief from the marriage tax penalty. That is not fair. I invite him to join the 48 Democrats earlier this year who broke with him and voted with the Republicans to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH), one of the leaders, a proven leader in the effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, one of the chief sponsors of the Weller-McIntosh-Danner Marriage Tax Elimination Act.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, let me take a moment to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his tremendous leadership on this. His ceaseless efforts, particularly to shepherd it through the committee now twice, has been enormously important in making sure that this bill will come to the floor and that families will get their marriage penalty tax relief.

When I ran for Congress, I pledged to Hoosiers in my district that I would fight for more freedom, to cut their taxes and to strengthen their families as the centerpiece of our community. When I discovered that the Tax Code discriminates against marriage, I knew that by eliminating the marriage penalty, Congress could both cut taxes and strengthen the family. I made eliminating the marriage penalty my highest priority ever since.

It is unbelievable to most Americans that our Tax Code punishes them because they are married and they choose to work. Two constituents of mine, Sharon Mallory and Darryl Pierce, both work in a factory in Indiana. They wanted to get married, but they learned from their H&R Block representative that they would give up a $900 tax refund and be penalized $1,800 if they decided to get married.

Sharon Mallory wrote me a letter and said, ''Darryl and I would very much like to be married, and I must say it broke our hearts when we found out we can't afford it.'' Mr. Speaker, that letter broke my heart. I vowed to never stop fighting until this anti-family marriage penalty tax was eliminated. I have fought on the front lines for Darryl and Sharon and for 600,000 Hoosier families, 1.2 million Hoosiers, who will save over a billion dollars as a result of this marriage penalty relief and for 25 million Americans all over this country who want us to do the right thing.

The alternative bill, Mr. Speaker, does not help stay-at-home moms. It does not help stay-at-home dads. It does not help homeowners who do not qualify for the alternative. It does not help Darryl and Sharon Mallory. With record surpluses, this is the best chance we have to provide real tax relief and to help families at the same time. Let us put partisanship aside.

One of the things that I have noticed is that nobody stands up and says that it is a good idea to punish marriage and let us have a marriage penalty tax, but there are a lot of excuses for not doing it. Let me ask my colleagues on the other side to put aside partisanship and join us in getting this done. President Clinton has already indicated he could sign this bill. Of course he has got his conditions, but he said he could sign it. Vice President Gore is already campaigning on marriage penalty relief. So do not be left holding the bag here on the House floor. Join us in a bipartisan effort to do what is right for the American family and then we can be proud that we have helped to eliminate the marriage penalty for many Americans and reduce it for all families in this country.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a distinguished

member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the approximately 100,000 people who live in the Third Congressional District of Maryland that are affected by this bill are going to be somewhat perplexed by the debate that is taking place. About half of this 100,000 are currently paying a marriage penalty for being married. That is wrong. And they have their Congressman here today speaking up and saying that we should do something to help that approximately 50,000 that are paying a marriage penalty for being married. These are couples that have approximately the same income that are paying a penalty under our tax code for being married.

The other half are receiving a bonus today. These are individuals that are actually paying less taxes by being married than they would if they were filing single returns. These are couples in which one spouse has a much higher income than the other spouse. If they were living together without the benefit of marriage, they would actually be paying more taxes. They have a marriage bonus. They are not calling me. They are not writing me asking me to provide more relief because they are married. They are already getting the bonus.

The problem with the Republican bill is that it spends $182 billion and one-half of that is going to the people that are already receiving a marriage bonus. This is not the first tax bill that we are considering in this body. We have already been considering estate tax repeal that spends $69 billion over 10 years and then explodes in cost. And the list goes on and on and on.

The problem is we cannot afford to continue to spend money to deal with a problem that spends much more than we need to to deal with the issue. We have seniors who need prescription medicine coverage under Medicare. We have schools that we need to reduce class size and modernize. There are other priorities that we need to deal with.

This Congressman is interested in helping the people who pay a marriage penalty that live in my district. We can do that for one-half the cost of this bill. It is in the interest of all of my taxpayers, those that are paying a penalty, those that are receiving a bonus, that we do it right. The Democratic substitute is better targeted.

We should be working together, Democrats and Republicans, to figure out how we can target the relief to those that are paying the penalty and, therefore, we can do other priorities in addition to just this one. That is what we should be doing. But unfortunately this is more about a political message than it is about helping the 50,000 plus people in the Third Congressional District of Maryland that are truly paying a marriage penalty and deserve some relief by this body and unfortunately will not get it because of our inability to work together on a bill that could be signed by the President.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I note my friend's comments about one-half of the relief going to those who do not suffer the marriage tax penalty. If they analyzed their own bill, what they do with the standard deduction provides a similar proportion of those who do not suffer the marriage tax penalty some relief.

I would also say to the previous speaker that if he votes against this legislation to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, he votes to deny 132,000 married taxpayers in the third district of Maryland relief from the marriage tax penalty. That is just not fair. I want to invite my friend from Maryland to join the 48 other Democrats who have broken with their leadership and are supporting efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty once and for all.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), a senior and respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this issue.

I represent the middle part of Michigan. In my district alone, there are 106,000 people paying more taxes simply because they are married. The Vice President is trying to criticize the Congress as a ''do nothing for the people'' Congress. Yet he probably will not mention that this is the second time we have had to pass this bill because the President and some congressional Democrats think we are doing too much for 28 million American couples.

Earlier this year, the President said he supported marriage penalty relief, but here we are today, 6 months later, again passing marriage penalty relief. Yet he continues to threaten American families with a veto. The President does not mention that his own proposal and the Democrat substitute, I might add, does not do one bit for a working couple who saved enough last year to buy a home. Why? Because those people itemize. They fill out a different tax form. To not help those people is simply not fair.

I for one am proud that we are able to take this step forward and fix this glaring inequity. Let us strengthen families. I urge a ''yes'' vote on H.R. 4810.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, of course, our tax laws should not discriminate against marriage. And if ending such discrimination, if ending the marriage penalty were the true purpose of this initiative, it would have already been law and married couples would have benefited from it for a number of years, at least 3. Indeed, last year we Democrats again came to this House, and we offered more marriage tax penalty relief than our Republican colleagues. They were much more concerned with loading up their trillion-dollar tax cut with special interest provisions like the chicken manure tax subsidy and so forth that was really the mainstay of their effort last year rather than helping married couples.

Again this year, we offered to work with them in a bipartisan fashion to create true marriage tax penalty relief. They have rejected that. They have done so, I must say, with some rather unusual arguments in favor of their proposal. This indicates, I suppose, what sheltered lives some Republicans live. Why, they have told us that the Tax Code is encouraging people to live out of wedlock; that it is encouraging illegitimacy. I hate to expose them to a rude awakening about premarital relations in this country, but I just have a feeling that the fine print of the Tax Code is not the first thing that young people look to before they decide on their living arrangements or their relations with the opposite sex. I think if they continue arguing that, they will only demonstrate that they are even more out of touch with what is happening in this country than they do by their usual endeavors here most every day.

Leave it to the House Republicans to take something we all agree with, that there should be no discrimination in our tax code, and turn it from a workable, bipartisan plan into a total political ploy. You will remember the first time they came out here, they just happened to package it up in a loving way on Valentine's Day to present to the American people. That is the kind of political grandstanding with little action behind it that has characterized this entire Congress.

I think that the only illegitimacy associated with this bill is its mislabeling. It is not marriage tax penalty relief. Over half of the dollar benefit in this bill goes to people who do not incur a marriage tax penalty, people who gain tax advantages because they are married and filing a joint tax return. I have been extremely fortunate to be married to the same woman who has put up with me for over 31 years, my parents together over 55 years. I value the institution of marriage. But there are many folks that have not been as lucky. Some of them are widows or widowers. Some of them are victims of domestic violence. Some of them are single mothers that are trying to do as good a job as we tried to do for our family to rear their children. Why should our tax laws discriminate against those individuals? That is exactly what this bill does. Not

every family has the good fortune to be married. Some choose to remain single for a variety of reasons. My feeling is that our tax code ought not to discriminate for or against someone depending on their marital status.

This bill could also be called the Single Mothers Tax Penalty Act, or the Widow and Widowers Tax Penalty Act. The gentleman from Illinois seems to have so many statistics on those individuals that are going to benefit from this act, I wonder if he has statistics on how many will be discriminated against by a bill that accords over half of its benefits to people that do not suffer any marriage tax penalty. Unfortunately, instead of crafting bipartisan legislation, we have another political ploy that would produce more bad public policy.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Texas, the previous speaker, if he votes against this legislation, this bipartisan legislation to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, he will vote to deny 116,000 married taxpayers in the 10th District of Texas relief from the marriage tax penalty. By voting for the Democrat substitute, one votes to discriminate against those who itemize, particularly middle-class, married couples who own a home.

I also want to extend an invitation to my friend from Texas to join the 48 Democrats who broke with their leadership this spring and vote in a bipartisan way to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP).

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank him for just outstanding leadership, and all of the cosponsors of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in the 35 counties in east Tennessee, 200,000 people are adversely affected by the marriage tax penalty. More than 110,000 couples pay approximately $1,400 per year more in taxes simply because they are married. That is not right, and the fundamental issue here is whether or not we are going to reduce the tax burden on the middle-class folks in this country.

When I was born in 1957, if you add up the Federal, State, and local tax burden on my parents when I was born, it was not collectively, combined, more than 10 percent of every dollar that they made. Today, it is almost 50 percent.

In my lifetime the level of taxation in this country has gone from less than a dime of a dollar to almost half of every dollar you make. At what point are we going to roll this back? The fundamental issue is, it is time in a budget surplus to roll some of the taxes back from the middle-class taxpayers in this country.

If we do not do it now, with these record surpluses, my question is, when are we going to? If we do not sign the bill into law now, when will it happen? Because I would suggest if we do not do it now, it is not going to happen, and it is important that we continue to persist.

I am grateful that some people do not make everything out to be partisan. This is not about Republicans and Democrats, this is just about regular folks saying some taxes, death taxes and the marriage tax penalty, are unfair, they should be eliminated, never should have been there to begin with. And if you are not going to wipe those taxes out at a time of unprecedented surpluses and a good economy, when are you going to do it? It is not going to happen.

I believe in tax relief. I do not mind saying so. I also believe in tax fairness, in tax equity. There are 65 provisions in the Tax Code that penalize people just because they are married. Well, that is nonsensical. Our Tax Code is out of hand, to begin with. It is way too big and complex, it needs to be dramatically overhauled, and that will come, I hope, soon, but not between now and November.

This is today. This is now. We can pass this conference report, after all the debate that has taken place; we can send it down the street with some bipartisan support, and the President can sign it into law. I call on him to do that.

I call on all of our colleagues to come together and get some taxes, just one step at a time, off the back of middle-class America. Some people play class war with taxes. This is just regular people. These are the regular people you run into at the Food Lion in east Tennessee. Cut their taxes. Eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the speaker that was in the well and hope that the leadership of the House could come together with some type of package to present to the President that could be signed into law that would include a decent affordable drug package. There is an opportunity to do this.

I also agree with the gentleman that the present Tax Code is in the shape that most tax writers, as well as other Members of Congress, should be ashamed of.

The majority has been there for over half a dozen years. They talk a lot about pulling it up by the roots; but obviously, like with Social Security and Medicare, they have not been able to get enough discipline on their side to do anything about it. But that does not mean that something as important as a tax cut should be handled in the manner in which they are handling it.

I think that we should try to do it in a bipartisan way, not to do it in a piecemeal way, to agree to the cuts we are going to have, and to allow the other bills that we are talking about, whether they are the minimum wage bill, whether they are the Patients' Bill of Rights bill, whether it is pension bills, not just try to stack up on each and every decent piece of legislation a tax cut.

I think there is plenty of room for us to work together on, so that at the end of the day we can say in a bipartisan way that we have come to a meeting of the mind. There will be enough for us to debate at the polls come November, but certainly on these important tax issues, we should have to agree that whether it is the Republican majority today, or the Democratic majority next year, we cannot get anything done unless we work together in a bipartisan way. Neither one of us will enjoy the substantial margins that would allow us just to work our will. We are going to have to work in a bipartisan way if we are going to get any progress now or next year, so why not begin to think about working together this year.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, of course, I want to once again remind my good friend from New York, the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, that this legislation, when it passed the House earlier this year, it received bipartisan support. Forty-eight Democrat Members of the House joined every House Republican to vote yes to eliminate the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples.

I would also point out to the previous speaker that if you vote against our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty in a bipartisan way, you will vote to deny 60,000 married taxpayers in the 15th District of New York relief from the marriage tax penalty. That is just not fair.

Again, I want too extend an invitation to my friend from New York to join us in a bipartisan effort, join those 48 House Democrats who voted with Republicans, to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), a distinguished Member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for his phenomenal leadership on this very important issue.

We have heard a lot of debate today about saving Social Security and Medicare and prescription drug coverage; and it is interesting if you think for a moment, the President and Vice President have been in office for 8 years, and now in the last 3 months or 5 months of their term in office, they come up with all these plans to rescue Medicare, Social Security, add prescription drug coverage. Those are important issues,

and the Republicans take them seriously. We on the Committee on Ways and Means have been working on these very, very important issues.

Regrettably, when you talk bipartisan legislation, or at least when they claim it from the other side of the aisle, it is only bipartisan if it is their idea and their way. But the remarkable thing about this process on this floor is that after all of the baying at the moon about what a lousy idea this marriage tax penalty elimination is, we will be joined by numerous Democrats who recognize that the marriage penalty is in fact a penalty on marriage. Like estate tax relief, when we talked about it, we were derided for hour on hour on hour, and ultimately we had 95 brave soldiers join us in passing this very important piece of legislation.

Taxing two hard-working Americans who are married is a shame. It is abomination. Now, they use those words in their press conferences, but I do not hear them uttering them on the floor today.

Now, I just ask Americans who are watching today, hearing this debate and wondering what it is all about, there is a lot of rancor from one side and a lot of boasting on our side about the great importance of this bill; and I think at the end of the day, we win the debate. But more importantly, stay tuned, because the President will join us and support us and probably sell out his side of the aisle in order to make a deal on his legacy. And the Vice President, against tax cuts at the beginning of the year, now embraces $500 million of tax cuts.

So I just suggest to everybody, wait around for a little while and sooner or the later the parade follows leadership on issues important to the American taxpayer.

Now, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is not bankrupting the system with this bill. We will have money for prescription drug coverage. We will have money for Social Security reform. In fact, we lockbox Social Security and protect it for now and into the future, instead of, as they were for 40 years, borrowing out of the money and using it to pay their bills, or actually not even paying their bills, putting us in deeper debt and deeper deficit. We are in a financial quagmire because of their leadership. Now we have been in charge for 6 years, and finally advancing bills that are helping the American family.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and go to church this Sunday and explain your actions to your fellow parishioners, why you voted to continue to tax the sanctity of marriage. I am single, so I am not going to have a big argument from what I will save in my tax bill.

But to those of you who feel compelled, go to church next Sunday and stand up in the choir and praise the Lord first, and secondly say but I voted against you who are married, because I think you should have an added burden. Not only are you trying to raise children, pay the mortgage, buy a new washer and dryer, but the Government thinks because you are married, we should take a few more bucks out of your pocket and then spend it in Washington, because you know Washington knows best.

Save marriage, end the penalty, let Americans prosper.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Members are reminded that their remarks are to be directed to the Chair and not to other persons who may be viewing the proceedings of the House.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am not as much troubled by what I hear today, as by what I do not hear. What I do not hear is any of the participants reminding the American people that because of actions that Congress has taken during our lifetimes, our Nation is $5 trillion deeper in debt than the day that any of us were born; that we are the beneficiaries of those expenditures; that our Nation won the Cold War; that it built the interstate highway system; that it built the intercostal canal system; that it did a lot of good things for all us. And now it is time, when we have the opportunity because of some small surpluses to pay the bills, we seem intent on doing those things not to pay them.

In a search to give some Americans a break, we are going to see to it that all Americans continue to have $1 billion a day of their tax money squandered on paying interest on that debt; $1 billion a day.

I hear my colleagues talking about this enormous surplus, as if somehow this building is awash in cash. Well, if it exists, why are you delaying the pay of the people who serve our Nation in crummy places like Bosnia and Korea, people who are at sea right now, under the sea, on the sea on aircraft carriers for 6 months at a time, why are you delaying their pay from September 29 of this year to October 1, making them go an extra weekend when they cannot buy baby formula or diapers?

Do you know why? Because you are trying to disguise the true nature of the debt. You took that $2.5 billion pay period and you shifted it to the next fiscal year so it would look like the surplus is bigger than it really is.

Mr. Speaker, why are we not as intent on paying down the debt that was incurred in our lifetime as we are in trying to score political advantage against each other come November 2? The Nation that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) fought for, the Nation that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) fought for and so many Members of this body fought for is worth saving. If we do not pay our bills while we have this brief opportunity, the first time in 30 years that we actually have a surplus, then we never will.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my good friend from Mississippi, who I share many of his concerns on behalf of our friends, I would point out many of our military men and women suffer the marriage tax penalty, and invite him to join with us in a bipartisan efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, to close, I yield the balance of my time to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), a leading and respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. Speaker, like 144,000 other taxpayers in the 3rd District of Georgia, I wear a wedding band.

□ 1315

It is a symbol of my marriage. But, due to the Tax Code, it is an excuse to raise more revenue, and that is not right.

Under today's Tax Code, 25 billion married couples pay higher taxes as a result of saying, I do. Today's bill will change that. It will allow both wives and husbands to each take a full standard deduction, and it will broaden the lower tax bracket so that lower- and middle-income couples will not be punished or pushed into a higher tax bracket when their incomes are combined.

The Marriage Penalty Tax Relief Act of 2000 will provide American families relief from the excessive taxation which has been caused by our government's excessive spending. Now that a balanced budget and reforms that the Federal Government has done in the past few years, we have a positive cash flow. It is time to reduce the tax burden on working Americans. Ending the unfair marriage penalty is an important step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, my hope is that we will not stop there. American families are also paying far too much for gasoline, which is a necessity for most households. My hope is that we will look at repealing some of the Federal excise taxes which contribute to the high cost of gasoline.

But today, Mr. Speaker, we are considering relief from the marriage penalty. I had hoped that we would have made the tax relief in this bill effective for the tax year 2000 instead of the year 2001 so families could get immediate relief. Hopefully, in the conference we will be able to accomplish the change in the effective date for the taxable year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, despite the delay in implementation, this is a good bill that will correct an injustice in the Tax Code. I urge the House to pass this legislation. I urge the President to sign this bill into law, and I call on Members of the House and Senate to resist the temptation to use tax relief for married couples as a pawn in some political game.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress to help make our communities more livable—to make families safe, healthy and economically secure. Clearly, affording needed tax relief to America's working families is part of that effort. This bill, however, skews priorities: Rather than focusing on the working people who need help the most, the bill offers the most relief to those who already have lobbyists working for them.

First of all, we ought to be making things easier for families, not more difficult. One big problem for them is that a growing number are being forced into the Alternative Minimum Tax, which was originally intended to ensure that very wealthy people paid at least some income tax. Just last week, I was confronted back home with a farmer who has 10 children that he works hard to support. Taking the tax credits for his children triggers the AMT for him, and no one would confuse him with Bill Gates.

This bill not only fails to solve the problem, it actually makes things worse. In every year, a larger percentage of families are shut out from the full benefits of the bill, exceeding 50 percent by 2010.

It's not that hard to fix this. The Democratic alternative, which I support, would offer $89.1 billion in marriage penalty relief. It would fix the AMT problem, making sure that families actually get the tax relief they've been promised. It would direct an additional $10 billion to low- and moderate-income families. Even better, it would cost less than half of what the Republican bill does.

With that additional revenue, we could address other pressing priorities. More than 11 million American children have no health insurance. Many of their grandparents pay staggering sums for the prescription drugs that prolong and improve their lives. We have children with special educational needs that Congress has promised to fund—but Congress can't find the money for them. Sadly, in my own state, one in five children suffers from hunger sometime during the year. I believe these issues deserve our attention just as much as adjusting the tax schedule.

For that reason, I will vote for the alternative that offers the most direct and targeted tax advantages for American families. Unfortunately, the majority has rejected the opportunity for commonsense reform in favor of political theater. The bill the House will pass today will rightly be vetoed by the President. It is going nowhere—and it shouldn't go anywhere. At $182 billion, the cost of admission to this political sideshow is just too high.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, once again this House has before it legislation to eliminate the penalty on marriage that is found in the income tax code.

Quite simply, marriage should not be taxed.

As the financial pressures of families result in both spouses entering the labor force, an increasing number have become subject to the marriage penalty. A major reason why so many joint filers face this added burden is that the very first dollar earned by the lower-earning spouse is taxed at the marginal rate of the higher-earning spouse, not necessarily at the lower 15% rate faced by single filers. This problem was exacerbated in 1993, when the Clinton tax measure increased the number of tax brackets from three to five.

The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that over 20 million married couples pay higher taxes than they would if they were single. This ''tax'' on marriage averages nearly $1,400 per couple. This $1,400 could be used by families to save for college or retirement, make car payments, or pay for tutoring.

Middle income families are hit the hardest by this penalty and they need this legislation for tax relief. I urge the House to pass this legislation.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4811 and in strong support of the Rangel substitute. Unlike the underlying bill, the Rangel substitute alleviates the marriage penalty while preserving the necessary resources to enact other tax cuts for working families, to pay down the debt, and to protect Social Security and Medicare.

About half of all married couples pay more in income taxes because they are married than they would if they were single. The other half pay either the same or less. The Rangel substitute provides $90 billion in targeted relief to couples who pay the marriage penalty. The Republican bill, by contrast, funnels more than half the $182 billion in tax benefits to couples who receive a marriage bonus and ⅔ of the tax benefit to households earning more than $75,000 annually.

With finite resources available, the Republican bill must be viewed in term of its opportunity costs. The more than $100 billion in this legislation that is unrelated to marriage penalty relief could be used to enact significant tax cuts for working families. Rather than increasing tax bonuses for higher income people, Congress should help families cope with their core pocketbook issues such as reducing the cost of college, increasing the affordability of health insurance, and encouraging savings for retirement. In my view, these areas, along with marriage penalty relief, should be the tax cut priorities.

The current budget projections will accommodate significant tax cuts along with an aggressive plan to pay down the debt and to strengthen Social Security and Medicare. Paying down the debt and in turn reducing interest rates is perhaps the most significant tax cut Congress could offer. Lower interest rates would cut mortgage payments on a $100,000 house by $2,000 annually. Likewise, the cost of farm operating loans, car loans, and student loans would all be reduced.

Finally, before allocating surplus for tax cuts, Congress should set aside sufficient resources to shore up the long-term future of Social Security and Medicare. The current surplus projections afford us a rare opportunity to strengthen these programs for the Baby Boom generation and beyond. We must also reserve adequate resources to enact a guaranteed drug benefit as part of the Medicare program so that seniors will not be forced to choose between their prescriptions and their food and shelter.

In sum, there are a host of priorities that deserve our support, including marriage penalty relief. It is critical, however, that this relief be targeted so that we may enact other tax cuts for working families, pay down the debt, and protect Social Security and Medicare.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, when we considered a basically identical bill in February, I voted for it, although I was very reluctant to do so.

I was reluctant because that was not the best time for this bill, and that was not the best bill for the job.

It wasn't the right time because we had not yet adopted a budget resolution and so a tax bill—or a spending bill, for that matter—should not have been considered then. Now, of course, we have a budget resolution in place. So, today at least the time is right.

But this still is not the best bill for the job because in some areas it does too little, and in others it does too much.

It does too little because it does not adjust the Alternative Minimum Tax. That means it leaves many middle-income families unprotected from having most of the promised benefits of the bill taken away. The Democratic substitute would have adjusted the Alternative Minimum Tax, which is one of the reasons I voted for that better bill.

The Republican leadership's bill does too much in another area. Because it is not carefully targeted, it does not just apply to people who pay a penalty because they are married. Instead, a large part of the total benefits under the bill would go to married people whose taxes already are lower than they would be if they were single. In other words, if this bill were to become law as it now stands a primary result would not be to lessen marriage ''penalties'' but to increase marriage ''bonuses.''

And, by going beyond what's needed to end marriage ''penalties'' the bill—if it were to become law—would go too far in reducing the surplus funds that will be needed to bolster Social Security and Medicare.

Those were and remain the reasons for my reluctance to vote for this bill. They are strong reasons then and they are strong reasons today.

In fact, if voting for the bill today would mean that it would be law tomorrow, I would vote against it. But that isn't the case, fortunately. The Senate still has a chance to improve this bill. So, I will reluctantly vote for the bill because I favor eliminating the marriage penalty.

I am prepared to give the Republican leadership one last chance to correct the bill's deficiencies rather than simply to insist on sending it to the President for the promised veto. I hope that the Republican leadership will allow the bill to be improved to the point that it merits becoming law—meaning that it will deserve the President's signature.

But if they miss that opportunity, and insist on sending to the President a bill that falls short of being appropriate for signature into law, I will vote to sustain a veto.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H.R. 4810, the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000. This is yet another bill in a series of legislation brought to the floor to help America's wealthy. Yes, we have entered an era of budget surpluses, but the surpluses must not be squandered on those who don't need it—the wealthiest U.S. income-earners. I support targeted marriage tax relief such as the Democrats have provided in our substitute amendment today. I also support increasing the earned income tax credit for the working poor who really do need the tax break. The Democrats have provided for this in the substitute bill as well. And the Democratic substitute makes sure that nobody will be denied the relief because of the AMT. The Republican bill does not.

The Republicans have brought the estate tax, marriage penalty tax, medical savings accounts, and the telephone excise tax to the

floor for consideration, and next week they plan to bring pension reform to the floor as well. Not a single one of these provisions will provide relief for middle and lower income working families. This Congress has already spent $471 billion on tax cuts for the wealthy and plans to spend another $54 billion on increasing pensions for the wealthy next week. This Congress can be charged with recklessly spending half a trillion dollars on the wealthiest Americans and there may be more to come. This is an irresponsible use of the hard-earned tax funds lower and middle-income earners contribute to their federal government.

I. MARRIAGE PENALTY TAX

This bill should target tax relief for those who need it most. Unfortunately, the GOP proposal actually helps wealthy Americans, not simply those facing a tax penalty due to marriage by implementing a tax bracket change favorable to those in the top brackets. There are nearly as many families that receive ''marriage bonus'' as receive marriage penalties in the U.S. As much as half of the $182 billion in tax relief in the GOP bill will go to families who receive the bonus and are not hurt by the marriage penalty. This bill's costliest provision, expanding the 15% tax bracket, only benefits taxpayers in the top quarter of the income distribution. This accounts for 65% of the plan's total cost, or nearly $100 billion. This bill's title implies that it helps those who are faced with a marriage penalty when it truthfully benefits the wealthy.

II. ESTATE TAX

The estate tax repeal—and the numerous other tax measures passed by the House—should be scrutinized with a measure of fairness. It hardly seems fair to come to the floor of the House week after week to provide hand over fist full of tax break dollars to the wealthiest U.S. taxpayers, when we haven't even addressed Medicare's solvency. The estate tax bill is the most egregious of all of the tax bills that have come before the House for a vote. It spends the most amount of money—$105 billion—on not just the wealthy, but the very wealthy. Ninety percent of the tax cut benefits will to go to those in the top 1% income group—those earning $319,000 per year and with estates over $20 million. Clearly this is a tax break for the rich.

III. PENSION REFORM

The Ways and Means Committee is scheduled to markup the pension reform bill tomorrow and it's expected to be on the floor sometime next week. While many of my colleagues would like to believe that this package of reforms will help to increase pension coverage for working Americans it will do exactly the opposite. Trickle down economics didn't work for Reagan and it won't work for pensions. This bill will directly help those executives who earn $200,000 per year. This bill will purely benefit the rich when not one provision is included to help increase pension coverage for low and middle-income workers.

IV. MEDICAL SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

The Republicans want to appear as though they are helping the average American worker so they decided to include medical savings accounts (MSAs) in the Patients Bill of Rights. The greatest savings from MSAs will help workers who have little or no health care expenditures. It allows people with low health costs to avoid taxes through essentially a new form of an IRA. And the Republicans go even further by allowing people to withdraw money from their MSA without any tax penalty if they maintain the deductible of $1,000 for individuals and $2,000 for families. This isn't a health proposal at all—it's just more money for the rich.

V. TELEPHONE EXCISE TAX

While this isn't a bill to directly help wealthy Americans, its primary purpose is to help wealthy corporations. This is just another fiscally irresponsible way for the Republicans to reduce federal revenues for the vital programs that the working families of this country rely on. The leadership of the 106th Congress doesn't care if it squanders another $20 billion in tax revenues by repealing the telephone excise tax. The GOP doesn't care if we have enough money to save Social Security and Medicare for future generations or to give our seniors a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

The Democratic substitute bill targets those workers who need it most. The Democratic substitute addresses the marriage penalty by giving married couples a standard deduction twice that of single people. In addition, low-income married couples face a marriage penalty in the earned income tax credit. The Democratic substitute would reduce those penalties by increasing the income level at which the credit begins to phase out by $2,000 in 2001 and by $2,500 in 2002 and thereafter. It would also repeal the current reduction in the EITC and refundable child credit by the amount of the minimum tax. The Democratic substitute is the responsible way to address the marriage penalty tax without pandering to the wealthiest 2% of U.S. earners. I urge my colleagues to support the Democratic substitute and oppose H.R. 4810.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to state my opposition to this bill being adopted in its current form. We should offer relief from the tax burdens, which may be imposed by our nation's current marriage tax policy only to those who are in need of help.

As founder and co-chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I do share many of the leadership's concerns regarding the promotion of stable and secure marriages in our society. After all, the foundation of any civilization is the strength of its families. Therefore, I believe that we should seriously consider passing legislation that will provide true relief for those pending marriages which are threatened by our nation's current marriage tax policy.

For this reason I have joined my fellow Democratic colleagues in voicing opposition to H.R. 4810, the Marriage Penalty Tax elimination Reconciliation Act as it is written because it does less than what it is being purported to do. For example, it will not provide marriage penalty tax relief for the poor of our society who face many hurdles to finding stable footings upon which to build lives for their children and families. In addition to this concern, H.R. 4810 provides a tax break mostly to the very wealthy. This fact alone taints the image that many in this body would like to project to Americans, that our actions have the altruistic intent of only helping those young people in our communities who are just starting out in life and who would like to marry.

I would suggest to those Americans who eagerly await our actions in this matter pay close attention to what this body is actually attempting to do. Our efforts today should not be based on tax cut slight-of-hand and short-sided actions on the issue of marriage.

All of us present understand that the institution of marriage is very important. I personally believe that it is sacred, and for this reason we should be very careful about what we do as a legislative body, in an area that is after all a personal decision. We should be very sure that any legislative changes made to any benefit for our citizens has the effect of supporting the institution of marriage in real and meaningful ways.

I would ask my colleagues to remember the struggle shared by them and their spouses when they first married. For this reason, I am very supportive of Congressman's RANGEL's substitute amendment to this bill. I applaud Congressman RANGEL's attempts to reach some middle ground on this issue with the majority, and thank him for bringing before this body an opportunity to have a rational discussion regarding the marriage tax policy of our nation. As the bill is currently written, the tax penalty to the federal government should this bill become law would be $182 billion in lost government revenue.

Like the bill, the Rangel substitute would reduce the marriage tax penalty by increasing the basic standard deduction for a married couple filing a joint income tax-return to twice the basic standard deduction for an unmarried individual, and adjusts the Alternative Minimum Tax in an attempt to ensure that the benefits of the standard deduction change would not be nullified. However, an added benefit of the Rangel substitute is that it will also reduce the marriage tax penalty by modifying the tax code in order to make more married couples eligible for the Earned Income Tax Credit beginning in 2001. Additionally, the Rangel substitute will increase the income level at which the credit begins to phase out by providing $2,000 in 2001 and $2,500 in 2002 and subsequent years. I would add that unlike the bill, the substitute does not provide for an increase in the upper limit of the 15% tax bracket. I would hope that this body not endorse a tax cut for the wealthy under the guise relief tax relief for newly married young couples.

This body did not do all that it could have done to promote the stability of marriage among our nation's senior population with the passage, of what was called, the senior's prescription drug benefit bill that was passed prior to the July 4, break that legislation merely gave insurance companies more money. If the marriages of our elderly poor are shattered due to the high cost of health care and in particular the financial stress created by the unfair cost of prescription drugs then the security of their marriages as well as their lives together are threatened. We should take the opportunity presented to us through the consideration of the Rangel substitute to make amends for some of the lack of attention given to real life problems through the adopting of a marriage penalty relief bill that will provide real tax relief to real people.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4810, the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000. This bill is the exact marriage penalty relief bill that was passed in February. So I must ask why are we wasting valuable time debating legislation that has already been considered and which the president threatened to veto last February? It is time that we provide tax relief for those couples that are truly penalized and then use the remaining time in this session to do what the

American public is asking for; providing prescription drug coverage, paying down the national debt and strengthening Social Security and Medicare.

While I support tax relief for those couples who are penalized, I do not, support H.R. 4810 which would provide tax relief half of which will to go those couples who benefit from a marriage bonus rather than a marriage penalty under the current tax code. Further, this bill would cost $182.3 billion over the next ten years and would give the lion's share of its tax cuts to higher-income families. The average tax cut for families with incomes less than $50,000 would be about $149 per year, while families with incomes over $75,000 would get an average tax cut of nearly $1,000 per year. That is why I oppose H.R. 4810 and support the substitute offered by Representative Rangel, which is fairer and more fiscally responsible.

The substitute would do a better job of fixing the marriage penalty, and cost less than half as much as H.R. 4810. It would assure that the Alternative Minimum tax (AMT) does not deny the tax relief the bill promises. The AMT ensures that everyone pays at least a minimum tax. Under H.R. 4810, many married couples with children will not get the advertised tax relief because they fall under a complex set of AMT rules. When this bill was drafted behind closed doors, it ignored the effect of the AMT. As a result, by 2008, nearly half of the American families with two children would be under the minimum tax and receive nothing or less than what H.R. 4810 promised.

Like the bill, the substitute would reduce the marriage tax penalty by increasing the basic standard deduction for a married couple filing a joint income tax return to twice the basic standard deduction for an unmarried individual. The substitute also would reduce the marriage tax penalty by modifying the tax code in order to make more married couples eligible for the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) beginning in 2001. It would increase the income level at which the credit begins to phase out by $2,000 in 2001 and by $2,500 in 2002 and thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to do what is right for the American people and oppose H.R. 4810 and support the substitute that provides genuine relief for our citizens who are truly penalized.

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, with great regret, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4810. The regret is not only because I must oppose this bill, but because my friends on the other side of aisle are unwilling to enact true and meaningful reform that benefits all American citizens. Instead, we are being presented with proposed legislation that will assist couples making more than $75,000 a year at the expense of strengthening future financing of Social Security and Medicare and modernizing Medicare by including affordable prescription drug coverage.

On the surface, this bill appears to be a blessing for all married couples but there will be millions of unhappy tax payers next April 15th when they learn that they will not benefit from the promises being made today.

Who will benefit? Two-thirds of the actual benefits in this package will go to the 30% of married couples making more than $75,000 a year. Review of the bill by financial analysts indicate that the average tax cut for couples receiving more than $75,000 would be $994 a year, compared to a tax cut of only $149 for couples making less than $75,000 a year.

Perhaps the most egregious flaw in this bill is that makes no modifcation to the Alternative Minimum Tax which places a floor on the total amount of deductions which couples may file for each year. By not adjusting that figure, many middle-class families with children will not receive a dime from the sham ''benefits'' contained in this bill. I believe that it is those very families with children who most deserve a marriage tax benefit.

H.R. 4810 proposes to remove $50.7 billion over five years and $182.3 billion over ten years from the federal budget. We are already scrounging for funds in an effort to pay down the national debt and shore up the Social Security and Medicare funds. Where will this put us in ten years when today's middle-aged married couples are ready to retire?

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today to express his support for H.R. 4810, the Marriage Penalty Tax Elimination Reconciliation Act. This bill will have a positive effect, in particular, on middle and lower income married couples.

At the outset, this Member would like to thank the distinguished Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], for introducing this legislation.

It is important to note that H.R. 4810 has the same provisions as H.R. 6, which passed on the floor of the House on February 10, 2000, by a vote of 268–158, with this Member's support. However, the Senate has been unable to reach the 60 vote threshold on a cloture vote to close debate on marriage penalty legislation. As a result, the House is now considering the marriage tax penalty as the first reconciliation bill, a status which will allow debate and amendments to be limited in the Senate.

While there are many reasons to support H.R. 4810, this Member will enumerate two specific reasons. First, H.R. 4810 takes a significant step toward eliminating the current marriage penalty in the Internal Revenue Code. Second, H.R. 4810 follows the principle that the Federal income tax code should be marriage-neutral.

1. First, this legislation, H.R. 4810, will help eliminate the marriage penalty in the Internal Revenue Code in the following significant ways:

STANDARD DEDUCTION

It will increase the standard deduction for married couples who file jointly to double the standard deduction for singles beginning in 2001. For example, in 2000, the standard deduction equals $4,400 for single taxpayers but $7,350 for married couples who file jointly. If this legislation was effective in 2000, the standard deduction for married couples who file jointly would be $8,800 which would be double the standard deduction for single taxpayers.

THE 15 PERCENT TAX BRACKET

It will increase the amount of married couples' income (who file jointly) subject to the lowest 15 percent marginal tax rate to twice that of single taxpayers beginning in 2003, phased in over six years. Under the current tax law, the 15 percent bracket covers taxpayers with income up to $26,250 for singles and $43,850 for married couples who file jointly. If this legislation was effective in 2000, married couples would pay the 15 percent tax rate on their first $52,500 of taxable income, which would be double the aforementioned current income amount for singles.

2. Second, H.R. 4810 will help the Internal Revenue Code become more marriage-neutral. Currently, many married couples who file jointly pay more Federal income tax than they would as two unmarried singles. The Internal Revenue Code should not be a consideration when individuals discuss their future marital status.

Therefore, for these reasons, and many others, this Member urges his colleagues to support the Marriage Penalty Tax Elimination Reconciliation Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The time for general debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute offered by Mr. RANGEL:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY IN STANDARD DEDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 63(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to standard deduction) is amended—

(1) by striking ''$5,000'' in subparagraph (A) and inserting ''twice the dollar amount in effect under subparagraph (C) for the taxable year'',

(2) by adding ''or'' at the end of subparagraph (B),

(3) by striking ''in the case of'' and all that follows in subparagraph (C) and inserting ''in any other case.'', and

(4) by striking subparagraph (D).

(b) INCREASE ALLOWED AS DEDUCTION IN DETERMINING MINIMUM TAX.—Subparagraph (E) of section 56(b)(1) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The preceding sentence shall not apply to so much of the standard deduction under subparagraph (A) of section 63(c)(2) as exceeds the amount which be such deduction but for the amendment made by section 2(a) of the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subparagraph (B) of section 1(f)(6) of such Code is amended by striking ''(other than with'' and all that follows through ''shall be applied'' and inserting ''(other than with respect to sections 63(c)(4) and 151(d)(4)(A)) shall be applied''.

(2) Paragraph (4) of section 63(c) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

''The preceding sentence shall not apply to the amount referred to in paragraph (2)(A).''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

SEC. 3. MARRIAGE PENALTY RELIEF FOR EARNED INCOME CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 32 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to credit for earned income) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) REDUCTION OF MARRIAGE PENALTY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a joint return, the phaseout amount under this section shall be such amount (determined without regard to this paragraph) increased by $2,500 ($2,000 in the case of taxable years beginning during 2001).

''(B) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2002, the $2,500 amount contained in subparagraph (A) shall be increased by an amount equal to the product of—

''(i) such dollar amount, and

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting 'calendar year 2001' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

If any increase determined under the preceding sentence is not a multiple of $50, such increase shall be rounded to the next lowest multiple of $50.''

(b) REPEAL OF REDUCTION OF REFUNDABLE TAX CREDITS.—

(1) Subsection (d) of section 24 of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(2) Section 32 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (h).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 545, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

As I have pointed out earlier, there comes a time that we should be talking about legislation that does not just pass the House, but is signed into law. What we have done is to recognize that there is an inequity that exists when certain couples pay more taxes than they would pay if they were not married, and that is why we double the standard deduction to take care of this inequity.

We too would like to give more dramatic tax cuts, but not just to give $200 billion out at a time, but to take a look and to see that the tax cuts are targeted, that they are fair and that they are equitable, but at the same time that we have fulfilled our responsibility to the Social Security, the Medicare system, and that we pay down some part of our Federal debt. This is so important when we think of the trillions of dollars that we are still in debt and the billions of dollars that we pay every year in interest.

Mr. Speaker, it would just seem to me that if we could come together and compromise, to make certain we take care of the problem without trying to make political statements, that the House of Representatives will be in better shape not as Republicans, not Democrats, but as lawmakers that are able to say that in the House, the people govern.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) claim the time in opposition?

Mr. WELLER. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

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

I would like to briefly respond to my good friend from New York, and I respect his efforts to offer a proposal addressing the marriage tax penalty, and I would point out that even though he means well, his proposal falls short.

Unfortunately, under the Democratic alternative, there is a very large group who suffer from the marriage tax penalty who are left out, essentially discriminated against under the Democratic alternative, and they are those who itemize their taxes. I would point out that those who primarily itemize their taxes are middle-class families, middle-class married couples who itemize their taxes because they give money to charity, their church or their synagogue, their temple, institutions of faith and charity, or they own a home. So if we think about it, we think about our constituents back home, married couples who, of course, suffer the marriage tax penalty and whether or not they own a home and, of course, I have thousands of married couples who suffer the marriage tax penalty and own a home. Under the Democrat proposal, they would be left out. They would still have to tough out suffering the marriage tax penalty.

Let us remember, what is the average marriage tax penalty? The average marriage tax penalty is $1,400. Here in Washington, $1,400 is a drop in the bucket; it is nothing to those who want to spend money here in Washington. But for families back home in Illinois and the Southside of Chicago and the south suburbs where I have the privilege of representing, it is real money. Fourteen hundred dollars is a year's tuition at our community college, it is 3 months of day care at our local child care center, it is a washer and a dryer. Frankly, for someone who just had a baby such as Michelle and Shad Hallihan, two public schoolteachers from Joliet, if they are able to set that full marriage tax penalty every year, that is $25,000 that they could set aside for their little child, Ben.

The bottom line is, if we want to help those who suffer the marriage tax penalty, we should help those who itemize taxes, such as those who give to charity, those who give to their church or their synagogue, as well as those who own a home.

So clearly, I rise in opposition to the Democrat alternative. The bipartisan effort which was supported by every House Republican, as well as 48 Democrats who broke ranks with their leadership, and again, I want to extend an invitation to those who did not support us this spring to join with us in an even greater bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Democratic substitute and in opposition to the base bill we have before us concerning tax relief.

I think what stuns me the most is how time and time again, the majority party proves its preference for clinging to a political sound bite that they hope will translate into Election Day results rather than actually seizing golden opportunities to accomplish something good for the American people.

How much more clear could it be that the vast majority of this body, as well as the Senate and the President, are eager to bring about genuine marriage tax relief for the average American family? We could come to the floor this afternoon and in very short order develop the compromise that would bring meaningful support and tax equity to millions of Americans. Sadly, we choose instead to continue a charade.

The other thing that amazes me is the level of inconsistency reflected from one message of the day to the next. On one day, this House loves to congratulate itself on its commitment to debt reduction. The next day it is tax relief for small businesses. Another day, we swear our support for Social Security and Medicare, while doing nothing about Social Security and Medicare. Then, we promise a huge tax cut not only for middle- and low-income married couples, but we also sneak in wider tax brackets to benefit on this folks.

Now, I think most of these things are worthy, and, in fact, should be among our highest priorities. But it is just not possible to have 10 different number one priorities.

The blue dogs looked at the whole picture and realistically balanced each concern with the other, rather than pandering to the ''cause du jour.'' We do not live in the political fairy land which believes in a Budgetary Godmother who can wave her magic wand and grant all of our expensive wishes.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Democratic substitute on the floor today. It would accomplish what the name implies: genuine tax relief for couples who have been penalized by virtue of marriage. It corrects the flaw in the Republican bill, the AMT problem which would deny relief to nearly half of middle-income American families with two children by the time the bill would be fully phased in. It also endorses the idea that lower-income, married couples deserve relief by adjusting their earned income tax credit. Just as importantly, the Democratic substitute ensures that we will have resources for other priorities, such as debt reduction, strengthening Social Security and Medicare, estate tax relief, prescription drug coverage, and

providing relief to our rural hospitals. The Democratic alternative and motion to recommit will guarantee that estate tax relief does not come at the expense of raiding the Medicare trust fund or taking away resources needed for Medicare prescription drug coverage.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to actually accomplish good today. Will we choose that path, or will we continue to choose rhetoric over solutions? Vote for the Democratic substitute and strongly oppose the base bill.

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

I would say to my good friend from Texas that if he chooses to vote against our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, he will vote to deny 114,000 married taxpayers in the 17th district of Texas, many of whom are ranchers and farmers, relief from the marriage tax penalty, and that is just not fair. I would extend an invitation to my good friend from Texas.

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

Mr. WELLER, Not this time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is going to use my name and my district, I would ask the gentleman to yield.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I extend an invitation to the gentleman from Texas to join us in a bipartisan effort and to join the 48 Democrats who already voted for this legislation.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER). The Chair will be glad to extend an opportunity shortly.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), my good friend, and a leader in the effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I am sure if my colleagues or the public is listening in on this debate, they are kind of confused, because Republicans and Democrats are both coming to the floor and they are saying they want to provide marriage tax relief and both are saying that it is unfair.

Folks, what we need to understand is that the Democratic leadership plan could best be labeled ''Marriage Penalty Tax Relief Light.'' The reason for that is that the Democrat leadership plan wants to create new discriminations in the code. They want to, for example, discriminate against stay-at-home moms or stay-at-home dads, or they want to discriminate against the people who own a home, but might have a mortgage against it, but provide tax relief for those people who own a home, but who would not have a mortgage against it.

Basically, what the Democrats are saying is that we will support your plan, if you will shift the marriage penalty from some families and impose it on other families.

Now, this bill is not just about tax relief, it is also about tax fairness. The Republican plan says, let us do this. Let us treat all families basically the same, if they have the same level of income.

Mr. Speaker, this Republican tax package started out as part of our budget. We said that we wanted to balance the budget and pay down the national debt. That was opposed by the Democrat leadership. We said we wanted to set aside 100 percent of Social Security in a lockbox. That was opposed by the Democrat leadership. We passed a prescription drug plan, $40 billion for seniors, also opposed by the Democratic leadership, and now we have a tax plan, a tax relief plan for all American families, and that is opposed by the democratic leadership as well.

Mr. Speaker, 90,000 families in my district, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) does not have to tell me how many, because I know, are going to get an average of $1,400 in tax relief from this bill, and they need it. I urge us to support the Republican plan, I urge us to oppose the Democrat substitute for tax relief light.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) to give him an opportunity at least to respond to the accusations made by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), my good friend, it may be true, and I assume the gentleman's numbers are correct, but I also have 116,000 Social Security recipients in my district. In all due respect, the Republican tax bill and the entire other tax package will jeopardize the future of Social Security and Medicare. And just as the gentleman in his own district, he has 92,000 senior citizens that he is willing to put at risk for this continued charade that we have today.

With all due respect, we have to have a balanced package, and we cannot do all of those things which the gentleman from Illinois and others contend we can do. We must map some priority choices, and I resent the fact that the gentleman from Illinois would imply that what I am voting for today does not eliminate the marriage tax penalty in the 17th district because it does, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) knows it.

□ 1330

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), for yielding time to me. I do not think I will need 4 minutes, but I appreciate the courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I have 61,000 good reasons to reform the marriage penalty. That happens to be the number, 61,000, of couples in my district being stuck with the marriage penalty today. What they will tell us is that taxing marriage is not just unfair, it is irrational, so why on Earth would any couple be forced to pay a penalty for getting married?

But if we listen closely to what they are saying to us, they are saying something besides, do not tax my marriage. They are saying, yes, we want a tax cut, but once we get it we do not want to have to spend it paying for our parents' prescription medicine.

They are right. That is why we have offered an alternative. We are cutting the marriage penalty for the middle-class couples, I think a better alternative than what the Republicans have offered, because it is fair, it is more equitable, it deals with the concerns of working men and women in this country, working couples.

But we are saying, let us just not stop there. Let us invest in providing an affordable prescription drug benefit through Medicare. If we do this right, and the offer has been made by the President, if we do this right, we can provide tax relief for married couples and affordable medicine that older Americans deserve. Even more, we can do it without busting the budget. We can do it within the confines of fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, let us make sure that the tax relief that we provide goes to the couples who have earned it, not to the big drug companies who want it.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the substitute and vote against passage of this bill. When we get into conference, as we will, as we get into a final discussion of this issue as well as other tax issues, as well as the prescription medicine, prescription drug bill, we will be able to facilitate the needs of both of those very important constituencies that we represent, and we will be able to do it within the confines of a balanced budget, reducing our national debt, getting the debt gone so we can have some fiscal solvency in our national life, as well as making sure that Medicare and social security are solvent at the same time, and providing tax relief for the people who need it in this country.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would remind my good friend, the minority whip, that the balanced budget we are working on this year not only locks away 100 percent for social security, but it pays off the national debt before 2013, the same year the President has set as a goal, and also sets aside $40 billion for prescription drug coverage under Medicare, legislation we passed just a few short weeks ago.

I would also note to my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that if

he chooses to vote against our bipartisan efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, he will vote to deny 122,000 married taxpayers in the Tenth District in Michigan relief from the marriage penalty.

That is just not fair. Let us work together. I would extend an invitation to join with the 48 Democrats who broke with their leadership and voted in a bipartisan way to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), a family advocate and leader in the effort to eliminate the marriage penalty.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I commend him for solid work on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support for the Republican bill and in opposition to the Democratic substitute. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is immoral to have a Tax Code that discourages people from getting married. It is immoral to have a Tax Code that encourages people to live out of wedlock.

I saw it firsthand in my medical practice where I had couples coming in to see me as patients who were living outside the bonds of marriage, and when I would ask them why, the reason I heard most often was because their taxes would go up.

It particularly disturbed me to see it in senior citizens, who knew that they were setting a bad example for their children and their grandchildren, and they would most often cite to me that their taxes would go up $1,000 to $1,400 if they were to get married. Our tax relief package provides that necessary relief so we would not have a Tax Code encouraging people to live outside of wedlock.

The Democratic substitute will provide about $210 worth of marriage tax penalty relief to those same couples, and it does not get the job done, in my opinion. We will not relieve this immoral feature of our Tax Code with their substitute, so that is why I am encouraging people to vote against it.

I would like to address head-on two of the big complaints that we are hearing today, one of which is that when we expand the 15 percent tax bracket for married couples filing jointly so that they do not suffer a marriage penalty, we provide tax relief to some married couples where the mother stays home and takes care of the kids.

I say, what is wrong with that? Is that not a middle-class tax cut? Did President Clinton not campaign in 1992 on welfare reform, balancing the budget, and a middle-class tax cut? What is wrong with providing those same families with a stay-at-home mom or stay-at-home dad some relief from their taxes?

Do not all the psychologists tell us that one of the best things to make sure kids do well in school and we have a lower incidence of juvenile delinquency is to have parents that are more involved? Should we not be encouraging parents to take more time to stay at home and be with their kids?

Another thing that I want to address head-on, and we heard this from one of the previous speakers, is that, oh, we are better off using this money for something else.

I heard that argument in 1997 when we passed the $500 per child tax credit and the capital gains relief. We passed those, and all the naysayers said, well, the money will be gone. We will not see that money anymore. We could better use it to spend on this or that.

What happened? Well, revenue into the Treasury went up. Indeed, those same arguments went on in 1980 when Ronald Reagan lowered taxes. The same arguments went on in 1960 when Jack Kennedy lowered taxes. Every time we lower taxes, revenue into the Treasury goes up, it does not go down. It is not a zero sum game.

The parents who get that money are going to spend that money. They are going to create jobs, stimulate the economy. We pass this tax package and it will be the best way for us to make sure that Medicare is solvent and that we can have a prescription drug plan, because revenue into the Treasury will go up, it will not go down. It is not a zero sum game.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), a distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. We passed a bill that would cost us, once fully phased in, $50 billion a year to provide relief to 2 percent of taxpayers when we cut the estate tax. The 2 percent of the taxpayers happen to represent the 2 percent wealthiest taxpayers in America, and 98 percent of all American families would not participate in any of that tax cut. That will cost about $50 billion once it is fully phased in.

This bill, which purports to provide relief for married couples, would cost about $30 billion per year as well once it is fully phased in. When we start adding it up, we start to realize that if we do do all of these things, we will not have money to do some other things.

Like what? Well, we are fighting on this floor these days to try to figure out a way to provide seniors with a way to pay for not an estate tax, when we have a massive estate and we are trying to avoid taxes on it, but trying to help them pay for basic coverage for drugs that they need, prescription drugs that they need, just to continue a healthy lifestyle as seniors.

We cannot get there. We have not done that yet. Yet, we will not have the money to pay for the cost of helping seniors afford prescription drugs so they do not have to make the decision between their prescription drugs or their rent or their prescription drugs or their food because we are going to spend it on giving a tax cut in the estate tax repeal bill that will benefit only the 2 percent richest families in America.

We are now talking about doing a marriage tax penalty relief that will benefit in many cases families that are not even being penalized. About half of the benefits of this bill go to families that are not even being penalized, so-called penalized, under the marriage penalty because they are families where there are two income earners, and one of the income earners happens to be very high earning and the other very low earning, but because this is a bill that gives an across-the-board cut to anyone who is married, even those who are benefiting from the Tax Code, and that includes that working family where there is one very high-earning spouse and the other a low-earning spouse, we are still going to give them a benefit, when in fact what we are trying to do is make sure there is no so-called penalty for any couple that decides to get married as compared to two people who stay single to live together.

How unfortunate that what we are planning to do is to provide tax cuts and not help seniors, unfortunate that we are looking to do tax cuts that benefit mostly wealthy folks and not help seniors, trying to do this and not protect young people who are trying to go on to school and perhaps make it on to college; do these tax cuts that help mostly wealthy individuals, and not help shore up our Armed Forces, where we have Armed Forces personnel, some of our men and women in uniform, who are on food stamp programs because we cannot give them enough money.

Why do we not start to do the right things first, get rid of those things that we need to do first, work on passing legislation that deals with the important parts of getting our seniors their benefits, getting our men and women in the Armed Forces the monies they need in their salaries, and then we go on to do the tax cuts that will benefit all people, not just the wealthy?

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

I would say to my good friend, the gentleman from California, that if he chooses to vote against our bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, he will vote to deny 88,000 married taxpayers in the 30th District in California relief from the marriage tax penalty. That is just not fair.

Let us work together. I invite my friend from California to join the 48 Democrats who broke with their leadership and supported our bipartisan efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 3½ minutes to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), who has been a real leader on behalf of families.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a good day. This is a good day for Americans because we are moving one day

closer to eliminating the marriage tax penalty. It is a good day for working women.

I am a working woman. Many working women have a large portion of their salaries eaten up by this unfair tax that is placed upon them only because they are married.

Garth Brooks is one of my favorite entertainers of all time. The reason I started liking him was because he sings a song called ''Shameless.'' I cannot help but think of Garth Brooks when I am sitting here listening to this debate today, because it seem to me that the speakers on the other side are shameless.

One on the other side said, ''We should not be passing this tax cut because we should be reducing the debt.'' The others are not quite so shameless because they say, ''We should not be passing this tax cut. We know better how to spend your money, so let us spend the money. We will spend it on other programs.''

The truth is, if there is money in Washington, it will be spent. So our choice is not whether or not we pay down the debt or cut taxes. After the President vetoed the $792 billion tax package last year that we passed, within 48 hours every single penny of that was spent.

So let us get honest, it is not between paying the debt and tax cuts, it is between giving people's money back to them, and it is their money, they know how to spend it best, or our arrogance, saying we know how to spend their money for them better than they do.

Over the past several weeks I have had the pleasure of attending weddings in my hometown of Casper, Wyoming. In both cases, as in the case with almost every young married couple these days, both the bride and the groom were starting bright futures in our Nation's work force. It is very satisfying to me to know that, along with my colleagues in the 106th Congress, I would have the opportunity to ensure that these young, ambitious, and hard-working couples would not have to shoulder an additional tax burden just because they took the marriage vows.

Unfortunately, I cannot say the same for the 45,000 married couples in my home State of Wyoming, or the 25 million married couples across the United States that are currently subjected to that tax every year.

Marriage is a sacred institution, it is not a taxable institution. Today we will have the opportunity to vote on a measure that will level the playing field for hard-working husbands and wives.

This legislation also includes specific provisions to assist our Nation's lowest income families. Washington should not be in the business of penalizing families but in providing them with more freedom, more choice, and more opportunity. I urge my colleagues to vote against the substitute and for the bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, since I believe the previous speaker made at least one reference towards me, I would like to point out that the Constitution of the United States says that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury except by an appropriation by Congress. The Presidents cannot spend money that we do not allow them to.

If this Congress truly believes in reducing the debt, then we can put a line in the budget saying *x* number of dollars will go towards reducing the American debt. That is what I am for. I hope Members will join me.

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

Mr. Speaker, this whole concept about if we do not give the money back to the taxpayers that it is going to be spent by the Congress, I do not know what is in the water on the other side of the aisle, but the Republicans happen to be in charge of the Congress. It is almost like a serial killer saying, stop me before I kill again.

If they cannot control themselves in terms of this spending, then let the whole world know it before November, but do not say, we are going to waste the taxpayers' money. It will not be ''we,'' it may be ''thee.''

□ 1345

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), my colleague and the ranking member of the committee for yielding me time that he has given to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have a record in support of reducing the tax burden for American families, one that I am very proud of here in this Congress. Today, I rise in support of Mr. RANGEL's Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Proposal.

The Rangel proposal provides greater marriage penalty tax relief and yet it maintains our budget discipline. For example, the proposal doubles the standard deduction for couples. It expands the Earned Income Tax Credit so vital to people who live in the area I represent.

It mitigates the harmful effects of the alternative minimum tax so that families with children will actually receive these benefits.

Under the Rangel proposal, a family with two children will receive almost $300 a year in tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked in the financial markets and my colleagues on Wall Street tell me that the Republican bill will devour one-fourth of the projected on-budget surplus, monies that we really need to direct at Social Security, prescription drug coverage, Medicare, and, most importantly, to pay down the debt.

Marriage penalty relief needs to be addressed, but not with the Republicans bill, not this large, skewed to the wealthy bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the proposal of the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) that while she claims that the Democrat proposal provides more marriage tax relief than the bipartisan proposal, I would point out according to the Joint Committee on Taxation that the bipartisan proposal provides $51 billion of marriage tax relief over 5 years, while the Democrat provides only $38 billion; 38 is less than 51. It is simple math.

Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the previous speaker, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) to note that if she chooses to vote against our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, she will vote to deny 101,000 married taxpayers in the 46th District of California relief from the marriage tax penalty. That is just not fair. I want to extend that invitation for her to join the 48 House Democrats who broke ranks with their leadership in order to join in a bipartisan effort to wipe out the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in strong support of H.R. 4810, the Marriage Tax Penalty Elimination Reconciliation Act.

This legislation increases the standard deduction for married couples to twice that of single filers. Moreover, it expands the 15 percent tax bracket to twice that for single taxpayers, phasing the increase in over a 6-year period. In all, the bill provides over a 10-year period more than $182 billion in tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, this measure also provides an increase to the earned income tax credit, EITC, for working poor families, by raising by $2,000 the amount of income a couple filing jointly may earn before the EITC benefits begin to phase out.

Currently, the Tax Code punishes married couples where both partners work by driving them into a higher tax bracket. Moreover, by prohibiting married couples from filing combined returns whereby each spouse is taxed using the same rate applicable to an unmarried individual, this Tax Code penalizes marriage and encourages couples to live together without any formal legal commitment to each other.

The CBO further found that most severely affected by the penalty were those couples with near equal salaries and those receiving the earned income tax credit.

This portion of the current Tax Code simply does not make sense. It discourages marriages. It is unfair to female taxpayers and disproportionately affects the working and middle-class populations who are struggling to make ends meet. For these reasons, this marriage tax needs to be repealed and, accordingly, I urge our colleagues to support this timely, appropriate legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans consistently use this word bipartisan, bipartisan, bipartisan. To be bipartisan, it would mean that they have some type of an agreement with the Democrats, and certainly that would include the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, to say that we have some Democrats and not enough to override a veto hardly seems to be a truly bipartisan effort.

It reminds me of the story that someone who asks what was the recipe of this very delicious horse and rabbit stew, and they said it was equal part rabbit and equal part horse; that is, you put in one horse and you put in one rabbit, and that is not exactly equal. Neither is having a handful of Democrats something that my colleagues can call bipartisan.

If my colleagues want to be bipartisan, let us sit down with the leadership of your side and our side and the President of the United States and get something that is not a political statement but something that we can go home so proud that we have something signed into law that brings relief and not something that makes people in Philadelphia feel good.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, we are not legislating today, we are choreographing for the upcoming Republican National Convention in Philadelphia. If we were legislating today, we would be doing as my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) just said, we would be sitting down in a bipartisan fashion and trying to figure out a way in which we could fix H.R. 4810, the bill before us today, that could get a true bipartisan vote for it, and would address some of the flaws in the underlying bill.

For instance, the underlying bill does nothing about the alternative minimum tax, and the gentleman knows very well that there are many American families who actually do suffer a marriage tax penalty but also have children, two or more children, I have two children, I assume I would be subject to this at some point, that they would hit the AMT, and they would not get any benefit, if any at all, of what is proposed in H.R. 4810, but the bill does not take care of it.

The Democratic substitute does, perhaps that is something my colleagues might want to pick up in their bill.

Second of all, the underlying bill goes far beyond the efforts to address the marriage tax penalty, because we know from studies, nonpartisan studies, that about 48 percent of Americans suffer from a marriage tax penalty, about 42 percent get a marriage bonus, and the underlying bill does not just try to address the marriage tax penalty, it gives an additional bonus to those who are already getting a bonus under the Tax Code.

Mr. Speaker, why is that under the manacle of the marriage tax penalty; that should be addressed, but the other side does not want to do it, instead they come up and say, oh, we want to take care of them too. That is not addressing what the underlying bill is; Democrats, in our bill, try to fix that.

Finally, the President has put a pretty good offer on the table. He said if we want to have a marriage tax penalty bill, he would be willing to work with us on that, but let us have a prescription drug plan under Medicare for senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I just spent a week back in my district having senior citizen town hall meetings. I heard time and time again about the rising costs of pharmaceuticals, the rising demand for prescription drugs among senior citizens and the fact that they cannot pay for it. And the Republicans have fought tooth and nail against bringing a bill. When they finally did bring a bill to the floor, it was a bill that would subsidize insurance companies to do something they did not want to do, quite frankly, under your standard, in fact, exceeding your standard of, quote, unquote, bipartisanship, there was bipartisan opposition to the Republican bill that they put on the floor.

The President has laid an offer on the table. Mr. ROTH, the gentleman from Delaware, in the other body, has put a bill on the floor that is like the President's bill and the Democratic bill to try and address this, but the Republican leadership in the House does not want to have anything to do with it because they do not want to legislate.

They want to go to Philadelphia, have a convention, say, look what the Democrats will not let us do, even though we are in the majority. If you give us a President and give us complete control of the Congress, look at what we will do.

We have already seen what my colleagues cannot do and what my colleagues do not want to do, and that is what this debate is about today.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would remind my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) that not only does our balanced budget this year provide $40 billion for prescription drugs and that we passed it 2 weeks ago, but also point out when he talks about a portion of the relief here going to those who do not suffer the marriage tax penalty, the Democratic alternative, one half of the relief it provides goes to those who do not suffer the marriage tax penalty, so same goes.

Mr. Speaker, I would also point out to my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) that if he chooses to vote against this bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, he will vote to deny 122,000 married taxpayers in the 25th district of Texas relief from the marriage tax penalty, and that is just not fair.

I want to extend an invitation to my good friend from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) to join the 48 Democrats who broke with their leadership and supported our bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), a good friend and distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, where did we get the marriage penalty tax? Where have we had the tax burden placed on our shoulders in this country, where the average family pays 40 percent of their income in local, State and Federal taxes, a big chunk that of the Federal taxes, where did we get all of these taxes?

When I came here to Congress in 1994, the Democrats had control of the Congress. In 1995, Republicans won the majority. And since 1995, we have not passed one tax increase, not one. We have cut taxes, but we have not passed a tax increase.

Where did we get all of these taxes that are burdening and pressing down on the American people today? One of the worst taxes is the marriage penalty tax. Where did we get them?

Mr. Speaker, the Democrats controlled, our friends on the left, controlled this House for 40 years. And also when I got here, we had a debt of $5½ trillion, and the spending was going up. The deficits were $200 billion.

I think they have never seen a tax that they did not like. I do not think they had ever seen an opportunity to spend more money that they did not like. They love taxes. They love big spending, and every time we try to do any tax cuts in this House, it is always a battle. It is always a fight. They never want to cut taxes. Why? Because, friends, there is not enough money in this world, I think, for them to spend.

There is not enough projects for them to think up to spend the taxpayers' money. Mr. Speaker, it is time to start cutting taxes.

I remember also in 1995 when we wanted to balance a budget, they fought us every inch of the way. I remember in 1995, when we wanted to cut taxes, they fought us every inch of the way, fought us all the way up until finally in 1997, the President finally signed into law a Balanced Budget Act that cut taxes. Actually, we balanced the budget. You know what? We have been paying down debt. We paid down

$140 billion since 1997 in paying down the debt.

Mr. Speaker, they said it could not be done. They said we could not balance the budget. They said we could not cut taxes, but it has been done. We have walled off Social Security.

Medicare was going to go bankrupt in 2 years, in 2 years, from 1995. We reformed Medicare. Finally, in 1997, the President signed it into law, and Medicare now is safe for 25 years, 25 years into the future.

□ 1400

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

Mr. Speaker, well I hope the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. LEWIS), when he is doing all that research about the Republican majority, would just check the records and find out that they have so tried to protect the vested special interests that they have added 1,543 pages to the Internal Revenue Code. That is not exactly pulling it up by the roots.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the action of the Republican leadership reminds me of a quote from Marie Antoinette, ''Let them eat cake.''

The American people are crying out to us to improve health care, education, housing, and Medicare; but this Republican Leadership keeps giving them what I call reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the working people and the poor people to give tax breaks to their friends.

As we debate the Marriage Penalty Act today, programs that serve millions of Americans are being ignored. The Older Americans Act, which provide meals, transportation, and service to our most vulnerable seniors, have yet to be reauthorized. The Ryan White Care Act, which provides counseling and medical treatments to those poorest children suffering with AIDS, has yet to be reauthorized. The Patients' Bill of Rights, which would finally give the American public some control over their health care, died in conference.

Tonight, thousands of American war heroes will go to bed on the streets, millions of American children will go to bed hungry, and millions of Americans will go to bed wondering how much longer their bodies can fight against AIDS, cancer, diabetes, lupus, and hundreds of other curable diseases.

As I speak, delegates to the International AIDS Conference are deciding how to deal with the 4.2 million South Africans infected with HIV while this Congress sticks its head in the sand. Unfortunately for those people, today on this House floor we are once again debating a tax bill that helps only a few and ignore the real problems we are facing as a Nation.

I can only hope that my colleagues do not suffer the same fate as Marie Antoinette. Maybe I hope they do.

Support fair marriage tax relief. Vote yes on the substitute, and let us get back to working for the people that sent us here to do it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) that, if she chooses to vote against our bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, that she would be voting against 6 million senior citizens who benefit from the legislation to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. But specifically, she would be voting to deny 89,000 married taxpayers in the 3rd District of Florida relief from the marriage tax penalty. That is just not fair. I invite her to join with us in a bipartisan effort, rather, to join with the 48 House Democrats who broke with their leadership and voted in an effort, in a bipartisan way, to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

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

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time. I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for his efforts in championing this issue in this Congress and really fighting on behalf of the American taxpayer. The gentleman should be commended for his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to reject the substitute very simply because it is bad for the people I represent. Very often, there are those here who underestimate the people of this great country. They underestimate that the people of this country work hard, that they are out there toiling in the fields or working back home where I am proud to represent in Staten Island and Brooklyn every day, 5, 6, 7 days a week. When they send that check to Uncle Sam, it is okay to send a little bit back.

So for those who underestimate the American people, it is understandable how they are here justifying keeping more money here in Washington.

I and others who will vote for this legislation have a very simple principle, I think, in mind; and that is the people that we represent work too hard to be taken for granted, that when we have the opportunity to do so, like give them some of their money back, we should take advantage of it.

So when I go back home this weekend and I see the cop who is married to the fireman or the cop married to the teacher or the nurse married to the small business owner, and they ask me, How did it go this week?, I can say, Do you know what, we voted for legislation that will give you almost $1,000 or $1,500 more in your family's pocketbook. That means that you, you the people of this country will have the freedom to choose what to do with their money.

Folks right now are contemplating going on vacation. Some are saying, what if we had a few more bucks, we can go away for a week or 2 weeks this summer. Some of them cannot do it. Maybe with this money they can. They are going to send off their child to kindergarten this September or to college. They are contemplating, where are we going to get the money from for Johnny or Lisa's education. Well, with this money, they can do it. Or they are contemplating buying some new clothes for their kids. Right now they cannot do it. With this money, they can.

There are those who are doing work on their house. They say, we would really like to put an extension on the back or put a deck on the backyard or perhaps get a swimming pool. Right now, they cannot do it. With this, they can.

So I feel very confident in knowing that the American people who have worked so hard to achieve this surplus, that too many in Washington are taking credit for, those individuals, the people that I represent, I can go back home, the constituents of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), he can go back home, and say, Do you know what folks, you have earned this.

Let us vote for true marriage tax penalty relief.

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

Mr. Speaker, it could be that the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is reading an entirely different bill than the Republicans have been really pushing, because any editorial people who understand the bill have called it a fraud.

Certainly this is not a question of giving the taxpayers back their money. We have a responsibility to pay down the Federal debt. When one does that, that is giving back money. To protect the Social Security system, that is a responsibility we have. God knows, if one goes to the town hall meetings and sees the people that work so hard to make this country as great as it is, and they cannot even afford to get prescription drugs, that is our responsibility.

So just because one wants to help the rich, one cannot hide behind it and say it is their money. America has an interest in making certain that all of our citizens are protected, and not just the wealthy few.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, since I came to Congress, I have been fighting to eliminate the marriage penalty. But we need to do it in a way that eliminates the marriage penalty's impact on the AMT. We need to do it in a way that provides the earned income tax credit for low-income married couples.

We need real marriage penalty relief. In fact, the Democratic substitute does more for those who deserve and need real marriage penalty relief than does the more expensive Republican plan. It is more generous, the Democratic substitute is, to those who pay a marriage penalty, and somewhat less generous to those who are getting a marriage

bonus, actually paying less taxes because they are a married couple.

I want to reduce taxes on married couples now. The Democratic substitute has one tremendous advantage over the Republican bill. It will be signed into law. It is real legislation. In contrast, the Republican bill is a good press release for some. They know it will never be signed into law. It will never save a single married couple a single penny.

What we need to do is pass the Democratic substitute now. Then we can come back in September. By then, hopefully, that estate tax repeal bill will have been killed; and we will know at that point that we can afford to provide an additional increment of tax cuts to married couples while at the same time protecting Social Security and Medicare, paying down the debt, and providing a real prescription drug benefit for our seniors.

I hope the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) would join me in voting for the motion to recommit to protect the 92,571 seniors in his district that urgently need real pharmaceutical coverage. These seniors deserve his help. Join with us, not in providing those seniors with some phony plan that invites them to pay an arm and a leg for a phony Medigap policy. Join with us in providing the seniors of the gentleman's district and mine with real pharmaceutical drug efforts.

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

Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) that 6 million senior citizens will benefit from our bipartisan efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. I also note that, if he chooses to vote against our bipartisan efforts to eliminate marriage tax penalty, that he will deny 123,000 married taxpayers, including seniors in the 24th district of California relief from the marriage tax penalty. That is just not fair.

I invite the gentleman from California to join with us, join the 48 House Democrats who broke from their leadership and voted in a bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the base bill, H.R. 4810, and in opposition to the substitute that discriminates against many married folks, homeowners, and charities alike, and offer my congratulations to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) for fighting this great fight.

In fact, this is one of the reasons why I ran for this office, because I really feel strongly that this Tax Code is unfair. It is voluminous. We cannot understand it. It needs to be reformed. It needs to be reduced to something that is simple and fair.

Let us talk about fairness, because that is what this base bill does. Now, let us remember what the marriage penalty does. It taxes working families. It taxes when both parents have to work to support their families. That is fundamentally unfair that married people have to pay more in taxes than if they were single.

So what do we do? This bill treats all married folks equally. That is part of what fairness in tax codes are, not discriminating against some in favor of others, but treating them all fairly. That is what this legislation does in creating the standard deduction, doubling it for married folks, and increasing the gap in the 15 percent.

We are helping the people in most need, like good friends of mine that I grew up with, both work in not-good-paying jobs. They certainly are not the wealthy folks that we hear demagogued on the other side of the aisle, but just hard-working folks that work hard to have a good house in a decent neighborhood, supply a house and a roof for their children. Yet they will pay as much as $1,400 more in taxes. Working class pay about $1,100 more in taxes.

Now, that is money that they can use to spend quality time with their children, to take vacations that they do not take now because both are working so hard. I encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this fair bill.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, life is about choices and priorities. Like a lot of Democrats, and I am not one of those 48 and I am proud of it, that supported the Republican plan, I do support eliminating the marriage tax penalty. But there is a reasonable way to do it. That is one choice we can make. That is a priority. It is not the only priority we have on this floor.

Sometimes I think the majority forgets that these days are not days in an end. We have to look at the whole picture. But one cannot have it both ways. One cannot increase the defense spending like they want to do, provide veterans benefits that we all want to do, to provide health care, do what we need to do about education, providing smaller class sizes and actually buildings that are safe, provide prescription drugs for our seniors and not a fake plan that just gives them an insurance policy, and really safeguard Medicare for the next generation. One cannot do all that and still promise the world in tax cuts.

One cannot do it without going back to the deficit spending that they all say they are against. One could go back to that spending that says we are going to spend $200 billion more a year than what we are doing, than what we are taking in.

That is what is wrong with the Republican plan for marriage tax penalty. We need to eliminate it. We need to eliminate it on a reasonable basis. But we need to make sure we continue our priorities as not just tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts.

Now that we have a budget in balance and actually a surplus, we need to make sure we take care of what the American people want us to do. Those same people that the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) said a while ago have a few bucks in their pocket, they want to take maybe an extra vacation. I will tell my colleagues what they would rather have is prescription drugs for their parent than maybe have that money in their pocket, because those are the choices we are making on this floor today.

We need to make sure that we provide education for those children that the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) wants to take care of, veterans health care, prescription drugs for seniors. Maybe they ought to listen to their Senator from Delaware who wants to make it part of Medicare. Medicare providers need assistance, Mr. Speaker. Life is about choices and priorities, and hopefully we will make the right one today.

□ 1415

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my good friend from Texas that if he chooses to vote against this bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, he will be voting to deny 92,000 married taxpayers in the 29th District of Texas relief from the marriage tax penalty, and that is just not fair.

And I want to extend an invitation to my good friend to join us and join those 48 House Democrats who broke with their leadership to vote in a bipartisan way to give marriage tax relief

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his great leadership on this issue.

I have been listening to the debate here over the last several minutes and it occurred to me we are hearing a lot of argument from the other side as to how we cannot do this because we have to pay down debt and we have to protect Social Security and Medicare and we have to keep the budget balanced, and I thought to myself, I was not here in the last 40 years but when the other side controlled this Congress, there was not any of those things that were accomplished.

We are now paying down debt, we have balanced the budget, we have walled off Social Security, and we intend to do it for Medicare. Those are all things that are happening as a result of the leadership of the Republican Congress.

I might also add that the marriage penalty when you listen to people talk on this side about the rich, all those rich people out there, I do not know who they are talking about. I grew up

in a small town in South Dakota of 650 people. I do not have any rich friends out there. We have a lot of people who are farmers or schoolteachers or small business people, and they need help paying for their kids' college education, paying the mortgage, all those expenses that are associated with their daily living. These people are not rich.

I want to give an example of that. I had a guy come into my office. He was making $46,000 a year and his wife was making $21,000 a year. They had two kids and were in their mid-30s. This year they paid $1,950 more in taxes because they were married. That is flat wrong. One thing the people in South Dakota know, in those small towns and rural areas, those people who are not rich that I grew up with, they know what is unfair. This thing is unfair.

We are talking today about eliminating unfairness in the Tax Code and restoring some level of common sense so that people are treated equally under the Tax Code, so that those people who work hard in this country, those working families, are not penalized because they are married. We believe in fairness in South Dakota, and we believe in the institution of marriage in South Dakota.

The Democrat plan is not fair and it penalizes homeowners by allowing people who are itemizing not to benefit from this. We need to pass this legislation on behalf of the 75,000 couples in South Dakota who would benefit from it, and I urge the House to pass this and send it on.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just came from the Department of Health and Human Services building, where the Secretary was celebrating the 35th anniversary of Medicare, and it was a great moment to talk about when Medicare was signed. But one of the things that Secretary Shalala said, and most dramatically, was how we had to revise Medicare, make sure it was solvent, make sure it was there for our seniors and make sure there was a prescription drug benefit.

The problem with the Republican proposal is it is not necessarily such a bad idea, but it costs too much and it is a needless waste of the surplus that could be used for other things, most importantly to expand Medicare, to make sure that Social Security is available, to make sure we have a prescription drug plan.

What the Democrats are saying with the substitute is we are in favor of a marriage tax penalty change, we want to make sure people are not penalized, but let us do it in a targeted fiscally sound way. Let us make sure whatever the surplus is, we do not spend a trillion dollars on different kinds of tax relief that is mainly going to the wealthy, and break it down in little parts like we are doing with this bill today, but rather make sure what we do first is to make sure that Social Security and Medicare are available and that Medicare is updated to include prescription drugs.

Now, what I am afraid is happening here today is that if we do not pass this substitute, and if we do not pass the motion to recommit that says that we are going to have a Medicare prescription drug benefit, then what will happen is that nothing is ever going to pass. The President already said he will not sign this Republican bill, that it spends too much money.

Well, the bottom line is if we want to get anything done here and we want to have this be a ''do something'' Congress rather than a ''do-nothing'' Congress, then why not go along with what the President has proposed. Basically what the President is saying, and what the motion to recommit says, is we will take even the proposal of the marriage tax penalty the Republicans put forth, even though it spends too much money, but we will even go along with it as long as we can have the prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

If the Republicans really want to get something done and not have this be a ''do-nothing'' Congress, they should go along with the substitute, go along with the motion to recommit, and then we will accomplish something.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say to my good friend from New Jersey that if he chooses to vote against our bipartisan effort to wipe out the marriage tax penalty, that he will be voting to deny 128,000 married taxpayers in the Sixth District of New Jersey relief from the marriage tax penalty, and that is just not fair.

And I want to invite my good friend to join those 48 House Democrats who broke with their leadership and vote in a bipartisan way to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of the base bill.

As one of my constituents said in a town meeting last month, ''Marriage is penalty enough, we don't need the government penalizing marriage with this special marriage penalty tax.'' And yet the Internal Revenue Service pushes many couples, simply for being married, into a higher tax bracket, and generally this is targeted on the income of the second wage earner, typically the wife, at a much higher rate than if she were taxed only as an individual.

I want to give my colleagues an example. A young woman was in my office on Friday. In terms of her own tax return, it means several thousand dollars of additional taxes if she makes the decision to get married. Now, if we go with the substitute motion, then we discriminate against those who itemize. She owns a house. As a result of the payments, those are deductible, so she itemizes. Those who make a payment toward their church or synagogue as a contribution, those are tax deductible. So we would be discriminating against those individuals.

Let us treat everyone fairly. That is what the Marriage Tax Elimination Act does. It provides relief from the marriage tax penalty, a penalty that is keeping many parents from doing all they want for their children, a penalty that, frankly, is keeping many young couples from getting married because they would be pushed into that higher bracket.

Many times both parents have to work full time, when one of them may prefer to work part time and spend more time with the children. This bill will help. As I say, the average penalty, right now, is $1,400 a year more in taxes than if they were single. Over a decade, as she pointed out to me, this young fiance, that money could go toward a family car, a college education, a downpayment on a home.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor of the Rangel substitute, which will assist more than 60,000 married families in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there should be relief from the marriage tax penalty, but the way it's being done in this bill is wrong. Working Americans should not have to pay extra just because they want to get married. The 25 million American couples who are affected by this unfair tax should be able to use the money saved to purchase a new home, or for child care. Right now, if this bill were to pass, American married families would still be taxed at the same rate they were taxed before. The Rangel substitute fixes the flaws in this bill and enables America's married families to truly see their taxes reduced.

In my district alone this substitute will help well over 60,000 married families. It is my hope we will get past all of the politics and come together to provide a bill that truly provides fairness and equity to our American families.

I want to extend an invitation to my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle to join with us and make it a bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty in a fair and sensible way. Vote for the Rangel substitute and let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, my last Republican colleague said that marriage in itself is a penalty. I am married 22 years now, and it is not a penalty.

My colleagues, the Democrats have a real plan to eliminate the unfair marriage tax penalty within a budget that continues to pay down our debt, that protects Social Security and Medicare, and allows for a prescription drug benefit that is so important to seniors today who are being choked by the cost of prescription drugs today.

Our plan eliminates the marriage penalty, and it rewards work by strengthening the earned income tax credit. It fixes the marriage penalty, it keeps us on a course of fiscal discipline, that course that has brought us the most successful and the most dynamic economy in history. It is a responsible tax proposal and tax relief that the American public supports.

I support marriage penalty tax relief for the families of Connecticut. That is what our plan does and it does not risk our fiscal discipline. It provides $76.4 billion in marriage tax penalty relief and an additional $12.7 billion for working families who need the help that is provided by the earned income tax. It is a plan that ends the penalty on marriage, it rewards work, and it allows our economic boom to continue.

The Republican plan is too big. It is skewed toward the wealthiest Americans. As part of the $800 billion Republican tax cut, it threatens Social Security and Medicare, it does not allow us to continue to pay down the debt that has brought interest rates down in this country, and it does not allow us to offer a prescription drug benefit through Medicare, which is the way in which it should go. It is not fair. It provides nearly two-thirds of its benefits to the wealthiest Americans and only about 41 cents a day in tax relief to families making less than $50,000 a year.

It is not tax fairness. Support the Democratic alternative.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains in debate?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. WELLER. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) has used his entire allotment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. He has.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I would inform the previous speaker that if she chooses to vote against our bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty, she will be voting to deny 110,000 married taxpayers in the third district of Connecticut relief from the marriage tax penalty.

I want to extend to my friend from Connecticut an invitation to join with us and to join with those 48 House Democrats who broke with their leadership to vote in a bipartisan way to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 545, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 198, noes 228, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—198

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

NOES—228

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

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Forbes
McNulty
Smith (WA)
Vento
Waters

□ 1450

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mr. CANNON changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. BOSWELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. MOLLOHAN changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. RANGEL

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RANGEL. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANGEL moves to recommit the bill (H.R. 4810) to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to

report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. TAX REDUCTIONS CONTINGENT ON MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFIT AND NO ON-BUDGET DEFICIT.

Subsection (f) of section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as amended by section 3 of this Act) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) LIMITATION ON TAX REDUCTIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The benefits of paragraph (8) (and the benefits of sections 2 and 4 of the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Reconciliation Act of 2000) shall be allowed for taxable years beginning in any calendar year only if the Secretary of the Treasury certifies (before the close of such calendar year) that each of the conditions specified in subparagraph (B) are met with respect to such calendar year.

''(B) CONDITIONS.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the conditions specified in this subparagraph for any calendar year are the following:

''(i) NO ON-BUDGET DEFICIT.—Allowing the tax benefits referred to in subparagraph (A) to be effective for taxable years beginning in the calendar year, when added to the cost of the coverage described in clause (ii), would not create or increase an on-budget deficit (determined by excluding the receipts and disbursements of part A of the medicare program) for the fiscal year beginning in such calendar year.

''(ii) PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE.—Coverage for outpatient prescription drugs is provided for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare Program on a voluntary basis at all times during the calendar year with—

''(I) the premium for such coverage being not more than $25 per month (adjusted for cost increases after 2003) with low-income assistance for Medicare beneficiaries having incomes below 135 percent of the Federal poverty level and phasing out for such beneficiaries having incomes between 135 percent and 150 percent of the Federal poverty level,

''(II) no deductible required before such coverage is provided,

''(III) the amount of the benefit being at least 50 percent of prescription drug expenses not in excess of the coverage limit (as defined in subparagraph (C)),

''(IV) a $4,000 limitation (adjusted for cost increases after 2003) on out-of-pocket prescription drug expenses of electing Medicare beneficiaries, and

''(V) all Medicare beneficiaries entitled to receive the discounts (otherwise available to large prescription drug purchasers) on their purchases of prescription drugs.

''(C) COVERAGE LIMIT.—The coverage limit is $2,000 for calendar years 2003 and 2004, $3,000 for calendar years 2005 and 2006, $4,000 for calendar years 2007 and 2008, and $5,000 for calendar year 2009 and thereafter (with adjustments for cost increases).

''(D) TRANSITION RULE.—For calendar years 2001 and 2002, the conditions specified in subparagraph (B)(ii) shall be treated as met if the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that coverage described in such subparagraph will be available as of January 1, 2003.''

Mr. RANGEL (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to recommit be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk today about bipartisanship. We do have unanimity on trying to remove an inequity that exists in the Tax Code. And we are fortunate that because the economy has been kinder to us that we can do something about it.

Bipartisanship to me means that the majority has to work with the minority and work with the President of the United States and not legislate and pass laws that they know that are going to be vetoed, but, rather, see how we can come together as Democrats and Republicans and do what is not best for our respective conventions but what is good for the people of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, to explain this more fully, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the distinguished minority leader, to close out the motion to recommit with a suggestion that would allow us to make law and not politics.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that today's debate on this bill is a chance for us to begin to talk about a compromise that will achieve a lot of the ends that our friends have on the other side of the aisle and a lot of the ends and goals that people on our side of the aisle have.

Our discomfort with their version of the bill is not about the fact that they are trying to deal with the marriage penalty. I think the vast majority of Members believe that we need to do something to fix this problem of the marriage penalty. We think there is a way to do this that costs a good deal less than the bill that they are presenting today. We say that with all respect and humility. We think there is a way to work our way to a common conclusion that will really attack this problem of the marriage penalty and cost about half, maybe a little less than half of what their bill costs.

We think that is important because at the end of this year, we are likely to be talking about a number of tax measures, some of which we have already voted on, others which we will vote on in the next weeks. The President sent to us, when he did his reestimate of the budget, this pie chart. This pie chart sets out $500 billion of the surplus in a reserve to frankly be decided by the next Congress and Congresses after that. We think that makes sense. But this budget also puts money into Medicare solvency and debt reduction, money into a Medicare prescription drug benefit plan, a lot like the one we presented 2 weeks ago, and $263 billion for targeted tax cuts.

If we do as much as they are asking to do today for the marriage penalty alone, it means other good tax cut ideas that there is a lot of support for will fall by the wayside. So we believe it is important that we try to work together to come to a series of ideas for tax cuts that we all can support that will fit within this budgetary $263 billion. Now, we further think their bill today is not giving the relief on the marriage penalty that we really need and that we hope that we can offer to people.

Finally, the President said 2 weeks ago that he understands the requirement and the desire on the part of Republicans to do something about the marriage penalty. He said he is more than happy to sit down and try to work out a marriage penalty reduction that he would sign this year. I think the same holds true of other tax cut ideas that have been presented. But in return for that, he wants to also be able to sit down to be able to get a Medicare prescription drug benefit plan that we all can agree with as part of settling these important issues.

Let me finally say that if you are suffering from the marriage penalty, you want relief now, this year, not next year. You do not want just a veto of a bill that results in nothing. If you are on Medicare prescription drugs, and you are having trouble paying for your prescriptions, you want relief now, this year, not next year.

My mother is 92 years old. She is doing great by the grace of God, but every time I go home, she says, What are you all doing on that Medicare prescription drug plan? I may not be alive next year.

I want to be able to tell her, We're going to get something done this year.

Let us work together. Vote for this motion to recommit. Let us work together to get this done for the American people.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Does the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) claim the time in opposition to the motion to recommit?

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as the minority leader, I want to just say this, and that is today we are here to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. That is our goal today.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, they have offered reasons to vote against eliminating the marriage tax penalty, and let me give one pretty basic good reason to vote against the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit, as designed by my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle, is designed to enact zero marriage penalty relief. The Joint Tax Committee, which is a bipartisan committee, has scored this as providing zero marriage tax relief.

With all due respect, I would point out that just 2 weeks ago this House

enacted a good plan, a $40 billion plan, to provide prescription drug coverage for every senior who wants to have that coverage. That is a great accomplishment. My hope is we could do it in a bipartisan way. So my recommendation, of course, and I rise in opposition, is to vote to reject the motion to recommit.

Let us talk about the real issue that is before us today, and that issue is a basic goal of this Congress, and that is to bring about tax fairness. I represent a very diverse district, city, suburbs and country on the south side of Chicago and the south suburbs.

As I talk with my constituents, they often talk about their taxes. They complain not only are their taxes too high, but they are unfair and they are too complicated. They often ask a pretty basic question, and that is, is it right, is it fair, that under our Tax Code, that a married working couple, husband and wife, a two-income household, pay higher taxes just because they are married?

Mr. Speaker, they often ask the question, is it right, is it fair, that under our Tax Code 25 million married working couples pay on average $1,400 more in higher taxes? Often I have come to this well, and I have talked about who benefits from our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

The district I represent, 60,000 seniors, as well as working families, will benefit. I also want to introduce Shad and Michelle Hallihan. Many of you have seen Shad and Michelle Hallihan in their wedding photo. Well, that was about the time we introduced the legislation, and because of the delay in enacting this into law, Shad and Michelle Hallihan have since had a baby, and little Ben is now their pride and joy.

I would point out that for Shad and Michelle Hallihan, $1,400 is real money. In Joliet, Illinois, for two public school teachers by the name of Shad and Michelle Hallihan, $1,400 is a year's tuition at a community college, 3 months of day care, it is a washer and a dryer, and, frankly, if we enact this into law over the next 17 years, they will be able to set aside almost $25,000 if they put that marriage tax penalty into little Ben's college fund. It is real money for real people.

I would point out that the Democratic motion to recommit denies marriage tax relief for good people like Shad and Michelle Hallihan. But our bipartisan proposal, identical to the proposal that received overwhelming bipartisan support earlier this year, will help working married couples like Michelle and Shad.

We help those who do not itemize by doubling the standard deduction to twice that for joint filers for single filers. We help those who itemize, people who own homes and give money to church and charity, by widening the 15 percent tax bracket. We help the working poor by providing marriage tax relief for those who participate in the earned income tax credit, and we also protect those who need the child tax credit from the alternative minimum tax.

The bottom line is we help every one of the 25 million married working couples who suffer the marriage tax penalty. And what is it all about? Today it is all about fairness, fairness for these 25 million married working couplings.

I want to extend an invitation to my friend on the other side of the aisle. February, when we passed this legislation, 48 House Democrats joined with every Member of the House to pass this legislation with overwhelming bipartisan support. I want to extend that invitation again today, to vote no on this motion to recommit, which provides zero marriage tax relief, and to vote yes on a bipartisan proposal that will.

We all know the President has changed his mind before. My hope is the President will join with us in a bipartisan proposal to eliminate the marriage tax penalty by signing this legislation into law when he receives it within the next 2 weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members, please vote no on the motion to recommit, please vote aye on our efforts, our bipartisan efforts, to eliminate the marriage tax penalty once and for all.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to recommit the bill.

I oppose the Republican so-called Marriage Penalty Relief Act because it fails to appropriately address the problem for which it is named. Instead of addressing the needs of families who pay an actual tax penalty for being married, this bill provides broad tax relief to a host of families who are actually already enjoying a marriage bonus. It makes no sense to squander $182 billion of our limited federal resources throwing money away in this manner. There are far more important federal priorities.

It is because of these other priorities that I rise in support of the Democratic motion to recommit. Under our motion to recommit, we would begrudgingly accept the Republican Marriage Penalty legislation, but the tax reductions would be prohibited from going into effect until a real Medicare prescription drug benefit was enacted.

Seniors are in vital need of a Medicare prescription drug benefit and the Republican sham bill passed here in the House of Representatives last month is no solution. Seniors aren't looking for the opportunity to be overcharged and under-provided for in another private insurance plan as would happen under the Republican bill.

Seniors want a drug benefit that is treated just like all of the rest of their benefits—as part of the Medicare program. They want a benefit that cannot be taken away, that will not vary if you live in a rural or urban area, that will not change if you live on the West Coast or in the mid-Atlantic states. It must offer a guaranteed benefit package and have an affordable premium and cost-sharing structure.

In order to achieve the standard of a real drug benefit, the Medicare bill must include: A voluntary outpatient prescription drug benefit; a premium of not more that $25 (adjusted for cost increases), with low-income assistance; no deductible for those benefits; the benefit must cover 50% of the cost up to $2,000 growing to $5,000 over time; a $4,000 out-of-pocket spending limit after which all costs would be covered by the government, and all Medicare beneficiaries would receive volume discounts.

Because providing seniors with a Medicare prescription drug benefit is such a vital national priority and because the Republican-led Congress clearly has no interest in passing a bill that meets the standards described above, we are willing to go along with this bloated marriage penalty tax bill.

Unfortunatley, I know that our motion to recommit will fail. Republicans would much rather continue pouring money into the pockets of their wealthy benefactors than address the real needs of America's seniors and their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The Chair announces that he will reduce to 5 minutes a vote by electronic device, if ordered, on one motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings de novo were postponed yesterday, which will immediately follow the vote on passage of H.R. 4810.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 230, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

AYES—197

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hinchey
Ackerman	Cummings	Hinojosa
Allen	Danner	Hoeffel
Andrews	Davis (FL)	Holden
Baca	Davis (IL)	Holt
Baird	DeFazio	Hooley
Baldacci	DeGette	Hoyer
Baldwin	Delahunt	Jackson (IL)
Barrett (WI)	DeLauro	Jackson-Lee (TX)
Becerra	Deutsch	Jefferson
Bentsen	Dicks	John
Berkley	Dingell	Johnson, E. B.
Berman	Dixon	Jones (OH)
Berry	Doggett	Kanjorski
Bishop	Dooley	Kaptur
Blagojevich	Doyle	Kennedy
Blumenauer	Edwards	Kildee
Bonior	Engel	Kilpatrick
Borski	Eshoo	Kind (WI)
Boswell	Etheridge	Kleczka
Boucher	Evans	Klink
Boyd	Farr	Kucinich
Brady (PA)	Fattah	LaFalce
Brown (FL)	Filner	Lampson
Brown (OH)	Ford	Lantos
Capps	Frank (MA)	Larson
Capuano	Frost	Lee
Cardin	Gejdenson	Levin
Clay	Gephardt	Lewis (GA)
Clayton	Gonzalez	Lipinski
Clement	Gordon	Lofgren
Clyburn	Green (TX)	Lowey
Condit	Gutierrez	Lucas (KY)
Conyers	Hall (OH)	Luther
Costello	Hall (TX)	Maloney (CT)
Coyne	Hastings (FL)	Maloney (NY)
Cramer	Hilliard	

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

NOES—230

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

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Forbes
McNulty
Smith (WA)
Vento

□ 1524

Mr. TANCREDO changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 269, noes 159, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]

AYES—269

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

NOES—159

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berman
Berry
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Conyers
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Snyder
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—7

Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Forbes
McNulty
Smith (WA)
Vento

□ 1532

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL H. LACY, SR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4447.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4447.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 0, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 393]

AYES—412

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—22

Armey
Callahan
Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Cook
Crowley
Dooley
Duncan
Ewing
Forbes
Green (WI)
Hansen
Horn
Lewis (CA)
McNulty
Oxley
Rangel
Smith (WA)
Terry
Vento

□ 1540

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 393, I was unavoidably absent on the work of my Subcommittee on Government Management and thus could not name the Baltimore Post Office in the honor of Samuel H. Lacy, Senior. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 22, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted on June 21, 2000 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Copies of the resolutions are being transmitted to the Department of the Army.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

DOCKET 2635: ILLINOIS RIVER AT BEARDSTOWN, ILLINOIS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Sid Simpson Flood Control Project, published as House Document 332, 81st Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable to address flood damage reduction, navigation, recreation, and related water resource needs on the Illinois River at Beardstown, Illinois.

DOCKET 2637: DUCK CREEK, OHIO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Comprehensive Flood Control Plan for Ohio and Lower Mississippi Rivers published as House Document 1, 75th Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports to determine whether any modifications to the recommendations contained therein are advisable to address flood damage reduction, environmental restoration and protection, and for other purposes in the Duck Creek watershed in Guernsey, Monroe, Noble, and Washington Counties, Ohio.

DOCKET 2638: DENVER COUNTY REACH, COLORADO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House

of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the South Platte River and Tributaries, Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska, published as House Document 669, 80th Congress, and other pertinent reports, in coordination with the City and County of Denver, and other interested Federal, State and local agencies, to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at this time, with particular reference to the desirability of developing a comprehensive watershed plan for the utilization and conservation of water and related land resources along the Denver County reach of the South Platte River, Denver, Colorado, in the interest of flood control, regional water supply and waste management, water quality improvements, recreation, fish and wildlife restoration and preservation, wise use of floodplain lands, and other associated environmental enhancements and protections.

DOCKET 2639: ARAPAHOE COUNTY, COLORADO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the South Platte River and Tributaries, Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska, published as House Document 669, 80th Congress, and other pertinent reports, in coordination with the County of Arapahoe, and other interested Federal, State and local agencies, to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at this time, with particular reference to the desirability of developing a comprehensive watershed plan for the utilization and conservation of water and related land resources of the South Platte River Basin within the County of Arapahoe, Colorado, in the interest of flood control, regional water supply and waste management, water quality improvements, recreation, fish and wildlife restoration and preservation, wise use of floodplain lands, and other associated environmental enhancements and protections.

DOCKET 2640: ADAMS COUNTY, COLORADO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the South Platte River and Tributaries, Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska, published as House Document 669, 80th Congress, and other pertinent reports, in coordination with the County of Adams, and other interested Federal, State and local agencies, to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at this time, with particular reference to the desirability of developing a comprehensive watershed plan for the utilization and conservation of water and related land resources of the South Platte River Basin within the County of Adams, Colorado, in the interest of flood control, regional water supply and waste management, water quality improvements, recreation, fish and wildlife restoration and preservation, wise use of floodplain lands, and other associated environmental enhancements and protections.

DOCKET 2641: VILLAGE OF FREEPORT, NEW YORK

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on Jones Inlet, New York, published as House Document 409, 77th Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time, in the interest of water resources development, including navigation, flood control, environmental restoration and protection, and other allied purposes for Freeport Creek, New York.

DOCKET 2642: ST. LOUIS RIVERFRONT, MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Mississippi River, between Coon Rapids Dam and the mouth of the Ohio River, published as House Document 669, 76th Congress, 3rd Session, and other pertinent reports to determine if improvements along the Mississippi River and its tributaries in St. Louis City, St. Louis County, and Jefferson County, Missouri, and Madison County, St. Clair County, and Monroe County, Illinois, are advisable at the present time, in the interest of public access, navigation, harbor safety, off-channel fleeting, intermodal facilities, water quality, environmental restoration and protection, and related purposes.

DOCKET 2643: EASTCHESTER BAY, NEW YORK

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Eastchester Creek (Hutchinson River), New York, published as House Document 749, 80th Congress, 2nd Session, and other pertinent reports to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of storm damage reduction, flood control, environmental restoration and protection, and other related purposes at Eastchester Bay for Edgewater Park and surrounding communities.

DOCKET 2644: PECKMAN RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, NEW JERSEY

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Passaic River Mainstem project, New Jersey and New York, published as House Document 163, 101st Congress, 1st Session, and other pertinent reports to determine whether modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time, in the interest of water resources development, including flood control, environmental restoration and protection, stream bank restoration, and other applied purposes for the Peckman River and tributaries, New Jersey.

DOCKET 2645: WHITE RIVER, WASHINGTON

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Upper Puyallup River, Washington, dated 1936, as referenced in the Flood Control Act of 1936 (P.L. 74–738), the Puget Sound and adjacent Waters Study, authorized by Section 209 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1962 (P.L. 87–874) and other pertinent reports to determine whether modifications to the recommendations contained therein are advisable, with references toward providing improvements in the interest of water resource and watershed issues affecting Lake Tapps and the White River Watershed downstream of Mud Mountain Dam, Washington.

DOCKET 2646: ST. JOHNS COUNTY, FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That in accordance with Section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962, the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers, is requested to survey the shores of St. Johns County, Florida, with particular reference to the advisability of providing beach erosion control works in the area north of St. Augustine Inlet, the shoreline in the vicinity of Matanzas Inlet, and adjacent shorelines, as may be necessary in the interest of hurricane protection, storm damage reduction, beach erosion control, and other related purposes.

DOCKET 2647: MEDICINE LODGE AND SALT FORK RIVER BASINS, KANSAS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Medicine Lodge and Salt Fork River Basins, published as House Document 758, 79th Congress, 2nd Session, and other pertinent reports to determine the feasibility of measures for improvements in the interest of flood control, water supply, recreation and allied purposes in vicinity of Kiowa, Kansas.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4811, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 546 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 546

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. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. When the reading for amendment reaches section 587, that section shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except as follows: beginning with ''*Provided*'' on page 11, line 23, through page 12, line 8; page 80, lines 18 through 24; page 121, line 1, through page 122, line 12. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph. Before consideration of any other amendment to section 587, it shall be in order to consider, and to dispose of, an amendment to strike that section. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole

may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI are waived. 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.

□ 1545

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), 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. Speaker, House Resolution 546 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 2001.

The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule also waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failing to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations and legislating in a general appropriations bill or prohibiting reappropriations in a general appropriations bill, except as specified by the rule.

The rule leaves exposed to points of order, two legislative provisions and one earmark restriction, areas under the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations.

The rule also waives points of order against amendments to the bill for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI, prohibiting nonemergency designated amendments to be offered to an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation.

The rule also grants the chairman of the Committee of the Whole the authority to postpone votes and reduce voting time to 5 minutes provided that the first vote in a series is not less than 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the rule provides that Members who have preprinted their amendments in the RECORD prior to their consideration will be given priority in recognition to offer their amendments, if otherwise consistent with House rules.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides a fair approach for the consideration of the foreign aid appropriations bill.

One controversial area, which always lends itself to important debate on the floor involves family planning funds and their potential use for performing or promoting abortion, and the so-called Mexico City policy which prohibits U.S. assistance to foreign organizations that perform abortions, or engage in lobbying activities to change such laws.

While I am personally strongly pro-life, under the regular rules of the House, a Member will have the opportunity to strike the section in the bill related to the Mexico City policy and the full House will have an opportunity to debate and vote on this issue.

Although several Members requested waivers for legislative amendments, the Committee on Rules chose to report a standard, open rule without granting waivers to any amendments. So no particular area is given special consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule and also the underlying legislation. A lot of work has gone into it.

I am pleased to see that this is the 11th appropriations bill to come before the House, and that this bill is within the committee's budget allocation.

I think the pace of the work for the House this Congress has been truly remarkable. I think that the Speaker needs to be commended and congratulated especially for this, as well as all of those who have worked so hard in bringing forth the appropriations bills.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for their hard work on this important bill. I urge adoption of both the rule and the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule, which will allow for consideration of H.R. 4811, which is a bill that makes appropriations for foreign operations, as my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) has explained. This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The rule will permit all Members on both sides of the aisle to offer amendments that are germane and that conform to the rules for appropriations bills.

Within the severe funding restraints placed on the Committee on Appropriations, the subcommittee made a number of positive choices for which I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

The bill increases the child survival and disease programs fund to a level about $119 million more than last year's funding. This bill includes $110 million for UNICEF, the same as last year's level.

These programs continue to demonstrate a commitment to the most vulnerable of the world's population, the children. Their health and well-being represents the hope for the future of the world.

The committee report directs the agency for international development to consider initiating a school feeding program in Sierra Leone to boost nutrition and school attendance in this war-ravaged country. I recently returned with my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), from visiting Sierra Leone and we can assure my colleagues that this program is much needed.

The bill also contains funding for the global alliance for vaccines and immunizations. The lack of immunizations results in the death of about 8,000 children every day, and the funding in this bill will help close the gap between children who are immunized and those who are not.

Though there are some highlights in the bill, I am deeply troubled by the overall low funding levels. The bill cuts the President's requests by 12 percent. In fact, the overall funding is even lower than last year.

Mr. Speaker, cutting off foreign assistance in a time of enormous budget surpluses is irresponsible. It is unconscionable. Never before has the United States had so much wealth available to help the poorest of the world's poor. It is irresponsible to do so little when we have so much.

We can eliminate tuberculosis in the world and polio and cholera and so many things that we can do. We can save so many lives with a few dollars.

Most people in this country when we ask them how much money do they think we spend out of our total budget for foreign aid, most will say somewhere between 17 percent and 25 percent, when, in fact, all we are talking about today of foreign aid is less than 1 percent. And of the humanitarian part, it is less than one-half of 1 percent.

Our basic principles tell us that when we reap of financial windfall, we save some, we invest some, and we donate some to charity. Is that not what we teach our children?

As a Nation, we are going in the wrong direction. It is our obligation to help the needy, both in our own country and overseas. This is what a great Nation does.

I am especially disappointed over the low funding for debt relief. A number of

developing nations are struggling to overcome crushing debts that they can never repay, and now is the time to reduce these debts. But instead, the bill slashes the President's request for debt-reduction programs by $180 million, more than two-thirds cut.

The cut comes on top of the failure by Congress to provide any of the President's request for $210 million in fiscal year 2000 supplemental appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, by turning our backs on the debtor nations, we are condemning them to carry impossible financial burdens. I am ashamed.

A number of amendments were proposed that would increase the funding levels for the most important foreign assistance programs, and these amendments required a waiver of the House rules; however, the Committee on Rules chose not to make any in order.

So that while this is an open rule, the amendments needed the most to improve the bill cannot be offered. There are so many things that my colleagues can say about this bill that it does not do.

As I said earlier, there are some good highlights, some good spending in it from the standpoint of child survival, but when it comes to debt relief and when it comes to development assistance, which has been cut by 50 percent since 1985, I remember when we had a budget that was around $19 billion, now the budget is below $12 billion. Egypt and Israel take half of it, and the rest goes to the poor.

We could do so much better. We could end hunger, feed people, save lives, end so many diseases that we have in the world today. Yet, we become a Congress that is parsimonious and it is just not right.

We need to do better, and if there is ever a Congress that could lead, ever a Congress that could be known for something that would be generous to our own country and overseas, it would be to lead in this area, to save lives.

So for all of these reasons and because the rule is restrictive, was very restrictive and I thought there were very good amendments that could have been offered and were not protected by the Committee on Rules, I believe this rule should be opposed, it ought to go down.

We ought to start over again. We can do better than this. We have a chance to save so many lives, and we are making a big mistake with this bill.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, we do not have any other speakers on our side of the aisle. We look forward to getting to the debate on the underlying legislation. It is a good bill. We have $13.340 billion in this bill for foreign aid, a lot of important programs we want to get to work on.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle will address their concerns about the bill before us today, citing the cuts in funding to some of the poorest countries and to international financial institutions, and adoption of this so-called Mexico City language.

Mr. Speaker, I share many of these concerns and would urge my colleagues to oppose the rule. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to use my time to focus on some of the more positive aspects of this legislation with regard to Armenia.

These provisions are the result of the hard work of Members on both sides of the aisle, including both the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the ranking Democrat, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), as well as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), I see out there, and others.

Under the bill, the Republic of Armenia would receive 12.5 percent of the total account for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union, which translates into $92.5 million. While the dollar amount would represent a reduction from the $102.4 million in fiscal year 2000, the amount in the current bill actually represents a slight increase in the percentage of the IS act.

Given the fact that budgets are tight this year and the total level of assistance to the IS has been decreased, I appreciate the fact that the appropriators have recognized the need to continue our commitment to Armenia.

Mr. Speaker, Armenia is a nation that has continued on the path of democracy and free market economic reforms, despite daunting challenges both external and internal. Armenia continues to suffer the effects of blockades imposed by its neighbor to the west, Turkey, and to its neighbor to the east, Azerbaijan.

In addition, the tragic shooting last October from the Armenian parliament, claiming the life of both the prime minister and the speaker of the parliament, could have undermined Armenian democracy. But President Kocharian, who was our guest here on Capitol Hill just 2 weeks ago, took resolute and effective action to prevent the situation from unraveling, thereby keeping Armenian democracy on track.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to applaud the members of the subcommittee for maintaining section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, which restricts assistance to the government of Azerbaijan until that country lifts its blockades of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh.

I also want to salute the subcommittee for providing funding for confidence-building measures to resolve the Nagorno Karabagh conflict, and also for language which urges the Secretary of State to move forthwith to appoint a high-level, long-term special negotiator to facilitate direct negotiations and any other contacts that will bring peace to the people of the Caucasus.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to mention that as we get into the debate on the amendments to this bill, it is expected that our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), will offer one or more amendments to single out India for a punitive cut in development assistance. Similar attempts to stigmatize India have been defeated by increasingly lopsided bipartisan margins in recent years.

These amendments have been opposed by the chairman and the ranking members of the subcommittee, as well as the Committee on International Relations.

The arguments against the Burton amendment are stronger this year than they have ever been. In March, President Clinton completed the first visit to India by an American president in more than 20 years. India is the world's largest democracy with over a billion people.

Mr. Speaker, it is a country that has made tremendous progress in free-market economic reforms over the past decade. Cutting development aid to India will only serve to hamper America's efforts to reduce poverty, eradicate disease and promote broad-based economic growth in the world's second most populous nation.

□ 1600

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to continue Congress' long-standing bipartisan tradition of defeating ill-advised efforts to punish India through the Foreign Operations bill. I do not think this is the appropriate vehicle, and it is ill advised more than ever this year.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak in support of the rule and of course this bill, H.R. 4811, the fiscal year 2001 appropriations bill for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), who I think, because of his leadership and determination in steering this bill through the legislative process, we have something that may draw some disdain from some, but I think it is a wholesome bill. It is a good bill.

This rule is obviously one calculated to bring about some debate that, in the end, will bring us a product that I think will be proper. It is never easy for a chairman to do that. I believe that the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), with his fairness and his leadership, and frankly an astonishing amount of patience, which he has done each year during this appropriations process, is something that we should make note of.

I also would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, who has provided leadership on many important issues and promoted, I think, her views with a great deal of energy and enthusiasm.

Of course, I would be lacking if I did not support and thank the staff for the great work that they have done, all of them. I note Mr. Shank and Mr. Flickner are two that have been extraordinarily helpful, and all of them have been very much involved in this process to bring about a bill that is drafted, I think, for success.

Mr. Speaker, this is a responsible bill that effectively allocates the foreign assistance that we have available while providing crucial support for our country's national security.

In the region of the former Soviet Union, this bill helps to strengthen our relationship with our friend and ally, Armenia. The U.S. relationship with Armenia is vital to our effort in promoting democratization, economic development, peace and stability in the independent states and particularly the Southern Caucasus.

This bill contains much-needed funding for Armenia as well as important language directing the administration without further delay to release the remainder of the $20 million provided in 1998 for the victims of the Nagorno-Karabagh conflict.

I believe we have produced a productive, positive approach that will facilitate peace in the Caucasus by emphasizing confidence-building measures which have been discussed among the parties at NATO and OSCE summits.

This bill also contains critical assistance to Lebanon. I successfully sponsored an amendment during full committee consideration with support on both sides to increase aid to Lebanon from $15 million to $18 million.

The withdrawal of Israeli forces, armed forces from South Lebanon, creates a great and immediate need for the U.S. and the international community to assist the people of that region. This additional funding will provide an important start by allowing USAID to expand its program in Southern Lebanon. However, I am hopeful that the U.S. will be able to provide a significant aid package to Lebanon in the near future to help rebuild its school, repair and rebuild its infrastructure, and further our goal of establishing a comprehensive lasting peace throughout the region. I look forward to working with the subcommittee on this effort.

This bill also provides important protections for our national security. Once again, conditions have been included on aid to North Korea through the Korean Energy Development Organization. Since 1994, when the United States and North Korea established KEDO and the Agreed Framework, the United States has upheld its commitments to North Korea.

I might add that North Korea is the biggest recipient of foreign aid from the U.S. in Eastern Asia and Southern Asia. However, hundreds of thousands of North Koreans have died from starvation while Pyongyang continues to divert our aid to their military.

North Korea has repeatedly antagonized its neighbors and threatened to launch ballistic missiles capable of hitting America. The conditions of KEDO contained in this bill are necessary to ensure North Korea is living up to its end of the bargain and uphold the national security of the United States.

I am also pleased there is language in this bill to prohibit the administration from implementing the Kyoto Protocol on climate change without first sending it to the Senate for advice and consent as required by the U.S. Constitution.

Both USAID and the State Department have attempted to pursue programs and activities solely contained in the Kyoto Protocol. I have documented these efforts in subcommittee hearing. I have also discussed this matter on numerous occasions with USAID administrator Brady Anderson.

Section 577 of this bill provides an appropriate balance by prohibiting the administration from engaging in activities specifically related to the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol, such as carbon emissions trading, while at the same time protecting the long-standing programs and activities within USAID which have been previously and specifically authorized by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of the House to support this rule for what I think is a very responsible bill. The subject of foreign aid often sparks heated debate on this floor, but I hope all Members will unite behind this fair bill and what I believe to be a good rule to maintain U.S. leadership and strengthen our influence across the globe.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reference language that is contained in this bill that is identical to language included in the Agriculture appropriations bill that was offered as amendment No. 58 by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), who just spoke relative to the Kyoto Protocol.

I would like to follow up my remarks made during the floor debate on the Agriculture appropriations bill. I was supportive of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and as agreed to by myself and other Members.

I also agree with the gentleman's characterization of the language as identical to the provision offered on Energy and Water and as contained in this bill today. Essentially, it is also the same language as contained in the VA–HUD and CJS appropriations bills.

However, I would adamantly disagree with one of the gentleman's characterizations of the provision, both in his statement relative to the Agriculture bill as well as to his statement just made now relative to his use of the word ''specifically.'' They do not reflect our agreement with the statutory language that is now contained in the Agriculture bill and in this bill.

I would note for the RECORD that the word ''specifically'' is not used in terms of authorization in the bill language in this legislation. The assertion of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) that activities must be specifically authorized from my perspective is not correct. There are many activities that the administration engages in that fall within generally authorized activities.

He has stated that he has no intention of disrupting these constitutional authorities or the ability of the administration to negotiate the climate change treaty or to engage developing countries in a manner consistent with Senate Resolution 98, for instance; and yet his characterization in the RECORD that activities must be specifically authorized is not reflective of the statutory language that was agreed upon and adopted by this House.

Additionally, the gentleman from Michigan has stated in the past that the United Nations Framework Convention, which was ratified by the United States Senate in 1992, requires specific implementing legislation for programs or initiatives. That is also, from my perspective, not correct. A ratified treaty carries the weight of law. The U.S. has many obligations and commitments that it agreed to under this ratified treaty and that are authorized without ''specific implementing legislation'' beyond the treaty. No one, I believe, can reinterpret the law or a treaty by making statements for the RECORD.

Finally, there are many programs and activities that are funded by the Congress and carried out by the administration that are not ''specifically authorized'' by Congress. I am very concerned about the use on the floor.

The gentleman's use of the word ''specifically authorized'' in his floor remarks, for example, could include voluntary nonregulatory programs or initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases, programs that also reduce energy bills, improve the Nation's energy security, and reduce local air pollutants.

I do want to make it clear that, again, I agree with the language contained in this bill, in the Agriculture bill, the Energy and Water bill, as well as CJS and VA–HUD.

I would note that the word ''specifically'' is not included in any of the report language and is not included in any of the bill language, and I would not want there to be confusion about the use of this word.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). She is the ranking minority member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. She is a great advocate for people hurting in our country and around the world.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I thank him for his very impressive leadership on issues of concern to people in need throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, today we are going to consider a bill that is very, very important because it will define how Congress sees our leadership role in the world.

Unfortunately, we will not have the fullest of debates on the bill because of this rule that we have before us. So I, with great reluctance and great respect for the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), who is presenting the rule, rise in opposition to it. I do so for the following reasons:

The bill that we will consider later today, if this rule passes, is seriously deficient in the resources to match the responsibilities of our great Nation. In the past, I have tried to be cooperative, and if it was a close call, come down on the side of moving the process along. But this bill is a hollow shell. The only remedy we would have had is if the Committee on Rules would have allowed some amendments to be in order which would have helped correct some of the deficiencies in the bill.

The Committee on Rules did not allow any of the amendments to be in order. These amendments would have addressed the serious concern that many Members in this House have about international debt relief. Several of us had amendments to redress the lack in the bill.

One that I had proposed would have called for an increased funding of $390 million to bring the total in the bill up to the President's request for the supplemental and for the next fiscal year of approximately $470 million.

My request was for the Committee on Rules to allow us to have this amendment come to the floor under emergency designation. There is already precedent in the bill that will be considered later.

The distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of our committee, placed in the bill funding for storm relief in Mozambique and Southern Africa; and that money, we are very grateful that that money is in there. It was really put in under the leadership of the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK). That money survived the process. We are grateful for that. It did also establish a precedent which is emergency designation within this particular appropriations bill.

Indeed, the debt relief is an emergency. We have a situation where several of the highly impoverished countries are suffering under oppressive burdens of debt. Some of them pay more on their debt each year than they do for education or for health care for their people.

Many of these debts have been incurred by previous regimes and now these countries have to bear that burden and are unable to lift themselves up and enjoy for their people some of the benefits of the more democratic systems that they have entered into.

So the bill contains only $82 million of the $472 million in pending requests for debt relief, and we have no opportunity to address that under emergency designation. The bill contains only $2 million of $244 million that we wanted for AIDS, global AIDS issues. At the same time as the whole world of those interested in HIV/AIDS is converging, on Durban, South Africa, in conference on how to deal with this pandemic that is afflicting the world and especially Africa and Asia at the same time we are deprived of having an amendment to acknowledge that emergency with a $40 million emergency designation. The rule does not allow that. I must oppose that rule.

□ 1615

And then there is the oppressive language on international family planning. The President had requested $541 million. The bill puts in $285 million with the stipulation that if the oppressive language is in there and the waivers are used, that is reduced by over $12 million, down to $372 as opposed to $541 that the President has requested. So the number is too low, the language is a gag rule, and we were not allowed to have an amendment.

The Greenwood-Lowey amendment was not made in order so that this House could work its will. It was not a question of changing policy, it was a question of having this opportunity within this House of Representatives to have a clean vote on that. In the past, our chairman has provided that the bill would come to the floor clean of any language relating to Mexico City and the House would then work its will. This year is different. It contains the oppressive language with no remedy allowed in the rule.

And so I must oppose this rule, urge my colleagues to do so, and also to oppose the bill that may follow.

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

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong opposition to the rule and the underlying bill on foreign operations.

I say this notwithstanding what I recognize to be a great deal of hard work on the part of the chairman and the ranking member, and notwithstanding what I think are very good provisions regarding aid to Armenia. But the sad fact is that this bill is another case in which our rhetoric far exceeds our actions. We talk a great deal about helping poor countries, but when we look specifically at the issue of debt relief, we find that we have provided a level of funding that is woefully inadequate.

This bill contains only $82 million of the $472 million requested for multilateral debt relief assistance. I mention that because this debt relief is not the United States going it alone, this debt relief is in the context of working with the G–7 countries, the major developed countries in the world, who have made a commitment to provide debt relief jointly to sub-Saharan Africa and other developing countries.

Why is this problem so bad? For example, consider Tanzania. The government spends four times as much money on debt payments as it does on health and education combined. In Uganda, Zambia, Nicaragua, and Honduras, the government spending on debt service is greater than government spending on health and education combined. These countries cannot develop under this crushing burden of debt.

I would also mention that debt relief is not conducted in a vacuum. It is tied to democratization. It is tied to economic reforms. These reforms have been occurring, but these countries still need debt relief.

Probably most crucial today, however, in today's debate, is this simple fact. Twenty-two million have died in sub-Saharan Africa of AIDS. The crisis in sub-Saharan Africa is pandemic. We have a situation in which those countries cannot provide the health care that they need to, the education about AIDS that they need to because they are providing debt service, debt service which basically provides money going from the poorest countries back to the wealthiest countries.

We have an opportunity to exert leadership, to say to the world that, working in concert with other developed countries, we are going to provide debt relief, to put some action behind our rhetoric, to provide relief for AIDS, and to provide general debt relief so poorer countries can develop and progress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge rejection of the rule and the underlying bill.

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

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Firstly, let us have it clearly understood that foreign assistance is an aid to America, it is not a hindrance.

When we came to Congress, those of us in 1992, we spent $18 billion in America on foreign assistance. Now we propose in this measure less than $12 billion. Overall, the bill cuts programs which benefit Africa and Latin America by 15 percent. The bill also cuts nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, de-

mining, and related programs by 32 percent from the administration's request, and it cuts 27 percent from funding for Eastern Europe and the Baltic states.

Mr. Speaker, I just returned from a CODEL to Bucharest, Romania, led by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and Senator GEORGE VOINOVICH, along with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) and several others of us. There we met with more than 350 parliamentarians representing 54 countries. And let me tell my colleagues that the whole week we were there we were touting the leading role that the United States plays in the world. Frankly, I hope none of our colleagues from those parliamentary bodies are watching the procedures in this House today, because I am embarrassed.

Setting aside the procedural problems with this rule, the fact that several amendments that would make this bill stronger have been disallowed, the underlying bill itself is weak to the point of impotency. We tout ourselves as being one of the most charitable nations in this world, and yet this bill appropriates less than 20 percent of the President's request for debt relief. This level of funding will deny relief to some countries, such as Mozambique and Bolivia, who have already met the conditions necessary to obtain debt relief. In addition, this low level of funding would seriously jeopardize the highly indebted poor country initiative because it may lead other bilateral donors to reduce their contributions.

Defeat this rule and defeat this bill.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this unfair rule. The foreign operations appropriations bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation we will consider this year.

It is up to this Congress to provide the resources that are adequate to maintain the United States' leadership in the international community. That is why I am deeply disappointed that this rule denies a voice to some key constituencies in this Congress and denies the House the opportunity to respond to some of the most urgent global needs.

For instance, this rule denies Congress the opportunity to debate our amendment to eliminate the anti-democratic Mexico City language that is already included in the bill. The very same amendment passed the House last year during the debate over foreign operations. I am outraged that we are prohibited from even letting the House express its will on this issue and have a free and fair debate.

This rule also denies Congress the opportunity to respond adequately to the global AIDS crisis. Our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. Pelosi), sought to offer an amendment increasing funding for the AIDS crisis and giving these funds an emergency designation. Our administration has made it clear that the AIDS crisis is a national security emergency, and former Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin called it the biggest impediment to economic development in Africa.

How can we, as the international health community gathers in Durban, South Africa to discuss this pandemic, turn our backs on this crisis? Debt relief has been severely underfunded, and the committee denied the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and others the opportunity to designate this important funding as an emergency.

As developing nations are crushed under the burden of mounting debt, unable to devote the necessary resources to the health and education of their people, we continue to deny this funding. Without this relief, my colleagues, we are dooming countries that have tried hard to break the cycle of poverty to repeat this cycle indefinitely.

Extreme poverty worldwide is an emergency. We should have been able to designate it as such, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the rule.

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

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), a member of the Committee on Rules, and to express to him the value of his contributions to end world hunger and his leadership on this issue.

Let me also comment on the chairman and the ranking member of this subcommittee, realizing that in many instances they have worked together on issues, and I particularly thank the members of the subcommittee the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), and others on that committee that have worked so hard on the issue of HIV/AIDS internationally.

I rise to indicate that I wish in addition to having an open rule, that points of order on certain very vital issues could have been waived. It is clear that if this Nation wants to continue living in peace, then we must encourage world peace and world economic order. With regard to foreign aid, foreign assistance, this appropriations bill is an investment in our peace. And until we go home to our districts and explain what foreign aid is all about, we will continue with this mismatched debate on the floor of the House providing for legislation that does not do its job.

One in five South Africans are HIV positive and are dying. The reason they are dying is because there is no access to the prescription drugs at a cost that they can deal with that we have the privilege of having in this Nation. A population that is dying cannot build its Nation, cannot raise its children, and cannot provide economically for itself. Simple as that. When a Nation crumbles under its own weight, its own burden of debt, its own health problems, it impacts the very citizens in our respective locations where we come from. The comfort of being able to go to a doctor, to be educated, even though we have our own problems, is hurt by the fact that the world is hurting.

To not provide the dollars that are needed for debt relief adds additionally to the burden of the United States of America and its citizens. A simple investment of the amount of monies that are necessary to provide this debt relief would be an investment for our safety and our security.

I would hope that when we debate this bill that we will find it in our hearts, Mr. Speaker, to pass amendments that will remedy the problems in this bill and truly invest in world peace and world order.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to just say that this bill is very inadequate, and I want really the people that listen in and watch the Congress in action, because so many people are under the misunderstanding that we spend so much of our total budget on foreign aid, to understand that the fact is that is not true.

If we put everything together, including aid to Israel and Egypt, of our total budget it is less than 1 percent that goes for foreign aid. Most people across the country think that we spend somewhere between 17 and 25 percent of our total budget on foreign aid. We have done polls on it. A lot of our elected officials run against foreign aid and they tell people we spend too much money, but the fact is it is less than 1 percent.

In our own country the bottom 2½ to 3 percent of our people live in great poverty, whether it is in the cities or in Appalachia or in other parts. As a matter of fact, they rank as low as any people of the poorest of the poor in the Third World countries. The first thing this Congress ought to do is take care of that problem.

Now, this bill does not have anything to do with that, but if Congress was going to be known for anything, and I would love to see this someday, I would love to be part of a Congress that someday said we are going to take care of our poor. They are going to be fed and they are going to have shelter and they are going to have clean water. And then we could take some of this tremendous surplus that we have and forget about giving these multibillion dollar giveaways on tax cuts to so many people and start helping some people live, to eat, to be immunized, to pay for debt, to have development assistance so they can help themselves.

For every dollar we invest overseas, we get $2.37 back. This is not a bad deal for us. Economically it is a good deal, if we want to consider it just on economic terms.

□ 1630

But this budget is inadequate. We can do better. Hopefully some day, and I do not know if I will be around, I would like to be part of a Congress that ends hunger, that ends disease. We can end tuberculosis, we can end cholera and we can end polio and so many of the diseases in the world. We have the ability.

So, with that, I apologize to my colleagues for going on and on and on. They have heard me give this speech many times, but it needs to be said over and over again.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), for whom I have great respect, and also all the Members who have spoken this afternoon on this issue.

I know that there is always more money that could be spent. There are always more things that could be done by Government. But I am not ashamed of what the American people, through their Congress, do in foreign aid.

We are spending $13.340 billion. That is $13,340 billion in this bill for assistance for peoples in other countries, for the poor and the needy in other countries. I think that is something that the American people have to be very proud of and that is something in the tradition of generosity of the American people. And so, I support this legislation. I thank all of those who have worked so hard on it, especially the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN).

Mr. Speaker, I urge at this point support also for this rule, which will bring to the floor the legislation for consideration of debate in an open rule permitting any amendment that is germane and pursuant to the House rules.

So I support this rule. I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, there is language contained in this bill that is identical to language included in the Agriculture Appropriations bill as amendment #58 by Mr. KNOLLENBERG relating to the Kyoto Protocol.

I would like to follow up my remarks on the floor, during deliberations on the Agricultural Appropriations bill. I was supportive of the amendment offered by Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and as agreed to by myself and other members. I agree fully with Mr. KNOLLENBERG's characterization of the language as identical to the provision adopted on Energy and Water, and contained in the Foreign Operations bill, and essentially the same as on VA/HUD and CJS.

However, I would disagree with one of Mr. KNOLLENBERG's characterizations of the provision, both in his remarks made on the floor, and as submitted for the RECORD. They do not reflect our agreement or the statutory language which is now contained in the Agricultural Appropriations bill and the other bills mentioned.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG's assertion that activities must be specifically authorized is incorrect. There are many activities that the administration engages in that fall within generally authorized activities. Mr. KNOLLENBERG has stated that he has no intention of disrupting these constitutional authorities, or the ability of the administration to negotiate the climate change treaty or to engage developing countries in a manner consistent with Senate Resolution 98, for instance. And yet, his characterization in the RECORD that activities must be specifically authorized is not reflected in the statutory provision that was agreed upon and adopted.

Additionally, he stated that the United Nations Framework Convention, which was ratified by the United States after consent by the Senate in 1992, requires specific implementing legislation for programs or initiatives. That is also incorrect. A ratified treaty carries the weight of law, and the United States has many obligations and commitments that it agreed to under this ratified treaty, and that are authorized without ''specific implementing legislation'' beyond the treaty. No one can reinterpret the law by making statements on the floor.

Finally, there are many programs and activities that are funded by the Congress, and carried out by the administration, that are not ''specifically authorized'' by Congress. For example: Mr. KNOLLENBERG's characterization made on the floor using the word ''specifically''—which is not contained in this bill, the Agriculture, Energy and Water, or VA-HUD bills, implies that some regulatory and non-regulatory programs that have bipartisan support and that save money for businesses and consumers, help the environment, and improve public health would have to be rolled back.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG's use of the word ''specifically'' authorized in this floor remarks would include voluntary, non-regulatory programs or initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases—programs that also reduce energy bills, improve the nation's energy security, and reduce local air pollutants. Let me be clear. The language in this bill and those mentioned before very deliberately does not include the word ''specifically'' and I wanted to ensure for the record that the gentleman's floor characterization does not represent our agreement on this issue and it is not the congressional intent in this bill.

The language included in this bill does not do anything to interfere with valuable research, existing programs, or ongoing initiatives designed to carry out the United States' voluntary commitments under the 1992 Climate Change Convention.''

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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 225, nays 199, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 394]

YEAS—225

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

NAYS—199

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge

Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Cooksey
Forbes
Matsui
McNulty
Smith (WA)
Vento

□ 1652

Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. CRAMER changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. EHLERS 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 reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4811, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 546 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4811.

□ 1655

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the floor today H.R. 4811, the fiscal year 2001 Appropriations Act for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. I urge all Members to support this bill.

The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a bill with total discretionary spending of $13.281 billion. This compares to an enacted level, excluding emergency spending and including scoring adjustments, of $13.432 billion. The President requested $15.132 billion for the programs funded through this bill. In short, the bill responsibly reduces foreign aid spending by $151 million below fiscal year 2000 and by $1.8 billion below the President's fiscal year 2001 budget request.

Mr. Chairman, there are those including the ranking member the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) who are disappointed in some of the funding levels for specific programs and activities covered by this bill. I sympathize with them, but we have a 302(b) allocation that limits us to the spending in this bill, and I have no choice but to live within that level. While it is true that the pending bill significantly cuts foreign aid spending below what the President has requested, I disagree with the rhetoric that we may hear today about the bad things that this bill does. Let me be clear: this bill preserves U.S. national interests and maintains American commitments abroad.

The bill increases funding above last year's level for a number of critical initiatives which support U.S. national interests and which help to achieve America's humanitarian goals. These include increasing the child survival account by $119 million to a total of $834 million. Mr. Chairman, we receive more requests, more letters of support about the child survival than any other single issue in this bill.

I know my colleagues will be pleased to hear that we have made such a significant increase once again in this crucial child survival account.

We are increasing HIV/AIDS funding by $27 million, up to $202 million; nonproliferation and antiterrorism programs by $25 million, up to $241 million; increasing the fund for Ireland by $5.4 million, up to $25 million; increasing the Peace Corps by $13 million, up to $258 million; and increasing refugee programs by $20 million, up to $657 million.

□ 1700

In addition, the pending bill fully funds the President's request for economic and military assistance for Israel, Egypt and Jordan; and this includes an increase of $60 million in military assistance for Israel. Indeed, 39 percent of the funds in this bill, or over $5.2 billion, will be available and be provided to the Middle East.

Let me just comment once again about the controversy that has been discussed in the last several months about the Phalcon sale by Israel to China. As of this morning, as I announced earlier on the floor, the Israeli government contacted me by telephone and told me Mr. Barak had requested that I be informed and that the Congress be informed that the Phalcon sale to China has been stopped. I think that is a tremendous step in the right direction, and I applaud the decision of the prime minister in making this decision.

I know many Members of the House have expressed to me and shared in my concern and yet were concerned about the possibility of a lengthy debate. So since that has been consummated and our objective has been fulfilled, there will be no need to discuss that reduction in the early disbursal account for Israel.

Further, this bill continues to support American involvement in Africa and Latin America. H.R. 4811 ensures at least $1.55 billion for sub-Saharan Africa for development of humanitarian programs next year. In addition, thanks to the efforts of the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of our subcommittee, we have included funds urgently needed for Mozambique, Madagascar, and southern Africa; and the committee directs that development funding for Latin America be no less than the fiscal year 2000 amount.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the pending bill benefits American business by increasing funding for the Export-Import Bank and provides central funding for OPIC, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and for the U.S. Trade and Development Agency. In addition, the bill, thanks to the efforts of one of our colleagues from Ohio, retains longstanding Buy America requirements and protection for American jobs.

I urge Members today to read the editorial in the Washington Post entitled ''An Unobserved War.'' It states that ''not much notice is paid in the West these days to the war in Chechnya.''

Unfortunately, the Post is largely correct. While we hear many of our colleagues from the other side complain about various aspects of this bill, I doubt that you will hear any of them complain about the Clinton-Gore administration's deafening silence about Chechnya. According to recent press reports, Russian military actions in that area are even more brutal than what we had previously thought, including the rape, torture and murder of innocent civilians.

The committee is not silent on this issue, however. No funds may be made available to the government of Russia if that government continues to violate the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe due to the deployment of its military forces in Chechnya. This sends two messages: one, that Russia should live up to its treaty commitments with the West; and, two, that it should end its military campaign in Chechnya.

Mr. Chairman, the balance of the bill is good. Without question, there is room for improvement, and I expect some modifications will be made during the process; but I encourage Members to support its passage today.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following chart for the RECORD, which details the funding provided in this bill, as well as a copy of the Washington Post editorial of July 12, 2000.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001
(H.R. 4811)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE					
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES					
Subsidy appropriation	759,000	963,000	825,000	+66,000	-138,000
(Direct loan authorization)	(1,350,000)	(960,000)	(960,000)	(-390,000)	
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(10,400,000)	(15,040,000)	(15,040,000)	(+4,640,000)	
Administrative expenses	55,000	63,000	62,000	+7,000	-1,000
Negative subsidy	-15,000	-15,000	-15,000		
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States	799,000	1,011,000	872,000	+73,000	-139,000
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION					
Noncredit account:					
Administrative expenses	35,000	39,000	37,000	+2,000	-2,000
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections	-303,000	-283,000	-283,000	+20,000	
Subsidy appropriation	24,000	24,000	24,000		
(Direct loan authorization)	(130,000)	(127,000)	(127,000)	(-3,000)	
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)	(1,000,000)		
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation	-244,000	-220,000	-222,000	+22,000	-2,000
TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY					
Trade and development agency	44,000	54,000	46,000	+2,000	-8,000
Total, title I, Export and investment assistance	599,000	845,000	696,000	+97,000	-149,000
(Loan authorizations)	(12,880,000)	(17,127,000)	(17,127,000)	(+4,247,000)	
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Agency for International Development					
Child survival and disease programs fund	715,000	659,250	834,000	+119,000	+174,750
UNICEF	(110,000)		(110,000)		(+110,000)
Development assistance	1,228,000	948,822	1,258,000	+30,000	+309,178
Development Fund for Africa		532,928			-532,928
International disaster assistance	202,880	220,000	165,000	-37,880	-55,000
Transition Initiatives			40,000	+40,000	+40,000
Micro & Small Enterprise Development program account:					
Subsidy appropriation	1,500		1,500		+1,500
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(30,000)		(30,000)		(+30,000)
Administrative expenses	500		500		+500
Urban and environmental credit program account:					
Subsidy appropriation	1,500			-1,500	
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(14,000)			(-14,000)	
Administrative expenses	5,000			-5,000	
Development credit programs account:					
Subsidy appropriation			1,500	+1,500	+1,500
(By transfer)	(3,000)	(15,000)	(2,000)	(-1,000)	(-13,000)
(Guaranteed loan authorization)	(40,000)	(213,000)	(49,700)	(+9,700)	(-163,300)
Administrative expenses		8,000	6,495	+6,495	-1,505
Subtotal, development assistance	2,154,380	2,369,000	2,306,995	+152,615	-62,005
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	43,837	44,489	44,489	+652	
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development	520,000	520,000	509,000	-11,000	-11,000
Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General	25,000	27,000	27,000	+2,000	
Total, Agency for International Development	2,743,217	2,960,489	2,887,484	+144,267	-73,005
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance					
Economic support fund:					
Camp David countries	1,695,000	1,535,000	1,535,000	-160,000	
Other	650,500	778,000	673,900	+23,400	-104,100
Subtotal, Economic support fund	2,345,500	2,313,000	2,208,900	-136,600	-104,100
Emergency funding	450,000			-450,000	
International Fund for Ireland	19,600		25,000	+5,400	+25,000
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States	535,000	610,000	535,000		-75,000
Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union	839,000	830,000	740,000	-99,000	-90,000
Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	4,189,100	3,753,000	3,508,900	-680,200	-244,100
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Inter-American Foundation					
Appropriation		20,000			-20,000
(By transfer)	(5,000)		(10,000)	(+5,000)	(+10,000)
Total	(5,000)	(20,000)	(10,000)	(+5,000)	(-10,000)
African Development Foundation					
Appropriation		16,000			-16,000
(By transfer)	(14,400)		(16,000)	(+1,600)	(+16,000)
Total	(14,400)	(16,000)	(16,000)	(+1,600)	
Peace Corps					
Appropriation	245,000	275,000	258,000	+13,000	-17,000

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4811)—Continued (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Department of State					
International narcotics control and law enforcement	305,000	312,000	305,000	.....	-7,000
Assistance to Plan Colombia	.....	256,000	.....	.....	-256,000
Migration and refugee assistance	625,000	658,212	645,000	+20,000	-13,212
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund	12,500	20,000	12,500	.....	-7,500
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs	216,600	346,740	241,600	+25,000	-105,140
Total, Department of State	1,159,100	1,592,952	1,204,100	+45,000	-388,852
Department of the Treasury					
International affairs technical assistance	1,500	7,000	2,000	+500	-5,000
Debt restructuring	123,000	262,000	82,400	-40,600	-179,600
United States community adjustment and investment program	10,000	10,000	.....	-10,000	-10,000
Subtotal, Department of the Treasury	134,500	279,000	84,400	-50,100	-194,600
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance	8,470,917	8,896,441	7,942,884	-528,033	-953,557
Appropriations	(8,020,917)	(8,896,441)	(7,942,884)	(-78,033)	(-953,557)
Emergency funding	(450,000)	.....	.....	(-450,000)	.....
(By transfer)	(22,400)	(15,000)	(28,000)	(+5,600)	(+13,000)
(Loan authorizations)	(84,000)	(213,000)	(79,700)	(-4,300)	(-133,300)
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Military Education and Training	50,000	55,000	52,500	+2,500	-2,500
Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Grants:					
Camp David countries	3,220,000	3,280,000	3,280,000	+60,000	.....
Other	200,000	258,200	230,000	+30,000	-28,200
Subtotal, grants	3,420,000	3,538,200	3,510,000	+90,000	-28,200
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)	.....	(-2,505)
Total, Foreign Military Financing	3,420,000	3,538,200	3,510,000	+90,000	-28,200
Emergency Funding	1,375,000	.....	.....	-1,375,000	.....
Special Defense Acquisition Fund: Offsetting collections	-6,000	.....	.....	+6,000	.....
Peacekeeping operations	153,000	134,000	117,900	-35,100	-16,100
Total, title III, Military assistance	4,992,000	3,727,200	3,680,400	-1,311,600	-46,800
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)	.....	(-2,505)
TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Financial Institutions					
World Bank Group					
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Global Environment Facility	35,800	175,567	35,800	.....	-139,767
Contribution to the International Development Association	775,000	835,570	576,600	-198,400	-258,970
Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency	4,000	16,000	4,900	+900	-11,100
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(20,000)	(80,000)	(24,500)	(+4,500)	(-55,500)
Total, World Bank Group	814,800	1,027,137	617,300	-197,500	-409,837
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	25,611	.....	.....	-25,611	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(1,503,719)	.....	.....	(-1,503,719)	.....
Contribution to the Inter-American Investment Corporation	16,000	34,000	8,000	-8,000	-26,000
Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund	.....	25,900	10,000	+10,000	-15,900
Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank	41,611	59,900	18,000	-23,611	-41,900
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	13,728	.....	.....	-13,728	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(672,745)	.....	.....	(-672,745)	.....
Contribution to the Asian Development Fund	77,000	125,000	72,000	-5,000	-53,000
Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank	90,728	125,000	72,000	-18,728	-53,000
Contribution to the African Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	4,100	6,100	3,100	-1,000	-3,000
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(64,000)	(95,983)	(49,574)	(-14,426)	(-46,409)
Contribution to the African Development Fund	128,000	100,000	72,000	-56,000	-28,000
Total	132,100	106,100	75,100	-57,000	-31,000
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Paid-in capital	35,779	35,779	35,779	.....	.....
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(123,238)	(123,238)	(123,238)	.....	.....

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001 (H.R. 4811)—Continued (Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2000 Enacted	FY 2001 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Contribution to the International Fund for Agricultural Development	.....	.....	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Total, International Financial Institutions	1,115,018	1,353,916	823,179	-291,839	-530,737
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(-2,186,390)	(-101,909)
International Organizations and Programs					
Appropriation	183,000	354,000	183,000	.....	-171,000
(By transfer)	(2,500)	(2,500)	.....	(-2,500)	(-2,500)
Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance	1,298,018	1,707,916	1,006,179	-291,839	-701,737
(By transfer)	(2,500)	(2,500)	.....	(-2,500)	(-2,500)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(-2,186,390)	(-101,909)
TITLE VI - SOUTHERN AFRICA REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Agency for International Development					
Economic support fund (FY 2000, emergency appropriations)	.....	183,000	.....	.....	-183,000
International disaster assistance:					
FY 2000 emergency appropriations	.....	10,000	.....	.....	-10,000
FY 2000 Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	.....	160,000	+160,000	+160,000
Operating expenses of the Agency fo International Development (FY 2000, emergency appropriations)	.....	7,000	.....	.....	-7,000
Total, title VI, FY 2000 emergency appropriation	.....	200,000	160,000	+160,000	-40,000
Grand total	15,359,935	15,376,557	13,485,463	-1,874,472	-1,891,094
Appropriations	(13,534,935)	(15,176,557)	(13,325,463)	(-209,472)	(-1,851,094)
Emergency appropriations	(1,825,000)	.....	.....	(-1,825,000)	.....
FY 2000 emergency appropriations	.....	(200,000)	(160,000)	(+160,000)	(-40,000)
(By transfer)	(24,900)	(17,500)	(28,000)	(+3,100)	(+10,500)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(30,495)	(33,000)	(30,495)	.....	(-2,505)
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(2,383,702)	(299,221)	(197,312)	(-2,186,390)	(-101,909)
(Loan authorizations)	(12,964,000)	(17,340,000)	(17,206,700)	(+4,242,700)	(-133,300)
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Total mandatory and discretionary	13,775,935	15,176,557	13,325,463	-450,472	-1,851,094
Mandatory	43,837	44,489	44,489	+652	.....
Discretionary	13,732,098	15,132,068	13,280,974	-451,124	-1,851,094

[From the Washington Post, July 12, 2000]

AN UNOBSERVED WAR

Not much notice is paid in the West these days to the war in Chechnya. This is not, as you might think, because the war is over, although Russian officials have declared victory on any number of occasions. It is rather because the facts of the war are inconvenient. Inconvenient for Russia's leaders, who have done everything possible to keep reporters and aid workers from observing the misery there, and inconvenient for U.S. and European leaders, who want to cozy up to Russian President Vladimir Putin.

It's not that the war is a secret. The foreign minister of Chechnya's elected government, who was in Washington a few weeks ago, spoke—to those who would listen; the Clinton administration had little time for him—of the terrible hardship experienced by hundreds of thousands of Chechens rendered homeless by Russian bombs and artillery. Many are trapped in the southern mountains, he said, where most of the fighting now takes place. Chechen and Russian civilians also are often the victims of retaliatory bombings attributed to Chechen fighters. On Sunday, Post correspondents Sharon LaFraniere and Daniel Williams reported on a Russian command post in the Chechen town of Urus-Martan that has become a torture chamber. Many civilians have been raped, brutalized and killed there, according to reliable eyewitness testimony. ''They beat us because we are Chechens,'' a beating victim told the Post.

That reflects the kind of ethnic hatred President Clinton denounced so eloquently, and fought against with such tenacity, in Kosovo. He's had less to say about Russia's assault on the Chechen people. But Mr. Clinton's reticence looks statesmanlike next to the fawning friendship German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder has bestowed on Mr. Putin. This week European Union foreign ministers released $55 million in aid to Russia that they had frozen last December to protest the war. What's changed since then? The Chechen capital of Grozny is still in ruins, the bombing continues, the Russians have yet to credibly investigate or punish a single case of torture. But the war is no longer on television.

In 10 days Mr. Clinton and other leaders of top industrialized countries will meet with Mr. Putin in Japan at the annual G–8 summit. If the leaders express forceful and public disapproval of Russia's abuses, Mr. Putin might believe there is some cost to continuing human rights violations. If they smile and shake hands as if all is well, they will highlight their own hypocrisy while betraying the hapless Chechens and the few Russian human rights activists campaigning in their behalf.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to this legislation before us today. I first want to commend our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), on the manner in which the bill was put together. Unfortunately, because it is seriously deficient in the funding level, and I believe that has resulted in some skewered priorities in the bill, I cannot support it and cannot urge a vote of yes on it.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say for the purpose of starting this debate on this bill, which everyone knows is a statement of the importance we place on our leadership role in the world, this bill of $13.3 billion is well below the President's request of $15.1 billion. The President's request was less than 1 percent of the entire budget. The entire budget is $1.8 trillion. If we had a pie chart here, this amount in this bill would be just a line, a sliver, a hair, a thread, whatever is smaller, of our national budget. It is just less than 1 percent. Yet the Republican majority could not see fit to meet the President's request, so I must oppose the bill. I will say why.

The bill, I think to make judgment about it we should consider what is the vision of the bill, what is the knowledge it is based on, what is the plan it proposes, how does it respond to the spirit of the American people. I think it fails in every respect.

I am led by President Kennedy's words. Anyone who knows American history knows that in his inaugural address President Kennedy said to the citizens of America, ''Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country.'' Everyone knows that. But everyone does not know that the very next line in that speech, which I heard as a student here in Washington, D.C., in the very next line President Kennedy said to the citizens of the world, ''Ask not what America can do for you, but what we can do working together for the freedom of mankind.''

That, I think, should be the vision and the spirit of this legislation, that what we put forward should give some of the benefits of democratization, some economic benefits to these emerging democracies. But this bill does not enable that to happen.

As far as knowledge is concerned, we are blessed in this House of Representatives by the diversity of our membership. Members of our Congressional Black Caucus and of our Hispanic Caucus and the Asian Pacific American Caucus know and understand the cultures and politics of many of the countries that we would hope to cooperate with in this bill. They have been a tremendous intellectual resource to us, and yet we have not listened to them or heeded their call for increased funding, for example, for international debt relief, or increased funding for global AIDS, or other initiatives that we can take to help these countries. It is about cooperation. It is not necessarily about just assistance.

So we have ignored the vision, we have ignored the knowledge, and what is the plan? We have a plan. We have a definite plan. As far as debt relief, for example, is concerned, Jubilee 2000 is an international ecumenical religious and lay community initiative to relieve international debt. Others will talk about the fact that many countries are paying more on their debt payments than they are on education and health services in their countries. This is a travesty. We should be doing something about it, at the same time as we are not alleviating poverty and we are exacerbating the AIDS crisis.

In addition to the vision, the knowledge, the plan that we are ignoring, we are also ignoring the spirit of the American people, a compassionate people who want to alleviate poverty, stop the starvation of children throughout the world, recognize our interdependence in terms of health issues, infectious diseases and environmental degradation internationally.

So we are ignoring the heart, the head, and the knowledge of this great congress with its diversity, and I think that this is the last time we will ever see a bill that looks like this, because we must assert the influence of our diversity on this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on this legislation.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama for his excellent work in developing this bill. He has written an outstanding bill with extremely scarce resources provided to him, and he and his staff have worked very hard to meet the numerous concerns of many Members, including this Member. Since the gentleman from Alabama took over the helm of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, he and his staff have shown great patience in addressing so many of my concerns and those of other subcommittee members, and all of us truly appreciate this. It has been a great pleasure and an honor to serve as a member of his subcommittee and under his outstanding leadership.

In particular, I am pleased with language in this bill and report supporting the furtherance of the peace process among Armenia, Nagorno-Karabagh, and Azerbaijan. The region has been in a fragile state since the tragic event at the Armenian Parliament last October, but it appears that talks have resumed among the parties; and I hold out hope for a peace agreement.

As indicated in the committee's report, I feel that a special negotiator is of critical importance in making progress on the peace process. It is vital that the State Department provide for a long-term special negotiator to follow through on this process. As Presidents Kocharian and Aliyev hopefully resume face-to-face discussions, I hope that the United States will do everything possible to facilitate a lasting peace in this region.

I am grateful, too, for the committee's recommendation concerning Tibet. Tibet remains a desperately poor region, with the majority of its economic development targeted at the ethnic Chinese residing in the region. It is critically important that programs which support the Tibetans and their culture continue to be funded.

I also support the committee's recommendation of $15 million for Cyprus. I am encouraged that Mr. Denktas and

President Clerides are engaged in talks in New York this month. It is critical that as Turkey's EU candidacy is considered, the reunification of this island nation must be addressed, and the U.S. should continue to work to facilitate peace.

I am also pleased with the committee's continued insistence on limiting Guatemala and Indonesia to expanded-IMET. After the violence which raged in East Timor last fall, the high number of refugees that remain in West Timor and the volatile situation on the island as well as the violence which continues in various regions of Indonesia, it is critical that the United States does not restart military-to-military relations with Indonesia at this time.

I am also pleased as well with the committee's attention and support of environmental and women's issues within the development assistance account.

Finally, I strongly support the committee's funding aid for Israel. It is a critical time in the peace negotiations with respect to Israel and the Middle East, and I believe that it is imperative that the United States continue to support the peace process and provide the environment in which final agreements can be reached.

However, having said all of this, and these items I support very strongly, I am very concerned about the overall funding level. The United States continues to enjoy the strongest economy ever, and yet the money we spend on foreign assistance continues to shrink.

Today our country has arrived at the point of being the strongest, most economically productive nation on Earth, and yet we are shunning strong support and leadership in promoting and supporting our values in other parts of the world. This bill is vastly underfunded. How much more we could do to promote and protect democracy, human rights, the rule of law and free markets with a strong commitment of resources in this area?

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a very valued member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly to oppose the foreign operations bill. I just want to speak just a moment on it. In 1992, this bill was $18 billion, at a time when our country was suffering major deficits. We were funding this bill at $18 billion and doing a better part as a leader in the world with countries around the world.

The President requested $15 billion for this 2001 appropriation, and I am sad to say that the bill before us is only $13.6 billion. We are the leaders of the world. We have a surplus that we never thought we would see, over $1 trillion over the next decade.

□ 1715

Surely, the leaders of the world, the United States of America, can share, and we want to share our tax dollars with those countries around the world because, as we say all the time, this is a global economy. We can be around the world in two or three clicks. God has blessed our country, and certainly we are in a position today to do better than the low funding that this foreign operations bill brings to us today.

Mr. Chairman, HIV/AIDS. Today in Durbin, South Africa and for the last 5 days, people from around the world have been discussing, how do we attack the pandemic. What must we do to make life available for Africa, for India, and for the former Newly Independent States who are seeing a burst of the illness and disease devastate their families, their countries, and their very being. This bill does not do its part for being the leader in the world. The President recommended $240 plus million. This bill has much less than that, and it is a travesty. We can do more.

We know now from our own country's experience with HIV and AIDS that prevention and education are the key to keeping the disease in control. We can do better and we ought to do better. Treatment for HIV, we know from our own experience with the disease in our country, that we can treat it, that one can live longer with it. So education, prevention and treatment are available to us. Why, then, is not the richest country in the world doing its part to make sure that we take care of the USA, of course, but also do our part around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the subcommittee, for his hard work. I want to thank him for sticking with it and making certain of the commitment that he and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full committee, made to fund Mozambique and that it does include $160 million, and I appreciate the gentleman's leadership for sticking with it when sometimes others did not want to stick with it. Mozambique has shown that they are head and shoulders above many other poor countries in the world and that they are doing their part, and I thank the gentleman very much for the appropriation that he has in this bill for Mozambique.

I also want to thank the gentleman for the Phalcon sale, for seeing that it is eliminated. Prime Minister Barak, who is visiting our country today and trying to work out a peace agreement, and we all support peace in the Middle East, has withdrawn that sale, and I think the gentleman's tenacity as well as all of the Members of the Congress have made it possible that that sale has now been rejected and is off the table in our own self-interests and the interests around the world.

Debt relief. There is no reason why we cannot do better with debt relief. Mr. Chairman, $82 million at a time when we have unparalleled surpluses, we can do better. This is the year of Jubilee. The Bible says that we ought to forgive debt. It has happened over and over again in other times in our existence, in the existence of human beings in this world, and today we can do that as well.

IDA, International Development Assistance, a very important program that we have where we assist other countries in the world. But this bill cuts IDA over $100 million from last year's appropriation. Over 30 percent of IDA has been cut. We are the leaders of the world. We have been blessed to be born in this country.

I know that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) have done their best. We can do better. I urge a no vote on this bill.

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

I would just like to share with my colleagues the procedure that we go through to arrive at this day, and that is, number one, we have a budget resolution and the budget resolution says we must protect Social Security, Medicaid and Medicare. We must do certain things, but in order to do that, we cannot outspend a certain level.

So they give to the Committee on Appropriations to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) a designated amount of maximum expenditures that we can appropriate. So the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations then sits down and tries to divide the money in such a fashion that it will be fair to all areas of government, to the housing needs of the people of this country, to the medical needs of the people of this country, to the Defense Department in order that we can have a viable national defense.

When he allocated the money to us, $13.2 billion, that is as much as we can spend. All of the rhetoric we hear today, Mr. Chairman, would indicate that we are not doing a responsible job in the division of the money that has been allocated to us. But Mr. Chairman, I think we have done a very responsible job. Each and every request that we got, not only from our Republican colleagues, but from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, each and every request was considered, and a great majority of those requests were granted. We have directed the administration to do exactly what they wanted.

So now they come and say, well, it is not enough money for HIPC, for debt forgiveness for the impoverished nations. Maybe they are right. Maybe it is an insufficient amount of money. But just because President Clinton sends us a message to send $15 billion, it is not quite that simple, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to tell my colleagues that we have worked with both sides of the aisle, with the gentlewoman from California, with all of the members of the subcommittee, to try to bring to this floor a responsible bill that lives within the allocated funds that have been given to us. I regret that there are not more funds. Maybe they are right. Maybe less than 1 percent of the total budget is an inadequate amount. But we made the decision months ago that we were not going to interfere with Social Security, that we were not going to interfere with the solvency of Medicare, that we were not going to interfere with Medicaid, that we were going to do certain things; and now we have to live with what we decided in March. That is where we are today.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Chicago (Mr. JACKSON), a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and other members of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations on the work that they have done on this bill. I want to especially thank the chairman and ranking member for working with me in subcommittee to improve some sections of the bill with respect to Africa and those countries that are not as fortunate as the United States. However, if the U.S. is to maintain its position as a global leader, we ought to act like one and assist those countries that are most in need.

We should create opportunities and spread stability throughout the world by combating infectious disease and poverty and working for conflict resolution, enhancing democratization and fostering the conditions for economic growth; that is in our national interests.

However, this year's budget for this bill for which the chairman just spoke is below the President's request and below the fiscal year 2000 enacted level. Moreover, I am deeply disappointed and disturbed that this subcommittee did not get more money to help demonstrate its leadership abroad, especially in some of the accounts that fund Africa and Latin America.

In this bill, Africa would receive about $97 million less than last year and $267 million less than the President's request. In percentage terms, funds for Africa are cut by 14.6 percent, while the overall cut to this bill is 10 percent below the President's request. Africa does receive funds from other accounts like the Economic Support Fund, the Foreign Military Financing, the International Monetary and Education and Training, and Debt Relief. However, inclusion of those figures would show a greater reduction from the request as cuts have been made in all of those accounts.

While the overall request has been reduced by 10 percent, the amounts requested to address the problems of debt relief in Africa and Latin America, the spread of HIV/AIDS in Asia and Africa, poverty alleviation and access to family planning have been cut disproportionately.

Consider this: the bill contains only $82 million of the $472 million in pending requests for debt relief and a moratorium for countries who receive debt relief from obtaining new loans. It will not even provide enough resources to enable two countries, Bolivia and Mozambique, who have all met necessary conditions to obtain debt relief. On Monday, the Wall Street Journal said, ''One year after President Clinton and other world leaders vowed to write off $50 billion in debt owed by deserving poor nations, that effort is in danger of collapsing, largely because Congress, this subcommittee, has not paid the share of the U.S. tab.'' That is quite disgraceful.

The bill contains only $202 million of the $244 million requested to combat HIV/AIDS. The staggering impact of this disease on health and development of affected nations has made it imperative that the U.S. provide more resources to combat the pandemic. In fact, so serious is the AIDS crisis in Africa that the U.S. has declared it a national security threat.

The bill before us reduces funding for lending to poor countries by drastically cutting funding for the International Development Association, the African Development Bank and Fund, and the Asian Development Fund by 32 percent below the requested levels.

Overall cuts to all programs in the bill which benefit Africa and Latin America are 15 percent.

The $541 million requested for family planning programs has been cut to $385 million, which is 29 percent below requested levels. The bill also contains objectionable language on the Mexico City policy, which seeks to impose undemocratic restrictions on foreign organizations.

Recently, Congress passed, and the President signed, a bill signaling a new relationship with Africa. To make this relationship a reality, we need to put our money where our mouth is. Additional funding needs to be made and provided for the African Development Fund and the African Development Bank and the Development Fund, for Africa needs to be made into a separate development assistance account.

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

Although there have been many concerns in the past about management of the African Development Bank, I know that strides have been made. I feel it is unwise to completely underfund the bank at this time when they are working diligently to address the management problems. I am encouraged that the African Development Fund received an allocation, however.

Mr. Chairman, in turning our attention to some of the more important regions of the world, we should not turn our back on others.

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

I do not have before me the percentage of increase that we have provided for the continent of Africa during my tenure as chairman of this committee, but I would remind the gentleman from Illinois that this year, we appropriate more than $1.5 billion for sub-Saharan Africa. I think that under the circumstances of the limited allocation we have, and in response, a great deal, to the request that the gentleman from Illinois has made, that we have provided to sub-Saharan Africa a sufficient amount. I wish we had more, but we do not have more.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, with great respect for our chair and our ranking member, who both wish they had more for this bill, frankly, I rise in disbelief that we are here, once again, debating a foreign aid bill that is woefully underfunded. Whatever the reason, this bill, like just about every other House version of the foreign operations bills since 1995, is the epitome of myopic neglect. With a few notable exceptions, the bill underfunds almost every aspect of United States foreign aid. It is $1.5 billion less than the President's request; it undercuts our contribution to IDA, the arm of the World Bank that makes loans to the poorest of poor nations; it practically ignores the AIDS crisis in Africa that is plunging that continent further into economic and social despair every day; and it adds insult to injury by undercutting the President's debt relief initiative. And, once again, it violates fundamental principles of democracy by imposing a malicious gag rule on foreign NGOs participating in a bilateral family planning program.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we discuss for a moment why a strong United States foreign aid program is so critical, because it is very clear to me there is a misunderstanding in this Chamber on that point. The single most important argument for a stronger investment in foreign AID in this time of great prosperity and burgeoning budget surpluses

is that we have a responsibility to help those who have been left behind.

In the Jewish faith, we call it ''tikkun olam,'' which means, repairing the world. What it means is that we recognize that if we were suffering under the scourge of a 20, 25 percent HIV infection rate or experiencing such a high level of infant mortality that we all knew someone who lost a child or could not send our daughters to primary school because only the boys were allowed to go to school, and even they could only go for a few years, that we would expect, and rightfully so, that other more fortunate nations around the world would help alleviate some of this suffering, and we, in turn, are bound by that same obligation.

□ 1730

I was brought up believing that the right thing to do is to repair the world, to help those who need it. Sadly, this bill takes that principle and throws it out the window.

But there is another reason why such a low level of foreign assistance is terribly misguided, a more selfish reason. That is because in the long run we in the United States will reap the benefits from the stability sown by our aid.

Countries that are now top candidates for foreign assistance can use our aid to strengthen their democracy, stabilize their economies, and improve the health and well-being of their citizens. When these goals are met and these countries become strong and independent, they will graduate from being recipients of our aid to being our strategic allies and trading partners. So it makes sense for us, it makes sense for them.

In the last year of World War II, Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave his fourth inaugural address to the Nation. As the war raged and some people suggested that we ought not to be involved in the affairs of other nations, FDR made a profound case for the importance of the United States' engagement around the world. I think his words are particularly relevant today.

He said: ''We have learned that we cannot live alone at peace, that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away. We have learned that we must live as men and not as ostriches, not as dogs in the manger. We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community.''

FDR's words from 55 years ago ring even truer today. We cannot turn our backs on the people of the world. It is in our interests to promote economic stability and democracy.

Reluctantly, I will vote for this bill today because I do not believe that the Republican leadership in the House will produce a better bill. I do believe that this bill will look a lot different, a lot better, when it comes back to this floor after conference.

I am telling the Republican leadership today that I refuse to play their game. I want to move the bill off the floor to the conference, of which I will be a member as soon as possible. As the most powerful Nation in the world, we have the capacity and the responsibility to improve the lives of those less fortunate. We cannot turn away from that obligation.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), a member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, who is very knowledgeable about the world debt issue and a great leader on that issue.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am enormously proud as a Jew at this moment of the government of Israel and Ehud Barak. We are seeing on the part of the government of Israel an enormous outreach unlike what any victor in a war has ever done towards those it was forced to fight.

I am therefore pleased that this bill funds at the requested level money for those who are trying to make peace in the Middle East.

Precisely for that reason, I am very sad that I must morally vote against the bill. I am confident that in the end a bill will pass which will fund fully the needs of those in the Middle East, including Israel and this enormously courageous leadership of Ehud Barak.

But I do not see how we can be asked to vote for a bill which at this point condemns countless hundreds of thousands of innocent children to death by starvation and disease which is avoidable.

We debate often in this Chamber about measures, the outcomes of which we cannot be sure. We debate about things which can be uncertain, things which are complex. Sometimes things are simple and important. Millions of children and other vulnerable people in Africa and Latin America and in Asia, in the poorest countries in the world, literally the poorest countries in the world, go without food, go without sanitation, go without basic medical costs, partly because of policies for which we are responsible, because in the exigencies of the Cold War we lent money to thugs and crooks, unconcerned about how they spent it.

Now the poorest people in the world, poor children and poor elderly and sick people, are being made to pay that back. The price of their paying it back is absolute, unremitting, degrading poverty leading to death.

In this Nation, the wealthiest Nation in the history of the world, we are creating wealth at a pace unparalleled in the history of the world. A relatively small amount of money in terms of this budget, several hundred million dollars, could alleviate untold sufferings.

For this House, with the money we spend in so many other places, for us to deny to the poorest people in the world the debt relief which the administration has asked for and which has been worked out is the cruelest single act of public policy I can recall in 20 years.

I implore the House not to ratify this most callous refusal to alleviate untold sufferings, which we could do.

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

I might just briefly respond, Mr. Chairman, and remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that during my tenure as chairman of this committee we have created the child survival account, which this year contains more than $800 million to do precisely what the gentleman from Massachusetts wants.

We have no problem with the destination that the gentleman seeks. It is like standing in this room and saying we want to get to that corner. The gentleman thinks maybe we ought to go to the left, which is the gentleman's party's view. I think that maybe we should go to the right.

But we are trying to do precisely the same thing, and that is what the child survival account does, it provides for starving children, it provides for the sick, it provides educational opportunities in these poor countries. It does it directly, primarily through private volunteer organizations, not going through some dictator or corrupt president. It does it precisely the right way.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to the gentleman that debt relief is an important part of that because otherwise the money goes in one pot and out the other.

For all of the volunteer organizations which the gentleman cites and which I am glad he is working with, for all of them, their highest priority is the debt relief, which is unfunded in this bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if they understood that the only way we could get the money under the allocation would be to take it away from the monies we are giving to them, they would change their minds.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I agree that there are many deficiencies with this bill, particularly the ones that have been cited by some of my Democratic colleagues: the lack of adequate funding for debt relief, the lack of adequate funding for AIDS, the 32 percent below requested funding for development in Asia and Africa, family planning cut 29 percent below requested levels.

We are acting as if we have to enact an austerity budget, and perhaps that was dictated by the budget resolution, in a time of huge and unprecedented surpluses.

These considerations would ordinarily lead me to say we ought to vote

against the bill. But this bill comes at a particular time right now. This bill comes at a time when there are very sensitive negotiations which may determine whether there is major warfare in the Middle East or whether a peace agreement finally ends the 100 Years War.

The aid for Israel and Egypt is locked into this bill. I very much fear that if this House today were to vote against this bill, it would send the wrong signal to the Palestinian negotiators, a signal of wavering support for Israel which might make the Palestinian negotiators even more rigid and less willing to make the necessary compromises to reach a peaceful settlement than they have thus far shown themselves to be.

The Israelis have shown themselves willing to make very far-reaching compromises. So far the Palestinians have been rigid. They have to make compromise positions if there is going to be an agreement and not an explosion.

For that reason, I do not want to send the wrong signal to them that could be misunderstood as wavering support for Israel. Therefore, I will vote for this bill today, but I want to make it very clear that if the deficiencies in funding for the Asian and African family planning and other accounts are not fixed as this bill goes through the conference, I may very well vote against the conference report when it comes back here. If the President should decide that he has to veto this bill, I will certainly vote to sustain the veto.

But today, with the Camp David negotiations going on, today is the wrong time to send a signal that could be misinterpreted and that could deleteriously affect the chances for peace in the Middle East. Today I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill, for the moment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the very distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I see things quite differently than the gentleman who just spoke. What I find amazing about this bill is that just the increase in the budget for the Department of Defense over the last 18 months, just the increase, is larger than the entire foreign aid assistance bill which we are debating today.

Foreign aid as a percentage of our national budget is less than 1 percent. This bill fully meets our responsibilities to our national interests in the Middle East. We understand that. The problem is that we are not a third-rate power who only has to worry about one part of the world. We have obligations to our interests in Africa, in Asia, in Latin America, as well as the Middle East.

While this bill is a full policy for the Middle East, it shreds our ability to defend our interests in Latin America, in Africa, and to a lesser extent, in Asia. For that reason, it would be a horrendous mistake for us to vote for this bill until we have met our responsibilities to ourselves in each of the regions of the world.

It would also be a mistake to vote for this bill until we provide a recognition of reality through debt relief. Debt relief is no great gift that we are going to be giving to the Third World, these are debts that are totally uncollectible. They were incurred by governments that were national disgraces and international jokes.

We gave debt relief to the tune of billions of dollars to the new regime in Poland because we understood that was the only way for that economy to revive, for that society to revive after the communists had run that country into the ditch.

The same is true many times over for many of these African and Latin American countries. We will never have markets for our own products in Africa, in Latin America, until we create the same economic conditions that we created in Eastern Europe through debt relief that was provided there.

This country has also provided very large debt forgiveness for Israel, it has provided very large debt relief for Egypt. Now we are being asked to treat the poorest countries in the world, the same countries who have no capacity to pay back that debt, the same way. If we do not act, we will assure even greater numbers of deaths through the pandemic problem of AIDS that we now face on the continent of Africa.

We need to get real. Eventually we will, and when we do, this bill will be worth supporting. Until then, because of the limitations imposed on the committee, it does not contain the resources necessary for us to defend either our interests or our moral obligations around this planet.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2001 foreign operations appropriations bill. I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Although I understand and share the concerns of many of my Democratic colleagues, such as the level of debt relief or lack thereof, the global gag rule, the lack of funding for HIV-AIDS, and the funding shortfall in general, despite all that, I feel that it is important to keep this legislation moving forward and address these concerns in a House-Senate conference.

There are a number of important initiatives in this legislation which I requested and that are critical to U.S. security. This legislation includes a $5.4 million increase for the International Fund for Ireland, and a recommendation that Project Children receive $250,000 to help support their good works.

I would also like to thank the committee for including $10 million for microbicide research.

Finally, I would like to thank the committee for working with me to include language urging Arab states to establish full diplomatic relations with Israel.

I would like to extend my gratitude to the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and my good friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for assisting me in including these initiatives.

While I support this legislation, I would ask that the chairman address the concerns raised by my colleagues and myself when this legislation goes to conference. We will all be watching to see that additional funding is added. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the FY 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

Although I understand and share the concerns of many of my Democratic colleagues, I feel that it is important to keep this legislation moving forward and address these concerns in a House-Senate Conference.

I, too, am concerned about the low level of funding for debt relief for the heavily indebted poor countries, the low level of funding for international infectious diseases, especially HIV/AIDS, and I am especially concerned about the low overall funding level of this legislation, which is about twelve percent less than the President's request.

Like many of my colleagues, I am also unhappy that the so called compromise language from last year's Omnibus legislation placing a ''gag rule'' on international healthcare providers was included in this legislation. This language represents an unnecessary rider, which the Republican leadership stated should not be included in appropriations bills. I will speak more on this issue when it is debated later.

However, there are a number of important initiatives in this legislation, which I requested, and that are critical to US security.

I would like to thank Chairman CALLAHAN, Ranking Member NANCY PELOSI, and Representative LOWEY for assisting me in including these important initiatives.

This legislation includes a $5.4 million increase for the International Fund for Ireland (IFI). The IFI was established as an independent, international organization 1986 and receives contributions from the United States, the European Union, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The objectives of the Fund are to promote economic and social advance and to encourage contact, dialogue and reconciliation between Unionists and Nationalists in the North of Ireland and the border counties of the Republic of Ireland.

This funding is of critical importance at this juncture in the Northern Ireland Peace Process.

Additionally, the Committee has included a recommendation that Project Children receive $250,000 to help support their work. Project Children brings Irish children from a range of ages to spend six weeks in the U.S. Sometimes a Protestant child joins a Catholic child in the same home with remarkably positive results. In addition, the program brings college

students to the United States through its ''Young Leaders'' program and places them in internship positions in local organizations. A number of U.S. Representatives have taken Project Children Young Leader interns into their offices and homes.

With these additional funds, the true benefits of a lasting peace in the North of Ireland, economic prosperity and equal opportunity, will receive a much-needed boost.

I would also like to thank the Committee for including $10 million for microbicide research and instructing USAID to work in consultation with the National Institutes of Health to ensure microbicide research and development takes into consideration the special circumstances of drug delivery in developing nations.

As many of you know, microbicides are user-controlled products that kill or inactivate the bacteria and viruses that cause STD's and HIV/AIDS and would fill a gap in the range of prevention tools because they are woman-controlled and could protect against various STD's, not just HIV. Microbicide products, it is hoped, will provide women in developing countries with a cheap, effective alternative to prevent the spread of STD's. Issues such as a lack of refrigeration, cultural and educational barriers, and a lack of access to medical facilities need to be considered carefully if microbicides are used effectively in developing nations. This funding will help ensure the special needs of developing nations are met with respect to microbicide research.

I would also like to thank the Committee for working with me to include language updating the Arab League Boycott language, urging Arab states to establish full diplomatic relations with Israel. Israel has existed for more than 50 years and has earned the right to be treated as a full member of the international community.

Once again, I would like to extend my gratitude to Chairman CALLAHAN, Ranking Member PELOSI and to my good friend Congresswoman LOWEY for their assistance, as well as the rest of the Committee.

While I will support this legislation, I ask that you address the concerns raised by my colleagues and myself when this legislation goes to Conference.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), the co-chair of the Congressional Women's Caucus.

□ 1745

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for yielding me the time and for her leadership on this bill and on some of the issues before this Congress.

This bill vastly underfunds the AIDS prevention program and debt relief for the world's poorest countries and undermines our commitment to international family planning.

The President pledged a multiyear U.S. commitment for debt relief, which this bill guts. It also drastically underfunds international family planning 30 percent below the President's request. Every day we in government face problems for which there is no solution, like global warming, the AIDS crisis, Parkinson's disease, but family planning presents a different challenge, we know what to do.

Mr. Chairman, we know what the answer is, all we need is the funds and the political will to get the job done. Increasing international family planning to the President's request by 30 percent more would allow 11.7 million more couples to have access to family planning. It would also mean 2.2 million fewer abortions, and it would save the lives of more than 15,000 women and 92,000 infants.

Earlier this year, many of us introduced a bill called Saving Women's Lives Through International Family Planning, we had over 122 cosponsors. We asked this Congress to go ''Back to the Future,'' back to 1995 funding levels for family planning and meet the budget requests of the President. We asked for this money without restrictions.

Gag rules are enough to make us gag in our own country. The gag rule would be unconstitutional around the world. It is unconscionable.

This budget before us is far short of going back to the future. This bill also exports one of the worst policies, the gag rule language that is unconstitutional in our own country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join in a bipartisan effort to strike this terrible antidemocratic, antiwoman, antifairness language, the gag rule out of the bill, it hurts some of the poorest women and countries in the world.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend from California (Ms. PELOSI) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I will be offering a bipartisan amendment on behalf of the gentleman from New York, (Mr. HOUGHTON), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LUTHER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), to plus up by $15 million the microenterprise loans for the poor. This will be offset with $15 million in cuts.

We will probably hear some screams and some squeals from the bureaucrats or from big business, but I think we have a moral obligation to hear the cries of the poor of those in poverty, of those in Third World nations where the microenterprise loan for the poor of $16 or $60 can lift people out of poverty.

I hope my colleagues will vote for this for three reasons: One, these programs work. Secondly, they go to people in poverty, mostly women. Thirdly, they go to start small businesses.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we can pass this to get this $15 million up to the approved authorization level.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the very distinguished ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for yielding the time to me and ask my colleagues to look back at the oath of office they took when they were sworn in here.

Mr. Chairman, it speaks of all the enemies, foreign and domestic. It says we need to fully discharge our duties. And in the Constitution, it talks about our defense and general welfare.

I would submit to the body that if we pass this bill, we are doing neither; that our responsibilities here not simply out of the goodness of our heart and concern for the poorest people on this planet is not being met by this legislation, but what is in the best interests of the security of the United States is not being met. Whether it is the fight for AIDS and the opportunistic illness that has come to this country for people infected with AIDS in Africa and elsewhere, that come back in and not only takes the lives of Americans, but also increases the costs of the cure; TB that could once be cured for $2,000 per case is now $20,000 or $200,000 in some cases.

Together we need to reject this bill so that we fully discharge our responsibilities so this great Nation can do the job that it must do for all the people in this world that look to us for leadership and for the American citizenry who depend on our responsibilities here to do a job that protects them, that furthers America's interests in every continent, not simply in one region of the world.

We need to do what is right. I know the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) understands that. The only way to get to that point is to join the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and reject this proposal and force this institution to address the responsibilities fully as our oath demands.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) who has been a leader in the fight against global AIDS.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), for her leadership and commend her for the continued effort and tenacity in trying to make sure that we have a fairness on this floor in terms of our services to foreign countries.

Mr. Chairman, leadership is the operative word here today, and because of that, I will say to this body, if we are leaders, then please lead. Be leaders and be responsible for those things that we were sent here to do. It is unconscionable to me to see the most powerful country in this world reneging on children and women.

Some of the poorest countries in this world are suffering and here we are opposing the administration budget for $244 million for HIV and AIDS. It is a pandemic in Africa; we know that. You knew that. We know the 50 million people who have been infected with HIV and AIDS.

Why is it that my colleagues are minimizing the efforts that have been brought about with people throughout Africa in trying to combat this very critical infectious disease? I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation. It is unconscionable. It is immoral. It is inconceivable.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me express my appreciation for the hard work of the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), I am displeased with what has come.

Mr. Chairman, I fully respect what the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has done in portions of this bill. I fully understand why it is important to support the Middle East and the peace deliberations. But we cannot afford to come here day after day and ignore the poorest people of the world, while we have a pandemic going on in Africa and Asia with AIDS. If we think that is going to stay in Africa, we are in for rude awakenings.

The life expectancy is moving to year 30. Can my colleagues imagine any country, any nation that has a life expectancy of 30, and we are willing to walk away and simply say we just do not have the money when we know that we do?

We can save Social Security. We can do the right thing about Medicare prescription drugs and still send some aid, the appropriate aid as frugal as is requested by the President, and we have ignored that. Let us vote against this and do it right.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, there is a saying in the church that I go to ''to whom much is given, much is required.'' This is supposed to be the greatest Nation, the most affluent Nation on the face of the planet Earth, in the history of the planet Earth. Yet, why is it when it comes to us delivering to those who need the most, we find excuses not to do it.

When I heard the distinguished chair, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) talking in his opening statements, I heard excuses of why we could not help those who need help. People in this House have traveled to Africa, and when they go to Africa they say, oh, what a shame, how bad it is, oh, this is pitiful. Yet when it comes time when we can do something about it, and foreign operations is that time, we find excuses not to do anything about it.

It is time that we stop making excuses, put our money where our mouths are and do the right thing and give the money where it is needed and that is in the continent of Africa.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by thanking our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and also our ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for crafting this bill. They have had a difficult task.

Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned with the overall deep cuts to the bill and the disproportionately hurt African and Latin American countries, and I hope that when we send this bill to conference, we can fix some of that.

I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for implementing legislation I introduced last year about Professor Doan Viet Hoat. A journalist and university professor, Mr. Hoat spent nearly a third of his life in a Vietnamese prison for his efforts to bring freedom of the press and democracy to his native land.

It is a rare individual who is willing to sacrifice their own personal freedom for the sake of their fellow man, and when we find such a person, it is important for us in Congress to acknowledge and recognize their achievement and the purpose of their struggle.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy and a champion on international debt relief.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the terrific work that she has done as the ranking member. She has taken on a tremendous responsibility and helped to organize us all. The foreign operations appropriations bill is scandalously underfunded.

The entire region of sub-Saharan Africa has been ignored and abandoned by the Republican leadership in this bill. The African Development Bank's funding was cut by almost 25 percent below its current funding level and 50 percent below the administration's request.

The African Development Fund was cut 28 percent below its current level and $56 million below the administration's request. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the House Banking Committee, I know how important these programs are.

Development assistance programs that benefit Africa have also been underfunded. International disaster system was cut from $203 million to $165 million, barely a few months after floods ravaged Southern Africa. I am especially outraged by the lack of funding for debt relief.

The bill contains only $82.4 million for debt relief with only $69.4 million of which can be used to forgive the debt of the world's poorest countries. While HIV/AIDS epidemic continues to ravish sub-Saharan Africa; while the impoverished nation of Mozambique attempts to rebuild itself after it was nearly destroyed by devastating floods; while Nigeria scuttles to overcome the impact of years of dictatorship; while Tanzania, Zambia, Niger, Nicaragua, Honduras and Uganda continue to spend more of their budgets on debt service payments than they do on health and education combined, the Republican leadership is turning a deaf ear.

□ 1800

Shame on the failed Republican leadership.

It is hard for me to imagine how Members of Congress who claimed to be faithful, God-fearing leaders of families and communities can reject the most impoverished and vulnerable people in the world.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this shameful bill, send it down the drain. Do not vote for it. It is outrageous.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who is a senior member on the Committee on International Relations to close.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. This bill will significantly hamper our ability to compete in the international community. Unfortunately, this budget provides inadequate resources for discretionary investments.

I am very concerned about the Africa accounts which cuts the African Development Fund, the Development Fund for Africa, the Africa Development Bank, and the Peacekeeping Initiatives.

The bill underfunds the office of transition initiatives in Nigeria. It cuts economic support funds by $2.3 billion, international debt reduction by $180 million, African Development Bank by $3 million, HIV/AIDS under Child Survival by $42 million, and Peacekeeping to Sierra Leone, Congo and Eritrea-Ethiopia by $16 million.

Presently there is a meeting going on in Durban, South Africa, hosted by President Mbeki, where one out of four individuals in certain countries may die from AIDS. This bill reduces the global alliance for vaccines and immunizations by 25 percent. It is wrong. It is shameful. We should reject this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me start off by telling the Chair what a magnificent job he has done for the last several years in presiding over this Committee of the Whole. He is a complement to the system, and certainly his understanding of the rules and procedure and his manner helps make a very difficult job a little bit easier.

Under the rules of our side, this will be my last year as chairman of this committee. This is the sixth time I have come before this body and asked for their support in a bill that I have drafted. It is sort of sad in a way that I leave it. On the other hand, I am optimistically looking forward to the hope that the chairman of our full committee will award me a cardinalship of another committee, one that probably will not be as difficult as this one has been.

But during this process, Mr. Chairman, Charlie Flickner, John Shank, Chris Walker, Nancy Tippins, Lori Maes, and Julie Schechter on my side of the aisle have been invaluable.

Before I became chairman, I was a member of this subcommittee. But I will assure my colleagues that I knew very little because, back then, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) was the ranking Democrat and chairman of this subcommittee, and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. Livingston) was the ranking Republican, and I was the back bencher who was not allowed hardly to say anything. But on the other hand, I did not want to say anything.

So I had not done my homework, and suddenly one morning I woke up as chairman of this very important committee. So the educational process that these great individual staffers have given to me is invaluable, and I am extremely indebted to them.

Not only to those staff people on my side of the aisle, but on the other side of the aisle, Mark Murray and John Stivers as well as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) have been extremely courteous to me during this entire process.

We have had great differences. We are having great differences tonight. But nevertheless, there has always been the true friendship that now exists between me and the staff members on both the Republican side and the Democratic side as well as my subcommittee members and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my ranking member of the subcommittee.

It has been an interesting trip, and I think that we ought to go ahead and expedite this trip. Maybe during all of these opportunities we have to praise each other, we might even agree to some unanimous consent to limit debate since I think I have written the perfect bill. If we could just limit debate, all the Members could go home.

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

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding to me.

I want to speak for my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his leadership as chair of this subcommittee. While we may not have always agreed on the particular priorities, he has always been a gentleman and has always welcomed our input into the process.

I know that, at the end of this bill, and as we come back with the conference report, if we do, there will be more time for us to praise him and wish him well, as the ranking member of some other committee perhaps. That was a joke, Mr. Chairman.

In any event, in addition to all of the very fine staff that was acknowledged, who are acknowledged by the chairman, I want to add Beth Tritter, Charles Dujon, Kim Rudolph, Alan Dillingham, and Will Painter for their fine service to this process as well and associate myself with the remarks that the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) made about the other staff members and how dependent we are in a very bipartisan way on their service.

But I think I have the best chairman on the Committee on Appropriations, and he and the big chairman have always dealt fairly with us. We are going to miss the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN), Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I know we will see the gentleman from Alabama somewhere else along the way, so I wanted to commend him in that spirit.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I suppose the appropriate thing to say is I am going to miss the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), too; but I do not know that I really am going to miss her in this capacity. But I do appreciate what she has given to me in the form of friendship, in the form of intelligence, the great contributions she has made.

I am sort of like the country singer David Allan Coe. Once he said he had thought he had written the perfect song. The gentlewoman from California says there will be an opportunity for us to praise each other sometime later on in the process, but I, like David Allan Coe, think that I have written the perfect bill. I think there is a good possibility that the Senate may just accept my bill, Mr. Chairman, and there might not be a conference; and, therefore, we will not have these opportunities.

But, nevertheless, to our colleagues who are listening, as we go into the rest of this bill, I would encourage my colleagues to look at what we have done, and that is, the fact that we have drafted the best bill that we possibly could draft under the circumstances of the allocations that forced this to this point.

I know there are some people who differ from me. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) a few minutes ago was talking about a lack of attention to Latin America. Surely she jests because, under my chairmanship, we have quadrupled assistance to Latin America. Just in the last 3 years, we have given them nearly $3 billion.

I had to fight this administration tooth and nail, with the support from the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. PELOSI) to get them to recognize that another country exists in this hemisphere other than Haiti. We even put restrictions in our bills saying one can spend all the money one wants in Haiti, but one has to spend 10 times that amount in other countries in Latin America.

So we have been the biggest supporters of Latin America trying to pound into the head of this administration the importance of our neighbors to the south. I think they have finally come around, and they are finally beginning to recognize that assistance to Latin America and South America is just as important as it is to the Middle East and to Africa.

So we have done a great deal of good, I think, towards convincing this administration that other countries exist in this hemisphere that need assistance such as Bolivia, Honduras, Nicaragua, all of the Latin American countries.

I am proud that we have brought to this floor a bill which reflects the best that can be arranged for the allocation we have. I would encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Committee for maintaining strong conditions on U.S. military aid for Indonesia based on the situation in East Timor. I would particularly like to recognize and thank the Ranking Member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations. Mrs. PELOSI, for her leadership and actions in support of the people of East Timor.

I also applaud Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI for increasing to $25 million the amount of Economic Support Funds (ESF) targeted for the rebuilding of East Timor. I also hope that the United States will continue its policy of consulting directly with the communities and people of East Timor on reconstruction projects and employing, to the maximum extent possible, East Timor on reconstruction projects and employing, to the maximum extent possible, East Timorese in these projects.

Like so many of the colleagues, however, I remain deeply concerned about the situation in East Timor. More than 100,000 refugees from East Timor who were forcibly removed from their country in December 1999 remain trapped in squalid camps in the neighboring Indonesian province of West Timor. They suffer daily intimidation, harassment and acts of violence from the Indonesian-supported militias that control the camps. International humanitarian organizations, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and the U.N. High Commissioner on Refugees (UNHCR), have been forced to abandon their work in many of these camps because of acts of violence perpetrated by against their workers.

Also disturbing are the continuing cross-border attacks being carried out by the Indonesian-supported militias. Based and freely operating in the Indonesian province of West Timor, militias launch attacks against East Timor and against the United Nations peacekeeping forces in East Timor. These attacks must stop. The militias must be disarmed. And West Timor must cease being a safe haven for these paramilitary forces.

The Government of Indonesia has pledged to improve conditions in the camps and, for any refugee who wishes to return, to guarantee their safe return. It has pledged to remove the militias from the camps and stop the cross-border attacks. To date, these pledges are just empty words. They have not translated into concrete actions on the ground in West Timor. Until these refugees are safely returned to their homeland, the U.S. must maintain restrictions on U.S. military aid and the Administration must maintain its suspension on all military-to-military relations. The Government of Indonesia and its Armed Forces, in particular, must understand the safe return of these refugees is among our highest priorities.

I am deeply disturbed to hear that the Administration wishes to resume military-to-military relations with the Armed Forces of Indonesia (TNI). While conditions are worsening for the East Timorese refugees in West Timor, the Administration wants to include TNI officers and troops in training exercises, military seminars, college courses, and to provide spare parts and other technical assistance for Indonesian military equipment. I can only urge the Administration, in the strongest possible terms, to refrain from taking such actions unless it wishes to see the restrictions in this bill expanded to prohibit by law such military relations.

My distinguished colleague, Congressman CHRISTOPHER SMITH of New Jersey, and I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4357, the East Timor Repatriation and Security Act, which, among other things, would prohibit by law the military relations voluntarily suspended by the Administration in September 1999. Our bill currently has over 50 bipartisan cosponsors. We introduced our bill because we were increasingly concerned about the deteriorating situation of the refugees in West Timor; the continuing militia attacks along the West Timor and East Timor border; and the lack of consultation with, participation by and employment of East Timorese in reconstruction projects. I am fully prepared to continue to press for greater action on these issues as the foreign operations appropriations bill moves toward conference.

Mr. Chairman, it is very important that the bilateral and multilateral aid going to East Timor reach the people on the ground more quickly. I have heard nothing but good things about USAID projects in East Timor. We consult with the East Timorese people. Our reconstruction projects employ local workers, thus contributing to the rehabilitation of the local economy and the restoration of work and dignity to the East Timorese. But a great deal of the assistance is not showing up in the building of new homes and businesses, in the restoration of water systems, in electricity hookups and schools being reopened. Where is it going? I don't know, Mr. Chairman, but it certainly is not reaching the communities and people of East Timor.

I hope the State Department and our representatives at the multilateral development banks and at the United Nations will press our allies to fulfill their commitments to provide assistance for East Timor. I hope our representatives and aid workers will press our allies and the NGOs involved in rebuilding East Timor to accelerate reconstruction projects and to make sure aid reaches those who need it most, rather than resting in the pockets of consultants and high-salaried international officials.

I was in East Timor shortly before the historic referendum on independence, which means I was also there shortly before the horrific outbreak of violence that devastated the country. The international community and we in the United States promised the people of East Timor that we would support them in their quest for freedom and independence should they choose it at the ballot box. So far, we have only let them down. Many of them have died because we did not keep our word. For all East Timorese, their lives have changed for the worse with the physical destruction of their homes, businesses and communities and the separation of families.

We must do better in the future. This bill maintains the promise by this Congress to hold accountable those who destroyed East Timor and who forcibly removed the majority of the population from their homes. We in Congress must also hold the Administration accountable and ensure that the suspension on military-to-military relations is sustained. And we must remain committed to the rebuilding of East Timor and the ongoing process to bring full independence to this tiny but courageous country.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill before us. I am particularly disappointed that it allocates only a paltry amount of money to aid and assist Lebanon at a time when significant events have transpired in that country in recent months.

In May, Israel withdrew the last of its troops from south Lebanon. Prime Minister Barak made a wise decision to withdraw from the country his troops had occupied since 1977; it will do much to improve the prospects of negotiating future peace accords in the Middle East. The Administration has rewarded Israel for its withdrawal, stating that $50 million of Israel's aid package for the coming year will go to assist Israel as it redeploys its forces along the Lebanese border. I do not oppose this proposal. I would note, however, that Israel's total aid and assistance package provided by the bill before us is $2.9 billion. Including Wye funds allocated through the supplemental appropriation, Israel will receive $4.1 billion this year.

Mr. Chairman, Lebanon is in dire need of assistance. The bill before us provides only $18 million to Lebanon, which is an improvement over last year's figure, but is woefully insufficient considering the changes that have taken place in Lebanon. This spring alone, an estimated $85 million in damage was inflicted on Lebanese infrastructure as a result of Israeli attacks. Lebanon has endured a prolonged civil war, foreign occupation, and an influx of refugees. The Lebanese government must have the ability to rebuild infrastructure damage earlier this year, reestablish order and the rule of law by civilian authorities in south Lebanon, and prevent further bloodshed from occurring along the Lebanese-Israeli border. I believe a six-year, $300 million aid package would be appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, Metro Detroit is the home of nearly 220,000 Arab Americans, many of Lebanese descent. Many have come to the United States since 1975, seeking to escape the mayhem that so long gripped Lebanon. And though these recent Lebanese immigrants have become an integral part of Southeast Michigan, they maintain a passionate love of their homeland. They are hopeful that Lebanon will continue its efforts, begun at the close of the civil war in 1990, to rebuild and reclaim its place as a regional leader in finance and commerce.

Disputes between the Lebanese government and Israel, and numerous militias in south Lebanon and Israel, are still unresolved. However, without stability in Lebanon, peace is impossible, and without peace or stability it is likely that renewed violence along the Lebanese-Israel border will occur.

Peace comes at a price, yet building a lasting, comprehensive peace in the Middle East is a key foreign policy goal of our country. American assistance to Lebanon at this time would be a wise investment and work toward fulfilling this goal. Clearly, Lebanon, a long-troubled country, must be stable if a lasting peace is ever to take root across the Middle East.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to clarify for the record that the bill language on Kyoto, in Section 577 of this bill, which was crafted in a bipartisan manner by my colleagues, myself, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG, is in fact identical to the provision adopted on appropriations bills for Energy and Water and Agriculture, and essentially the same as the provision on the VA/HUD and CJS bills.

However, I would like to clarify for the record that some additional characterizations of the provision, both in remarks made on the floor during deliberation of the Agriculture appropriations bill, and as submitted to the record on that bill, are not correct. They are in direct conflict with the bipartisan agreement that was crafted, and more importantly, with the statutory language which is now in the Agricultural Appropriations bill and the other bills I have listed, including the bill, Foreign Operations.

The assertion that activities allowed under the language must be specifically authorized in incorrect. In fact, that is not what the language says. The language says that activities otherwise authorized by law are not subjected to any of the restrictions that may be imposed by the Kyoto proviso. There are many activities that the Administration engages in that fall within generally authorized activities—activities that are supported and funded by Congress in a bipartisan fashion.

These types of activities include negotiations, both formal and informal, for instance—and many energy-saving programs that benefit consumers and the economy. Some Members on the other side of the aisle stated they have no intention of disrupting these programs, or the ability of the Administration to negotiate the climate change treaty or to engage developing countries in a manner consistent with Senate Resolution 98, for instance. And yet, characterizations in the record that activities must be specifically authorized in NOT reflected in the statutory provision that was agreed upon and adopted. It is simply not correct.

There are many programs and activities that are funded by the Congress, and carried out

by the Administration, that are not ''specifically authorized'' by Congress, but are authorized under general provisions. Moreover, the U.S. continues to implement its obligations under the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, which was ratified by the U.S. with the consent of the Senate. That is why the language that is included in the bills that I have listed—in Agricultural Appropriations, in CJS, VA–HUD, Energy and Water, and now, Foreign Operations—does not say that only activities specifically authorized by law are allowed. If such language were included, it would bring a halt too many bipartisan supported programs and initiatives that this Congress, and many others before it, have supported and funded.

I want to make clear, the language does not preclude the regulatory and non-regulatory programs that have bipartisan support and that save money for businesses and consumers, help the environment, and improve public health. It does not prohibit the many voluntary, non-regulatory programs and initiatives to reduce greenhouse gases—programs that also reduce energy bills, improve the nation's energy security, and reduce local air pollutants.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, the United States Government has consistently placed African foreign policy on the back-burner. As a result, economic stagnation, human rights atrocities, and social and political unrest have been perpetuating throughout the continent. Zimbabwe is the perfect opportunity for U.S. intervention to have a positive impact in Africa, and ensure the sustenance of a fair and free democratic process.

President Robert Mugabe has seized 804 farms for immediate distribution and resettlement. Violence has erupted throughout the nation. Not only has he rejected rulings from the independent judiciary, but he has enforced severe restrictions on the opposition's ability to campaign for parliamentary seats. Mugabe is using force to secure support and manipulate the outcome of the legislative elections this June.

The United States must play a proactive role in Zimbabwe to ensure that legitimate elections occur.

South African President, Thabo Mbeki, is securing money from countries like Norway and Saudi Arabia to purchase farms from willing sellers for redistribution. Perhaps, we should also look into a similar policy action that may enable adequate distribution and compensation of land. The European Union, Commonwealth of Nation, Southern African Development Community, and International Republican Institute are all sending observers to evaluate the legitimacy of the election on June 25th. We must do our best to monitor this entire process, and ascertain a comprehensive report on the events that are and will transpire in Zimbabwe.

In addition, I believe that we should still continue to provide money to Zimbabwe for HIV/AIDS programs to strengthen democracy, and to raise living standards despite the corruption that is occurring.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4611, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for FY 2001. I'd like to thank Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI for once again including $13 million in funding for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act expands President Bush's Enterprise for the Americas Initiative—EAI—and provides a creative market-oriented approach to protect the world's most threatened tropical forests on a sustained basis. It is a cost-effective way to respond to the global crisis in tropical forests, and the groups that have the most experience preserving tropical forests—including the Nature Conservancy, World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International and others—agree. The Administration is strongly in support of this effort as well. It is an excellent example of the kind of bipartisan approach we should have on environmental issues.

Tropical forests harbor up to 90% of the Earth's terrestrial biodiversity. They act as ''carbon sinks,'' absorbing massive quantities of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, thereby reducing greenhouse gases. They regulate rainfall on which agriculture and coastal resources depend, which is of great importance to regional and global climates. And they are the breeding grounds for new drugs that can cure diseases.

Sadly, since 1950, half of the world's tropical forests have been lost. Between 1980 and 1990, 30 million acres of tropical forests—an area larger than the State of Pennsylvania—were lost every year.

The Tropical Forest Conservation Act gives the President authority to reduce or cancel U.S. A.I.D. and/or P.L. 480 debt owed by an eligible country to the United States in exchange for the creation of a fund in the local currency that preserves, maintains, and restores tropical forests.

Currently, three countries—Bangladesh, Belize and Peru—have been declared eligible by our government to participate in the Tropical Forest Conservation Act. In March, the President announced that the U.S. and Bangladesh are discussing a Tropical Forest Conservation Act agreement to reduce up to $6 million of that country's outstanding debt in exchange for its commitment to invest funds in tropical forest conservation programs. This would make Bangladesh the first country to benefit from funding under the Act, and we are hopeful that a final agreement will be reached in the very near future.

Bangladesh's tropical forests cover more than three million acres, including an area that is home to 400 endangered Bengal tigers, the world's largest single population. The area also contains one of the largest mangrove forests in the world, and it has wetlands of internationally-recognized importance. Bangladesh is home to more than 5,000 species of plants, compared to 18,000 in the United States, which is 67 times its size. Clearly, a debt-for-forests arrangement with Bangladesh could play an important role in preserving endangered species and protecting biodiversity, as well as helping that struggling nation's economy.

Seven other nations also have expressed interest in participating in the program. These countries are Ecuador, El Salvador, Thailand, Indonesia, Paraguay, Costa Rica and the Philippines.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule. When the reading for amendment reaches section 587, that section shall be considered read. Before consideration of any other amendment to that section, it shall be in order to consider, and to dispose of, an amendment to strike that section.

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4811

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

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

SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance, and tied-aid grants as authorized by section 10 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, $825,000,000 to remain available until September 30, 2004: *Provided,* That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further,* That such sums shall remain available until September 30, 2019 for the disbursement of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance and tied-aid grants obligated in fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior Act appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, or related programs for tied-aid credits or grants may be used for any other purpose except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated by this paragraph are made available notwithstanding

section 2(b)(2) of the Export Import Bank Act of 1945, in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by any East European country, any Baltic State or any agency or national thereof.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. PELOSI

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. PELOSI:

Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $1,000)''.

Page 30, line 8, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $179,600,000).

Page 30, line 9, strike ': *Provided*'' and insert the following '', of which $179,600,000 is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided*, That the $179,600,000 designated by this paragraph shall be available only to the extent an official budget request that includes designation of this amount as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*''.

Page 132, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FOR DEBT RESTRUCTURING

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

For an additional amount for ''Debt Restructuring'', $210,000,000 for a contribution to the ''Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund'' of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (HIPC Trust Fund): *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress. For payment to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President $210,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

Ms. PELOSI (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 hours and that the time be equally divided.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I did not even really hear what the gentleman from Alabama said.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, I ask for unanimous consent that there be a time limitation on this amendment and all amendments thereto to close in 3 hours.

Ms. PELOSI. On this amendment?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it would yield 1½ hours to the gentlewoman's side, or that the time be equally divided.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make sure I understood the content of the proposal of the gentleman from Alabama. Is it my understanding that the gentleman is asking unanimous consent that all time reserved for this particular amendment only is 3 hours?

Mr. Chairman, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. No, it says and all amendments thereto, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. PELOSI. Thereto to this particular amendment, having nothing to do with any other amendments that are related to this subject, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct.

Ms. PELOSI. That is correct. Okay.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and posing a question to the gentleman from Alabama, I am not clear. Is the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) saying that it will be 3 hours total for everything or just the Pelosi amendment?

Mr. Chairman, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it is just the Pelosi amendment, 3 hours equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and a Member opposed each will control 90 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the distinguished chairman of the full committee for their courtesy as we go forward with this very important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment adds $210 million requested by the administration for debt relief for fiscal year 2000 supplemental request and $179.6 million for fiscal year 2001. The amendment, therefore, fully funds the pending request for debt relief before both fiscal year 2000 and fiscal year 2001. This is approximately a $390 million amendment.

Approval of this amendment has now become even more compelling in light of the fact that the bill only contains $82 million of the $472 million requested for debt relief. We have been working on the debt question in a very positive way with the chairman in his original mark where $221 million had been provided and where contributions to the HIPC Trust Fund had been authorized.

We now find ourselves with only $82 million, which is not enough to remove debt relief for Bolivia, which has been imminent and awaiting a sufficient United States contribution. In addition, Honduras, which was devastated by a severe hurricane not long ago, will be unable to consummate their debt relief without additional funds. We have talked already about Mozambique and its readiness for debt relief.

□ 1815

I regret that we have to use the emergency designation for this amendment, but I would point out that the bill already contains $160 million in emergency designation for the floods in southern Africa as an emergency supplemental funding. In addition, the supplemental just passed contains over $11 billion in emergency spending for everything from soup to nuts.

It comes down to a matter of priorities. I know that we will be hearing from our colleagues about the urgency, the specifics of the need for this debt relief. This is part of an outside mobilization that is ecumenical in nature, it is worldwide in scope, and it is very, very essential for us to heed.

As I said earlier, we are blessed in this caucus with a very diverse membership. This House of Representatives must hear what our membership is saying. We are blessed with the intellectual resources, the personal experiences, the direct knowledge of the cultures, the economies and the possibilities of countries south of the equator. The world does not stop at the equator, and sometimes I think this body acts as if it does. We must address these important economic needs in Africa and in Latin America and we can do so by the very important way of supporting these funds for debt relief.

I will have more to say on this subject, Mr. Chairman, but I know that many members of the caucus wish to speak to this issue.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) seek to control time in opposition?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) continues to reserve a point of order

against the amendment, and the Chair will assume that that point of order will continue to be reserved through the entire length of debate which has been agreed to by unanimous consent.

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is recognized for 90 minutes.

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

I think we all agree, Mr. Chairman, that the World Bank and the regional development banks have made a lot of bad loans that cannot be repaid. There are many decent and honorable people, including the leaders of our churches, who are asking Congress to support forgiveness of these poor countries' mountain of debt, and I commend them and I want to work with them.

In fact, it is largely fiction that these loans are being repaid right now. That debt burden is one of the main causes of poverty and of HIV/AIDS in many, many poor countries is just not true. It is not the only one. It is a fact that these countries are forced to take out new loans in order to pay back their old loans. There is a vicious cycle of ever-increasing unsustainable debt.

The debt left behind by bad loans is mortgaging the future of these poor countries and it should be forgiven by those who made the bad loans. That is why this committee decided some years ago to make almost all of our own foreign aid in the form of grants and not loans. Worst of all, the challenge of dealing with this cycle of bad debt exhausts the time and energy of the capable men and women who lead some of these countries.

Unbelievably, the British Government is suggesting that HIPC apply to the countries ruled by tyrants and dictators, such as Sudan, Burma, and the Congo. I know that this House does not support helping such leaders. We all agree that continuing this vicious cycle of unsustainable debt makes no sense. That is my mission, and I invite others to join me in halting the accumulation of new debt as fast as old debt is paid off under this Heavily Indebted Poor Country scheme.

Although this bill greatly improves the accountability of the HIPC scheme, almost everyone who has looked into the administration's original proposal finds fault with it. It does not help poor people obtain more health and educational services. Indeed, it could be detrimental towards benefits already being provided. In most cases, the original HIPC scheme does not even improve cash flow, a myth that has been put into the minds of a lot of good leaders of charitable organizations in our country and throughout the world.

The existing HIPC scheme merely bales out certain multilateral banks and keeps their bond ratings high. This plan is not increasing cash flow to countries; it is going to bail out banks. That is where the money that is being requested is going, to give to banks who have made bad loans.

In this country, if a bank makes a bad loan, there is a mechanism and a tax advantage encouraging it to write off the bad loan. In fact, the FDIC requires that they write off these bad loans. But in the international community, these multilateral banks that have decided that there is a scheme here whereby they can get people's sympathy by talking about the needs of the poor, what they are saying is, pay off these loans to our bank so we can once again be solvent. Thus, we will not have to write off these loans.

This is a message that has not gotten through to the religious leaders that have been convinced. It has not gotten to those members who hear from their pulpits of the church every Sunday that we ought to be more compassionate, I think they ought to take a close look at what really is being proposed and who is going to benefit.

I received a call just a few months ago from some singer named Bono, B-O-N-O, I do not know him, never heard one of his songs, but he was very knowledgeable and very compassionate and very wanting of us to do something for HIPC. I explained to him the GAO report that was requested by many of my colleagues on the Banking Committee which substantiates my argument that this is not going to help poor people get better health and education, that that is a myth, Mr. Chairman. It is not going to help poor people, in many instances, because it simply is bailing out some of these multinational banks. It is not even bailing out our bilateral aid. We have already forgiven those loans. This money is going to these multilateral banks, these development banks, because they have made bad loans.

Now let me tell my colleagues of another myth about this scheme that has been placed upon the American people and the people worldwide who have noble causes, Mr. Chairman. They want to do what is right. They want to help the sick. They want to help needy people. No one denies that if that is what this could accomplish, that is what we would do.

First of all, let me just give a scenario, Mr. Chairman. The scenario is that these countries have borrowed money. They have borrowed money that the banks loaned to them, not American banks, we are talking about foreign banks have loaned these countries money and now they cannot pay it back. So they are selling this myth, this scheme, to the American people and to people throughout the world.

And, incidentally, I forgot to tell my colleagues that Mr. Bono now agrees with me that the Banks and IMF ought to be more responsible in this endeavor. And we will get to this endeavor in just a few minutes.

But in any event, these countries are not paying interest on this debt from their own resources. They are not paying much principal on this debt, so it is not going to create any substantial cash flow. That is a myth. The principle of the scheme that has led people down this primrose path in expectation of providing human service to poor people is a myth. They are not denied human services because they are paying interest. Poor people are not paying interest, they are not paying debt. To the extent there nations are not paying anything on the principal, there is going to be no cash flow available to these countries to provide services to their people.

It is going to be a cleansing of their books. So the leaders of these poor nations are going to wake up one morning, because of the generosity of the American and European people, if indeed we continue with this program, and their nations are going to be cleansed of debt. They are going to rush to the same banks that have put them in this position today and borrow some more money.

And what are they going to do with it? They are going to do like they did in the country of Uganda, where America and Europe and worked out a debt reduction for the country of Uganda. The next week the president of that country bought a Gulf Stream airplane, a jet, for his own personal use that cost somewhere in the vicinity, with all of the things that go with a jet, of $50 million. So we got them out of debt one day, we cleansed the slate, and the next day they go right back into debt because a president buys a $50 million Gulf Stream jet.

At least he had the brilliance to buy it from an American firm, and I am happy about that, but the point I am trying to make is, if we do not put some contingencies to this, then that is what is going to happen in all of these countries and, as a result, no monies are going to be available to help the very people that noble people we are trying to help. There is going to be nothing much available to help them.

So, Mr. Chairman, we will talk later on about this HIPC scheme, but I would like to invite my colleagues to get a copy of the GAO report. The GAO report entitled ''Debt Relief Initiative for Poor Countries Faces Challenges,'' was requested by the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. Let me tell my colleagues that the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, along with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the chairman and ranking member on the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, sent to the GAO and they said, listen, give us a report on the debt relief initiative for poor countries who face challenges. And much to their surprise, the report comes back that says much of what I am telling my colleagues; that we ought to take a better

and longer look at the process we are going through because we are not going to accomplish any of the goals, or very few at the least, of the goals.

No one in this House, no one in this country will deny the opportunity being given to assist poor people or to assist starving people or to assist sick people or uneducated people. This, in my opinion, is not the right way to go. We have still provided money in this bill to begin the process, but to limit the process by saying that they cannot go right back into debt the next day.

I have discussed this with Secretary Summers, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States. And in the beginning they said, oh, no, no, no way. Secretary Rubin told me there is no way we could have any moratorium on additional debt. But when Mr. Summers came on board and he looked at what I was saying, and other people started thinking about the responsibility of this program, now Secretary Summers agrees with me that there possibly should be some restraints on the ability of a nation to go right back in certain kinds debt the day after their debts are forgiven.

Let us not fool ourselves. None of us would do this in our personal businesses, in our family lives, or in any other scenario that exists in the world. Nowhere should we allow these irresponsible and sometimes corrupt leaders the ability to borrow new monies simply because the United States of America and other countries are generous in their concern that people need to be helped.

No one is contesting the need to be helped. I am not saying that we should not. I think we ought to take our limited amount of money and add to the Child Survival Fund, because we know child survival monies go directly to needy people. But under our allocation process we may even be forced to take money away from direct child survival to give it to some bank president who has made a bad decision and free up the books of a nation that is going to go right back into debt the next day and create the same position and posture that we are in today.

□ 1830

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it was my intention at this time to yield to my colleagues, but I cannot resist. I must respond to the remarks of the gentleman. With all the respect that I have for him and knowing how important this issue is to so many Members of this Congress and to so many people in the religious community out there, I have to say, very regretfully, that his comments do a disservice to this debate.

This is not a scheme. This is a plan. This is a plan that was very harshly scrutinized and developed by the G–7 in their debt proposal. That proposal is in jeopardy now. Why is it in jeopardy? Because the U.S. has not paid its share of the tab 1 year after the promise.

Who is involved in this plan at the grassroots level? Well, let us start with the Vatican, His Holiness the Pope. Let us reach out then to an ecumenical movement, including Archbishop Desmond Tutu, who has spoken and traveled throughout the world promoting this plan.

Desmond Tutu of South Africa stated: ''The new moral crusade follows the Biblical principle of Jubilee. In the Bible it says, all belong to God. All debts are forgiven in the Jubilee year. Debtors make a new beginning.''

What this is about, Mr. Chairman, is an attempt on the part of people who minister to the needs of poor people throughout the world to alleviate poverty, promote democratic freedoms, and build markets for our products. In the interest of meeting the needs and lifting people up, there has to be some way to pull away the crushing mantle of this debt.

As our distinguished ranking Member said earlier, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), it is nothing less than we did for countries in Europe, including Poland, following the Soviet collapse, nothing less than that.

When we talk about this, we have to speak about it in a spirit of a strict plan. The IMF is not known for its programs that are soft on countries that want to receive loans. There is a very tough set of standards that these countries must live up to before they can have their debts forgiven, and much of it includes instituting budget austerity and programs that meet the needs of their people.

Our distinguished chairman makes a good point when he asks why should we forgive loans on the one hand and make loans on the other. Well, simply because many of these loans were incurred by previous regimes. The world is changing. We all know that. And these early stages of democracy in these countries require that they be lifted not only from the oppression of the dictatorships but the oppression of the loans that were taken out by those dictators. So now we want to forgive the loans.

The gentleman is simply not correct when he says these people are not paying any of their debts. The bilateral debts in many cases have a moratorium on repayment by some of these countries. But the debts to the multilateral banks still must be paid. So that is the rub. Many of these countries are paying more for their debt service than they are for education and health in their own countries.

So while we may all agree that loan forgiveness has to be done responsibly, we have no quarrel with that. Of course it must be done responsibly. And those of us who fight for this funding insist on that responsibility. We are not here to talk about irresponsibility.

While we may all agree on that and we would hope that the countries that receive this debt relief all act responsibly as well. An egregious example that the chairman may wish to point out, should not eliminate debt relief for all the other countries.

Many of those countries have put the reforms in place. They are ready for the debt relief. They are ready to go forward with their economic growth that this debt forgiveness will engender for them. But the U.S. are holding it up.

So while I respect the difference of opinion as to whether the amount of money is enough or not, I point out that $82 million is 20 percent of the President's request. It does not even begin to meet the needs for FY 2000 and 2001.

So if we want to talk about priorities and you say that that money is enough and we say it is not, that is one thing; but to denigrate this proposal which has been negotiated at the highest level, mobilized for, advocated for at the grassroots level throughout the world, and which is urgently needed, is in my view, painfully and sadly a disservice to the debate.

There is a need out there. It is urgent. It is great. We can speak to the specifics of it, and that will happen in this debate. But I would hope that the tenor of our remarks would not be condescending to the leadership of these countries who are trying their best to get on their feet and help their people and that it would not be dismissive of the efforts of the religious communities, starting with His Holiness the Pope and across the board.

I might just name some of the organizations that were with us this morning at a press conference: The Council of Churches, the Catholic Relief Services, the U.S. Catholic Conference, and then many environmental groups, as well, and then Oxfam, Bread for the World, Jubilee 2000, which is the organizing group for this mobilization.

So I hope that the debate will be respectful because it is with respect for every person on this Earth that we are going forward with this, with the need for people to have their needs met and to have children have some prospect of a future, and that can begin by lifting the burden of this debt.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I would encourage my colleagues during this 3 hours of debate on this issue, and I think we should debate it and that is why I have not insisted on my point of order at this time but I still reserve that point, to take a look at what the GAO reported in response to the very question that is being raised tonight. The very people who asked for the GAO report thought it would be positive, it came back negative; and now they are saying ignore the report, ignore the responsibility we have to the taxpayers of this country, do it irresponsibly.

In this bill we provide $69 million to start the process, but we restrict some

of that assistance to the extent that they must not borrow new money for a certain period of time, 9 months in some instances, 30 months in other instances.

So we are not putting a veto on the HIPC program. We are providing $69 million for the program, and in the process we will be able to work out a reasonable process where we can achieve the same goal that these people want.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) mentioned that the Pope has come out in favor of this. Well, I would like to tell the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) that the Pope is also against abortion. Does she agree with the Pope on abortion? If so, then we will not have the population debates that no doubt will take place later on in the bill.

I know what the Pope has said. I think all ministers throughout the world agree with the destination that all of us are trying to seek. We all want to get to the same point. But this is not a responsible mechanism at this time because it permits them to go right back into debt and to squander money and to put their country in the same financial condition that they are in today.

The GAO investigators confirmed that the only way there would be significant new resources for health and education in poor countries would be if these countries borrowed the money through new loans from the multilateral banks.

I mean, how more clear could it be with the GAO report that the very proponents of this issue are advocating, how clear could it be?

So what we have done in this bill is to say that we are not going to cut direct child survival assistance, direct assistance to HIV/AIDS in Africa, we are not going to cut from our allocation. Instead, we are going to give $69 million this year; and during the next 6 or 7 months, we can come up with a more responsible plan that denies these countries the opportunity to go right back into debt as they did in the country that I mentioned a few minutes ago and buy $50 million jets so they can travel throughout the world, or to even push some of this money into Swiss banks.

So I am saying let us do it, but let us do it responsibly; and let us make absolutely certain that what we do goes to the intended people that we want to help. I do not know how more reasonable someone could be.

The money is provided, the $69 million, to pay our fair share for the next 6 or 7 months. And when they come up with a responsible plan that will achieve intended purpose of this process, then we will give them some additional money. But to bail out some of these multilateral banks should not be our mission, and that is exactly what we are doing under the proposal that is before us.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and an expert on international debt relief.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I am again grateful to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the leadership that she is providing on the whole issue of Africa but particularly on this whole business of debt relief.

I am sorry that the chairman of the committee is leaving the room. I wish that he would stay, given some of the comments that he has made.

First of all, let me take up the issue that the chairman seems to be alluding to: these irresponsible people in Africa, they do not know how to handle their money; we give them money and they go out and they buy jets.

Well, I think we should reject that kind of condescending description of the problems of Africa. We do not hear him talking about Poland. We do not hear him raising questions about who else flies jets. We do not hear anything about Africa. We know what that is all about. We are accustomed to that kind of condescending accusations coming to people of color. I do not like it. I wish it would stop. And I do not appreciate the fact that this is all that can be talked about when we talk about what we do or what we do not do for Africa.

The fact of the matter is this country met in the big G–8 summit and gave leadership to the idea that we should do something about forgiving debt. All of the churches, organized religions of the world, came together to talk about Jubilee 2000 and put together a magnificent program that included the churches and organized religion and included all the nongovernmental organizations and they moved forward. And this country made a commitment and we led. And we have worked very hard for debt relief; we have worked very hard for debt forgiveness. And we should forgive the debts of the most vulnerable and the poorest countries of the world.

First of all, they cannot afford to pay it back. Some of them are starving their children, not being able to pay for education and health needs trying to pay back this debt. And the interest keeps piling up and piling up on this debt. They will never get it paid, even those countries that have gone under structural adjustment and have done well. We have allowed them to take from their economy dollars that they should be using for health and education and comply with structural adjustment, and we still have not gone back to help them in any appreciable way.

But we find that the chairman does not talk about the increases that they did, foreign military financing program, $60 million per year for the next 10 years. If they are so concerned about how they spend the money and doing it in a responsible way and making sure that they set priorities, how do they have money to increase the foreign military financing program by $60 million a year and try to do it for 10 years?

□ 1845

I think this is outrageous. I think we need to deal with it like it is. This is Africa. Somehow it is less deserving. Somehow the people of Africa and poor people of the world in Central and South America and in other places are not worthy of debt relief or support. They are worthy only of condescending remarks that they cannot handle their money, that they only use their money to buy things they do not need.

We did not talk like that when we talked about what we were going to do when the Soviet Union broke up. We do not talk about Russia that way. We do not talk about Poland that way. And we darn sure do not talk about Israel that way. There is nothing worse than a bully. There is nothing worse than somebody who picks on the least of these and the most vulnerable of these.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

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

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we began this debate by saying that this was a bad bill, but now the bad bill has become not only a terrible bill but terrible disposition expressed by the majority about Africa and its ability to handle the resources associated with providing for what the President of the United States has indicated a threat to the national security of the United States.

What this bill fundamentally says in light of the gentleman's disposition is that lives in the Middle East somehow are just a little bit different or a little bit more precious than lives in Africa. There are 5,000 Africans who are dying every day associated with the AIDS disease and the AIDS crisis. The export earning potential that we passed, the by-product of the Africa Growth and Opportunity Act, the debt service is designed to save health care and reprioritize issues like education and health care on sub-Saharan Africa's continent. That is what is so critical indeed in this bill.

A number of my colleagues have come to the floor of the Congress today and said, yes, AIDS is a problem; yes, all of these other problems exist in the world, but what we have to recognize is that a significant portion of this bill confronts very critical negotiations that are occurring at Camp David. Well, I sure hope someone at Camp David is talking about AIDS in Africa because Time magazine, Newsweek magazine, The Wall Street Journal, The Washington Times, everyone has said that the number one plague confronting the world is AIDS on the continent of Africa and for this Congress

to play a blind eye and to ignore that fact is a disgrace. We ought to do something about it in this bill, Mr. Chairman.

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

To briefly respond to the remarks by the gentlewoman from California and gentleman from Illinois, I respect their passion and their concern for the people of Africa. But not once during my statement did I mention the continent of Africa. I did by chance mention Uganda because of the ridiculous situation that took place when the president bought the jet. I might remind the gentlewoman that even the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, has now decided that I am right and they have cut off further debt forgiveness to Uganda until such time as they can get this situation straightened out.

My remarks were meant to be to the world. It applies to Central America. It applies to South America. It applies to Africa. It applies to every country where we are proposing to provide debt forgiveness. So I meant no disrespect to any race or disrespect to any continent. I am not condescending. I am telling you the facts. The facts are that we are giving $69 million of taxpayers' money towards this program to begin the process whereby in the process, and this is less than the Senate incidentally, that in this process they can come forward with a more responsible plan that can protect the integrity of the financial situation of these particular countries. The fact that some of these countries are in Africa, I did not mention that. You brought that up. I sort of resent you saying that I am condescending and implying that this is racist because it is not. This is responsible legislation.

I am proposing that we do what you want to do, that is, provide for the needy people, whether they be in Latin America, South America, Africa, Israel, Russia, wherever they are, that we do it; but we do it responsibly. I do not think that is being condescending. I think it is being responsible, because we have the same exact destination in mind. We want to help needy people. We want to help the sick. We want to eliminate HIV/AIDS. We want to do all of this. We want these countries to be financially stable. But to just give them a blank check and say, well, this debt is forgiven, and, incidentally, this money is not going to these countries. This money is to go to these banks. It is not going to the countries. It goes to the banks, so the banks' books can be cleared. So we have no difference as to our destination or goal or aims or wants. We have identical destinations.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I will yield to the gentlewoman from California if she will stop saying that I am condescending.

Ms. WATERS. No, I will not stop saying it yet, but I do appreciate your yielding. I would like to ask a question if I may.

Is there $90 million in fiscal year 2001 for the foreign military financing program with $60 million of that an increase going to Israel and $60 million over the next 10 years in an increase while you are being prudent in your budgeting?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That is correct. But that was the request of the President of the United States. I would like to remind the gentlewoman with respect to the assistance to Israel whereby we did increase the foreign military financing by $60 million, we cut $120 million from the economic support. I would like to remind the gentlewoman that that was the third rail of politics before I became chairman. No one dared walk on this floor and say, ''Let's cut assistance to Israel.'' But I went to Israel and at 2 o'clock in the morning met with then Prime Minister Netanyahu and he admitted that the economy there was now such because of the benevolency and the assistance of the United States, the economy was such that they could begin responsible reduction of economic support to Israel, and that process has been now for the last 4 years, and I have cut their economic assistance by nearly $120 million a year, so nearly $500 million.

And so the argument that the financial assistance for military financing is moot, because the bottom line is I have cut Israel $60 million a year net for the last 4 years because the Israeli government agreed to that. So I do not think it is irresponsible nor a good comparison.

Ms. WATERS. Sir, you made cuts in all of Africa's budget. Where did you then increase Africa's budget where the cuts have been made in both the development fund and the other fund for Africa? You cut them, but there is no place where you increased the funds to Africa. Where did you do likewise for Africa?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I have proposed $69.4 million in HIPC funds which is an increase. That is an increase in itself.

Ms. WATERS. Sir, the President asked for $400 million.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I do not care what the President asked for.

Ms. WATERS. You told me what the President asked for in military financial assistance.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Just because the President of the United States——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will suspend.

The Chair would kindly request that all Members follow regular procedure in yielding to one another or in requesting time from those who are controlling the time. The gentleman from Alabama controls the time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the true scenario is this. The President of the United States has committed to participate in this debt forgiveness program of worldwide contributions, and we intend to fulfill responsibly some of the requests of the President. But just because the President calls up or writes me a note and sends a note over here and says, Sonny, give me 4 or $500 million does not make it an obligation of the United States of America. I think that you as a Congressperson and that I as a Congressperson have a responsibility to ask the President, Are you sure this is the right way to go? That is what I am doing. I think the President is making a big mistake, not in the amount of money that he requested, not for the programs that he is requesting that be enhanced, but because of the mechanism to get to the end result of the entire proposal of HIPC is where the mistake is.

So I am saying, wait a minute. And you all know I am not the smartest man in the world. I am not the dumbest man in the world, either. And I have some background and experience in finance, not multibillions of dollars like some of our colleagues here in the House, but I have some experience. And anywhere in life, even in your family, if I overspent my Visa card, for example, and I went to my kids and I say, Kids, help me out, your daddy has done an irresponsible thing, the credit card company is telling me, ''Well, if they don't do this, they're going to take away my house and they're going to sue me,'' do you think even my kid would say, ''Dad, I'm going to help you, we're going to pay off your debt, but you're going to tear up that credit card.''

That is exactly what I am saying. I am saying we should not give these countries the ability to go right back into debt the next day. I am telling you that this is a mistake, but at the same time I am admitting that maybe I am wrong. For in the interim, here is $70 million towards our contribution, and we can go ahead and start with these programs. Just as we have already forgiven most of our bilateral debt, now we can help to bail out some of these banks because maybe I am wrong. So I am providing $69.4 million in this bill as a down payment to keep the program going in the hopes that the GAO report is wrong. Maybe I am wrong. But the GAO backs up what I am saying, and I think I am right at this time.

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

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

I am very, very dismayed by the comments that have been made by my distinguished chairman in this regard, because we can have a legitimate difference of opinion on an issue, but the course that this debate is taking is not worthy of this institution. We have a very serious policy decision to make. We have Members of this House who have worked very hard on this issue, and who know a great deal about the loan forgiveness program.

The gentleman is correct. We do not want to promote irresponsibility. That has never been an issue. The fact, though, is that if you are lifting oppressive debt, much of it incurred by

previous regimes, why should a country not be able to borrow from the poorest of the poor window of the World Bank that administers to the poorest of the poor, the IDA window, assistance for basic human needs? For basic human needs? Why should they not be able to start investing in their economies?

It is very simplistic to say, oh, I tore up my credit card, or my son tore up my credit card. That is not an analogy that is even in any way close to this. This is about countries wanting to assume responsibility. This is about countries saying yes to the reforms that they must comply with when they are applying for loan forgiveness. This is a very strict standard that is applied to qualify for these loans as HIPC, highly indebted poor countries.

So if we want to say that this is not an important enough priority to our country, then let us say that, but do not mischaracterize what is being proposed here and what is being supported across the board by religious communities throughout the world and which the administration supports. The Secretary of the Treasury does not support the chairman's position. Of course we all support responsibility; and that is what we are advocating, too.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can have the tenor of the remarks return to a place that is more respectful of the hard work that has gone into this. I say that with great respect for the chairman and with great sadness, quite frankly.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, one of the guiding principles of United States foreign policy is that whenever possible we use our assistance to enable developing countries to stand on their own two feet. That is precisely what this amendment would do and why I support it.

Many countries in the developing world have been unable to spend the necessary resources on health care and on education for their citizens because they have been saddled by debilitating debt. New regimes elected with high hopes for economic opportunity and democratic ideals will remain unable to achieve their noble objectives because of debt incurred by previous, often corrupt regimes.

Debt relief, as some contend, is not about giving a free ride to developing nations. That is not what we are talking about. It is about helping countries in sub-Saharan Africa build the health care infrastructure necessary to fight the AIDS epidemic.

□ 1900

It is about giving countries the chance to educate children, giving them hope for a better future. It is about giving nascent democratic regimes the chance to build constituencies, perpetuating the ideals of democracy abroad.

The cost of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, is a small price to pay for the myriad of benefits it will bring. It is disgraceful, in my judgment, that this small amount of money that this bill provides for debt relief will stall the global HIPC initiative and may deny relief to some of the world's most committed economic reformers. These countries have worked hard at developing concrete poverty-reduction targets, sound economic management practices. It would be shameful for us to turn our back on this important initiative.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask Members if they have the opportunity to get a copy, I keep talking about this GAO report which was requested by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and others to substantiate their claim of the merits of this program; and once again, I do not deny that the intentions of those interested in this are anything other than noble, and I share the exact same goals with them.

But in the results in brief of the GAO report, where they requested that the GAO report look into what we were doing, the results in brief say that the GAO's analysis shows that the decline in debt service for the seven countries, they selected seven countries in order to do their study, that these countries will only free up resources for additional poverty reduction if in the years prior to their qualifying for debt relief they are allowed to continue to borrow at the same level.

That is precisely what I am saying is the fallacy of this overall proposal. They go on to say that this occurs because the countries previously borrowed for several reasons, including debt payments; and they will need to continue borrowing after receiving debt relief in order to meet their remaining debt payments and to increase spending for poverty reduction.

These countries, are not paying any interest, they are borrowing more money to pay the interest. They are incurring more principal in order to pay the annual interest; and what they are doing is continuing to build up this debt.

So what this report is saying is that the only way they are going to free up cash is if indeed they have more borrowed money which they cannot pay back.

The route that we ought to be taking as an international community, and I am Catholic and I disagree with the Pope, because I don't think the Pope has had the opportunity to read such reports as this GAO report, nor do I think the Pope has had the opportunity to reflect on this. He is a very busy person. I do not think he has had the opportunity to reflect on the total program as to whether or not this mission will really benefit the very people he wants to help.

If the Pope wants to help, if the gentlewoman from California wants to help, if this Congress wants to help, I have no opposition to that. But if we are going to do it, let us do it right.

I started telling you about this credit card that I have overextended, so I go to my children and I say, Listen, Daddy is in trouble. Will you pay off my credit card? I promise you I won't do it again. My kids would say, Daddy, we are going to cut your credit card up.

That is the responsible thing to do, and that is what we ought to be telling leaders of these nations, whether they be in Central America, South America, Africa, Russia, wherever they are, that we are going to pay off your debts. You are not going to get any of the money because you have got to flow it straight through to a multinational bank. But we are going to allow you to flow this money through to a multinational bank to bail them out of their financial crisis, but you are not going to be able to go to that same bank tomorrow and borrow more money.

Now, maybe I am wrong, but that is the way I feel, and you are entitled to feel the way you feel. I think I am right, and it is not uncommon for these two sides to differ on a direction we might take on any given issue.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I must say, I differ with the gentleman in his interpretation of the GAO report; but if he is right, I am not that much of a theologian, but I notice that he corrected the Pope with the GAO. Are we hearing today the doctrine of GAO infallibility being promulgated on the floor of the House?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, conceivably so, and I am not questioning the intelligence of the Pope. I am just telling you the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) tells me we should support this because the Pope supports it, and my response to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is the Pope does not support abortion, and that if she is going to pay attention to everything the Pope says, she ought to be on my side on the abortion issue. That was just the point I was making.

But the Pope, as I say, is a very busy person. But I think if I had the opportunity and the privilege of appearing before the Pope for 15 minutes, as I have had the opportunity to appear before other people and convince them, that I could convince the Pope that I am right. The Pope would be issuing a proclamation tomorrow that would be read at the pulpit of every Catholic church in the world saying, Wait a minute. One of our colleagues, Catholic colleagues, has discovered a flaw in this proposal, and we ought to correct it and go forward.

That is what I do with the $69 million that I have included in this bill. Let us go forward, but let us do it cautiously.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield, since he referenced my name in his remarks?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman says that I heed the Pope when he is talking about debt relief, but not when he is talking about a woman's right to choose, or words to that effect, my comments to the gentleman were he was mocking this as a scheme; and I said this is not a scheme, this is a plan that has been thought out and proposed by the G–7. Just to get to the Pope for a moment——

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me reclaim my time and tell the gentlewoman an explanation of the word ''scheme.'' The scheme is not intended to reflect on the mission. I am saying a scheme has been presented to great charitable people of this world that does not do what they have represented to them in their proposal. Therefore, I think it is a scheme that has been concocted to convince people in this country, charitable people with good intentions, I think they have been misled; and, if that is the case, I think that should be called a scheme.

Ms. PELOSI. If the gentleman will further yield, the chairman knows I have the highest regard for him, and it is with a heavy heart, as Lyndon Johnson used to say, that I say to the gentleman that he is absolutely wrong.

I want to just get back to the Pope for a moment. The gentleman's powers of persuasion are considerable, but I doubt that he could persuade the Pope, the head of the church, whose mission is to alleviate poverty and respect the dignity and worth of every person on the face of this Earth, that we should not have international debt relief because of some egregious example that the gentleman might think up.

The GAO, if one reads the report, admits, we have never said that if you forgive the debt, that there will not be future lending. The debt is from a previous regime, or mistakes made before; and now we are talking about a fresh start.

But to get back to the Pope for a moment, because I want to make this point, I have never mocked, never, ever mocked, in fact I have respected the views of people who have a different view, some of them are in my own family, about a woman's right to choose and the rest. So really it offends me, and I say that regretfully, that the gentleman would say well, if you do not listen to the Pope about choice, why do you listen to the Pope about this?

Well, I respect the Pope's view on all of these things. But when the gentleman was characterizing this as a scheme, and now the gentleman is defining a scheme differently than he emphasized it earlier, it was with disdain; and that is the part that I find regrettable, because this is a very important debate.

This is a debate about whether our country will live up to its responsibilities that our President committed to at the G–7 one year ago. He is going to leave for Japan, for Okinawa, in another week, following the Camp David meetings; and he is going to have to go there and say I cannot fulfill the responsibility, the obligations that we incurred last year, because, maybe because somebody bought an airplane someplace, I do not know; but any excuse will do if you do not want to do something.

So to say that $69 million is a start, and we all want to get to the same place, is like saying let us all go to the Moon; here are your roller skates. That means I cannot get there.

So let us help these people get there. If we all do share the goal of alleviating poverty, if we all do share the goal of eradicating AIDS, as the gentleman referenced in his remarks, we have to put the resources where our compassion is. Compassion is great, but it is no substitute for a positive plan to go forward and the resources to match that proposal.

So we have an important decision to make here, respectful of each other's positions, and it is: Is it that a statement of the values of this country is that we will help these countries get on their feet? Standards have been set by the IMF. If it is a given that once the oppressive old debt is removed that countries not be able to incur further debt, I cannot even understand how you could put a moratorium on basic human needs, loans from the IDA window, the poorest of the poor window of the World Bank, and say that that is okay, we will teach them some discipline and they will not be able to incur any debts. Economic development is essential to the success of these countries, and they need the hard window loans as well.

So we are not talking about carelessness or irresponsibility; we are talking about sensible planning.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentlewoman has ample time. I thought she was going to question something I had said.

Let me just tell the gentlewoman, number one, we are not talking about debt that our country has given to these foreign countries. We have already forgiven that debt. We have fulfilled our shared responsibility of that HIPC agreement through our bilateral debt forgiveness. I am not talking about debt that these countries owe to the United States of America. I am talking about debts that they owe to the multilateral banks.

I am saying at the same time, SONNY, maybe you are wrong. That was my fear, that I would be making a mistake; and just in case I am wrong, which I really do not think at this time I am, nor have I heard any argument to the contrary. Just in case I am wrong, Mr. President, here is a down payment; here is $69 million to get you into the spring or fall, whereby we can look at a potentially more responsible mechanism for achieving the same goals that we all want to achieve.

I do not see anything unreasonable about that, but I know that you all do; and I know that you all have the right to disagree, and I respectfully disagree with you.

I will disagree with the Pope if indeed he says this is an irresponsible thing, but the Pope is too intelligent a person to deny that I am not right on this issue, Mr. Chairman.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

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

I would like to talk about what the history of debt relief has been. When I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and the Iron Curtain fell, all of a sudden we had a tremendous opportunity. All kinds of countries in Eastern Europe, where people looked like us, they had the same colored skin, they had lots of people in this country lobbying for their cause because they were the same nationality my wife happens to be Polish, for instance, and we recognized that the previous Communist government had stayed in power only by incurring huge amounts of debts that were totally irresponsible. When they left power we had a choice of whether or not we were going to create the economic conditions that would allow a democratic government to flourish or not. So we forgave debt.

As a result, you were able to get new investments, new economic growth in countries like Poland, and today they are reasonably healthy democracies, given what their history has been the last 50 years.

□ 1915

We also had debt relief provided for Egypt. That was done unilaterally with no consultation whatsoever with the United States Congress by one of the previous Republican administrations. And that was done because we needed the support of Egypt in the Middle East power game, and so not many questions were asked. But now we get to the hard cases. Now we get to the regions of the world that do not look like so many of us. We get to Africa, we get to Latin America, and the political pressures for us to do what is right and just are not quite as heavy as the political pressures were when we were dealing with countries that looked just like most of us.

So now we are told that because some idiot from one of those countries made a dumb purchase, that somehow, that example ought to be used as an excuse to avoid our responsibilities in

dealing with this problem in Latin America and Africa.

Now, the problem is very simple. A lot of these countries ran up debt when they were working for us and for the CIA and for our intelligence operations; they were conduits through which we were able to learn a lot about our political enemies around the world. So the Congress was asked to close its eyes while those governments did lots of dumb things. They abused human rights; they ran up huge debts. Now, we have new governments, and we are being asked to provide the same opportunity for new investment and new economic growth in those countries that we provided in countries that look just like most of us. It has been harder here. We are told that, well, this is just international debt that we are forgiving here and so we ought to put more stringent conditions on it.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that there are some countries that ought not to be lent an additional dime, and there are other countries who will be in a state of social and economic collapse if they do not receive new lending. We have some countries that are spending so much paying off the debts incurred by their former governments, that they do not have any money left to spend on education and health for their own children.

So we are here, not out of any bleeding heart knee-jerk reaction. We are here because we have two responsibilities. One is to our own national security, because we cannot exist forever, no matter how strong we are, in a world where there are large segments that are essentially poverty-ridden and open to all kinds of potential political mischief; and secondly, we are asked to respond to our moral responsibilities to help people who never had a say in incurring these debts in the first place. The ironic thing about it is that they are not collectible. They are lousy debts and all we are doing is clear the books so that we will give these new governments the same opportunity to start afresh that we gave other governments who look like most of us.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we ought to get on with the job, we will sooner or later; and if this bill did what it ought to do, we would be able to vote for it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of this committee; I do not know all of the great international nuances that are being discussed here. But I did come to the floor to speak, because it seems like the debate has gotten to a point to where there may be fingers pointed and charges being made back and forth, but I would just like to remind my colleagues that this debate about what other countries and their citizens may want or need, what the Pope may want or need, we do not sit here as a governing body to represent their opinions. We are here to represent the people of the United States. This is the people's House of the United States.

I am a practicing Catholic, although I happen to be a pro-choice Catholic, but the Pope does not direct me how I am going to stand on a policy statement of how the people of the United States' money should be spent. It is not a foreign government's money, and it is not the Pope's money. It is the American people's money, and it is not our money.

I just want us to understand that when we talk about forgiveness of debt, we should think about how many Americans are out there right now who say, this sounds pretty good. I would sure love to see Congress cut me the same deal that they are talking about cutting other people all over the world. Mr. Chairman, American taxpayers may be watching tonight saying, it really is true.

I am just saying I hope that we understand as we are talking about all of these bigger issues that there are people out there that are struggling to pay their taxes, struggling to be able to play by the rules, struggling to pay for their debts, and then seeing the House of Representatives, the people's House talking and saying, we need to talk about forgiveness of certain debts, talking about it as if it is our personal funds that we are willing to have a charitable contribution out of.

I bet, my colleagues, there are a lot of Americans out there who would say, great, Members of Congress, take it out of your pocket and put it in there, but you are taking it out of our pockets as taxpayers and giving it to another country, and giving it and giving it. It is a small, small, minute percentage of what we allocate out of this House, but do we not realize how much it just really rubs the taxpayers wrong when they hear the discussion of even the term forgiveness. I think that maybe we ought to talk about would we not be more productive in making people independent.

I just want to go back to this whole discussion of the Pope. He does not pay the taxes and we do not represent him. I follow him as a religious leader of my church, but the Constitution mandates to me and every Member of this body that we represent the people in our district, not even one of the great religious leaders that lives in Rome.

I would just say, we may disagree on this issue, on the technicalities of this issue, but I think the dialogue has gotten to where it is either/or: I am going to impugn your opinion for my opinion. I just think that people that are watching today and Members of Congress are watching, and remember, we are forcing this money, let me remind my colleagues, we are forcing this money from American citizens and resident aliens, forcing them under the threat of imprisonment to give us money, and we are sending this money all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, we have an obligation to make sure that every cent is responsible and is being responsible in its application and is being held accountable. I think the chairman has pointed out that that cannot be said with all of these funds, and we have the obligation to make it so.

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

Mr. BILBRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman explain to me how we help taxpayers when we refuse to write off debts that are uncollectible that will never be repaid and which simply get in the way of creating markets for products that are made by Americans so that they can have better jobs and earn more money?

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would say the same argument would be made by many taxpayers, Mr. Ranking Member; but the fact is that they are overburdened again and again and feel like they are over-taxed. The concept of saying they have to choose between child care and helping their family or sending their kids to school or being able to give what they want to their children, or the fact that they need, by force of law, to contribute to the Federal Government money that we then send overseas. I think that this is an issue that we just have to understand the dialog about.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and also for her outstanding leadership on this issue.

Let me begin by saying that I am very proud that Americans and specifically American taxpayers are not selfish, that they cannot bear the spectacle of 22 million people infected with AIDS in Africa; they cannot turn their backs on those people, and that they are not selfishly thinking only of their own concerns.

With respect to this amendment, I am here to support it. Here are the facts: the President asked for $475 million, this committee only gave $82 million, and that is a travesty.

Now, we hear a lot about corruption, but I am sure the chairman is not trying to say that the people who are dying in Africa ought to be sacrificed because of a corrupt leader. What we need to know about the facts of this issue is this: in Tanzania, for example, the government spends four times as much money on debt payments as it spends on health and education combined. What we need to know in this debate is that Uganda, Zambia, Nicaragua, and Honduras spends more on debt service than they spend on health and education combined. So this debate is not about corruption and it is not about wasteful spending.

Now, here is an issue that really strikes me as interesting. The gentleman talks about how we need to be concerned about how the money is spent; we need to have conditions. We can apply conditions. The problem is, the committee did not just apply conditions, the committee cut the money substantially. It cut 80 percent of the funds that were going to be used for debt forgiveness.

This is a project in which the United States and other developed countries are stepping forward and saying, there is a major epidemic, pandemic in Africa, sub-Saharan Africa, as well as in other countries, and we want to forgive debt as a group, this is true burden-sharing, to enable these countries to move forward, to spend money on health and education rather than on bad debts. This is a case where we really need to lead.

Thankfully, the American people are not selfish. I think they will agree with us that we ought to adopt the gentlewoman's amendment; we ought to put the money into debt forgiveness; we ought to give these countries a chance, and we ought to respond to the crisis that exists in Africa.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member for allowing the time for me to participate in the debate.

I do not want us to lose sight on the importance of our country and who we are in the world. This is the greatest country in the world in many respects. We are enjoying a surplus in a time when many in our country are living better than they have ever lived. At the same time, many do not live as well.

This foreign operations budget, as has been said over and over today, is less than 1 percent of our total budget. When we talk about debt forgiveness, we do it all the time, with our own American citizens, and we should. The S&L bailout, as we remember. We forgave a lot of those debts and many of those people involved in that scandal are living very well today. I am not opposed to it; I want us to take our responsibility as citizens seriously, to look at the world and see the ones who need forgiveness at this time.

The G–8 countries of which we are the leaders to look to America to see what we do for the least of these in that G–8 environment. We have a responsibility and an opportunity to give and forgive debt for some of the poorest countries, who have no idea and cannot pay that debt, were not responsible for it. This country gave that debt to many of those leaders who are long gone. Why, then, do we today hold those same children in those very poor countries responsible? We do have standards. The IMF has standards. Bolivia, Mozambique have met those standards. But the appropriation is now not there to help those countries and other poor countries come into the 21st century.

□ 1930

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House of Representatives, debt forgiveness in this year of jubilee, taught and mentioned in the Bible, is upon us. Let us rise to the occasion, do what is right, and forgive those poor countries at a time when God has blessed us to forgive.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I must confess, I am deeply distressed by the tone of this debate, at least in parts of it.

Let me just cite one fact. For the 41 Nations that have been identified as the most heavily-indebted poor countries, external long-term debt rose rapidly from less than $7 billion in 1970 to $169 billion today.

There has been some reference that the amendment would pay off multinational banks, as if these are multinational corporations, kind of using that rhetorical device. We are talking about debt owed to multilateral institutions and governments, not in this instance to private for-profit institutions.

It has also been said that cash flow is not affected. That is just patently wrong. Unless debt is eliminated, these countries cannot obtain further cash flow. With elimination of debt, they will.

Mr. Chairman, this is no scheme. This is a proposal, an edifice built by sovereign nations, by the G–8, who have decided that it is in their self-interest to act on this debt.

Then it is said, well, let us give the money to the child survival fund, instead. As a former assistant administrator of the Foreign Aid Agency, I am all for monies for child survival, but let no one think that that is an alternative to governments pulling their own weight. Indeed, the Republican administrations have insisted that aid has to be shifted to help countries pull their own weight.

I want to read the last part of the GAO report. I hope the gentlewoman from California will give me another minute if I need it, but I do not think I need it quite yet. I want to straighten out the references to the GAO report.

I just saw it now. But we do not have to read it from cover to cover to know that the statements here using the GAO report are a distortion, purely and simply. Here is the key paragraph, and I have dealt with a lot of GAO reports, including when I was in a previous administration:

> The uncertainties over whether the initiative provides a lasting exit from debt problems, the tension between quick debt relief and preparing poverty reduction strategies and the difficulties in financing the initiative should not be seen, however, as a reason to abandon efforts to provide debt relief to eligible countries.
>
> Heavily-indebted poor countries continue to carry unsustainable debt burdens that are unlikely to be lessened without debt relief. But participants and observers may need to have a more realistic expectation of what the initiative may ultimately achieve.

To use this report as an argument to thwart the effort of the administration to live up to its essential commitments as part of a G8 program I think is inexcusable.

I want to close with this. What is in our national interest? Africa and other countries face a tragedy, a human tragedy that could affect all of us, including our security and surely our sense of morality. For us to sit here and insufficiently fund debt relief is inexcusable in terms of American national security and American ethics. We must do better. Adopt this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), former chair of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and an expert on international debt forgiveness.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me and for doing such a great job.

The gentleman from Michigan made it very clear that when the chairman of the subcommittee quoted the GAO report, he got it exactly backwards. I guess to just stick with the theological tone that has occasionally intruded here, we now know that the devil may quote Scripture and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs may quote the GAO report, but neither one of them can be trusted on the interpretation.

The GAO says that debt relief is not enough. It does not say, do not give them debt relief, it says debt relief is not enough to do poverty reduction. So the notion that because debt relief is not enough to accomplish the ideal, we should therefore do less, makes sense only to the chairman of the subcommittee.

I also want to talk about the Pope. Obviously, we all have agreements and disagreements with the Pope, although respect for him, as the gentlewoman from California said.

But the Pope is not speaking here ex cathedra. This is not primarily a theological exposition. The Pope heads the most extensive anti-poverty organization in the world. Priests and nuns and church workers are the most sustained group of anti-poverty workers all over the world. The Pope's recommendations in this public policy come to us

better grounded, I must say, than the off-the-cuff observations of the chairman of the subcommittee. The Pope is reporting based on information he gets from people who are the on-the-ground poverty workers.

Here is the issue. This analogy to a credit card is, as the gentleman from California said, to use a technical parliamentary term, silly. We are talking not about an individual with a credit card, we are talking about, in many cases, regimes that borrowed and in many cases were overthrown with our help because they were corrupt and brutal.

New governments are in power. The question is whether the people who are now living in those countries should be bled, should be denied basic food and medicine, to pay off old debts.

The gentleman has said, Well, it is to bail out the multinational banks. No, the multinational banks, and let us make this point, when the bill came to us last year from the administration it did have provisions so some of the funds could have, after debt relief, continued to fund some of the activities of the multinational financial institutions. We stopped that. The bill that passed says the funds generated, whether from gold sales or from appropriations, go only for debt relief and nothing else.

Now, to say to these countries, by the way, we will give you debt relief but you cannot then ever borrow for anything else, is a very cruel approach. What about a country that has instituted democracy, that has instituted some reforms and gets the debt relief, and then wants to deal in a responsible way with its economic development? No entity finances all economic developments on a cash basis. People do not buy homes that way, businesses do not grow that way, and countries require some investments.

Investment means, give us some money now and we will pay you back later, maybe through equity, maybe through debt.

I have to say, and I am glad the gentleman from Alabama is back here now, because I want to express my disagreement with one of his constant premises, he keeps telling us that we agree on the goal. I must tell the gentleman that I see no evidence of that. I see no evidence that the gentleman from Alabama has been strongly moved to try to alleviate poverty.

Indeed, we heard the gentleman from California previously say the taxpayers do not want us using their money this way. I am very proud to be able to say that I believe that the people I represent, the people in my congressional district, on the whole want me to vote to use this relatively small amount of money to stop children from starving to death and to prevent disease from ravaging innocent people. I really believe that. If they do not, they can find another representative.

I do not believe that the people I represent do not want me to do that. The gentleman from Alabama said before, well, he set up this children's survival fund. The problem there is that money is not leaking but rushing out of these countries, on the one hand.

It does not do much to put money in on one end if it just goes out in the other. We need both. They are not alternatives.

The gentleman said the problem is the allocation. But the gentleman voted for the budget that set up the allocation. The allocation is an artificial fact which everybody knows is not going to hold up anyway.

The fact is this: Virtually every organization in the world, religious and nonreligious, Catholic, Protestant, secular, has come together to lobby the American government for this. This is not some construct of the Clinton administration or the Blair administration or the Jospin administration, this is a response by governments to the overwhelming demand of nongovernmental organizations, religious and nonreligious, based on their experience.

They say, look, the very least you can do is to go to the poorest countries in the world and do not make them continue to pay out the money. There is no blank check here. There is a requirement that the countries follow some basic responsible positions.

They will not do it perfectly. If the rule was that money does not go to anybody who did not spend it perfectly, we would have no CIA, we would have no HUD, we would have no Pentagon.

But here is the issue. Overwhelmingly, not just the Pope but the people the Pope supervises and all the Protestant churches and all of the non-governmental organizations and environmental organizations and poverty organizations that deal with international human concerns came to the governments and said, do this, and our government has been willing to do this.

There is an obstruction. The obstruction is the budget that has been brought forward which does not fund it in anything like the adequate amounts. The GAO report in fact, read correctly and fairly and in context, says do this, but this in and of itself is not enough.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment, and I have had more than ample opportunity to sit in committee meetings and share time with my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is extremely far-reaching in his thoughts and what have you.

However, I must rise to respectfully disagree with some of his conclusions.

I just want to share some of the deliberations that took place in the subcommittee as it relates to debt relief for the highly-indebted poor countries.

Just for the edification of the Members who are in this body who were not in attendance at that committee meeting, what we are considering here is a proposal in effect to forgive debt that has been accumulated by a number of heavily-indebted poor countries over the past years, the purpose of which would be to allow them to thereafter raise their standard of living, either by investing in infrastructure or in hospitals or schools or medical assistance, and care for their people, the people who live in those countries.

Keep in mind, this debate in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services took place this year, this being 2000. I just want to remind everyone that in the seventies and eighties when these loans were originally extended to these now highly-indebted poor countries, the loans and the grants and what have you were extended on the basis of providing these countries with the resources to raise their standard of living, to build roads and infrastructure and hospitals and schools.

So we find ourselves in the unique position today of in effect having in the seventies and eighties provided loans to raise the standard of living of these countries by virtue of investing in their infrastructure. Now we are going to forgive these loans so that these countries can raise the standard of living by virtue of investment in their infrastructure.

Let me just examine a little bit how we discussed this system would work within the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

As Members know, or as many know, we have various organizations around the world that are involved in investment in highly-indebted poor countries. We have the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, we have the World Bank, we have the IMF, we have various other things. Each of these institutions on their ledger sheets carry gold as an asset.

The manner in which we talked in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services about financing these loans to the highly-indebted poor countries, I just want Members to follow this, was we were going to take the gold that is on these balance sheets and unilaterally revalue it, and then we were going to take the difference between the book value of the gold on these balance sheets and the revalued value and basically collect interest on that difference and use it to relieve this debt.

□ 1945

Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of a more hobgoblin system by which we would conduct our financial affairs than to take what in effect is a rose that we hold at a value of $5 and say it is now worth $350 and take the difference of the $345 and use it to finance this debt forgiveness. I mean if I did that in private business, I can tell my colleagues I would be on Bill Gates' level. I would welcome that opportunity. However, I cannot get away with that.

I do not see why it is that the Federal Government, that this Federal Government would enter into that kind of a financial exercise, the purpose of which would be to forgive loans for the purpose of raising a standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, keep in mind, that the original purpose of the loans was to assist these highly indebted poor countries with raising their standard of living, so having given the loan, having time passed, now we are going to forgive the loan for the purpose of allowing these highly indebted poor countries to raise their standard of living.

The debate in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services revolved around what constitutes a highly indebted poor country, and I would just like to share with the other members of this committee that the standard that was used was, if I recall correctly, the accumulated debt of the country as a percentage of its gross domestic product. It had no connection whatsoever to the amount of trade or commerce that a highly indebted poor country who would be extended this debt relief might engage in with the United States.

There was no connection between commerce with the United States and the relief of debt to these highly indebted poor countries. We discussed at length amongst some of us whether or not we should change that standard by which we extended debt relief to account for the needs of our friends like Mexico or some of the trading partners with whom we have substantial economic commerce and with whom we have very, very specific United States interest with which to protect.

I would submit to my colleagues, in wrapping up, that extending or providing debt relief on loans that were originally granted for the purpose of raising standards of living, but now to provide debt relief for the purpose of allowing those debtors to raise their standard of living is at best circuitous and at worst challenges even the most brilliant of our scientists in terms of the logic they are in.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out that the gold revaluation in which we got a lesson from the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) is completely and entirely irrelevant to this bill. We did authorize gold revaluation last year with regard to the IMF debt.

This is a bill which appropriates money for the development banks, so the gold revaluation issue, whether we like it or not, is not involved in this bill. This is a bill that appropriates dollars to deal with the development banks, not with the IMF which had the gold revaluation, but it is still more relevant than the reading of the GAO report of the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, let me say that last year, the House, the Senate and the administration engaged in what I would call and has been termed a historic act of grace, and it was designed to relieve the debt of the poorest nations of the world.

My interests came about actually on an airplane flight from the middle of America, from Iowa, back home to Westerville, and I read the New York Times and there was a picture of a B2 bomber, and the question was ''what's the limits of America's power?''

When I read this article, I was really struck by the notion that while the United States has incredible military power, unprecedented military power and obviously now unprecedented economic power, many nations in the world were beginning to fear us, resent us. And as I thought about it, I thought if we have all of this power, and we do, it does not make any sense to not share some of the bounty that we have with those that have little.

I must tell my colleagues, I am not particularly interested in all the calculations that have been presented tonight, because I have been in Angola, and I have seen people hauled with half bodies through little villages as a result of a civil war. This is not designed to provide aid to people who are in the middle of a civil war, but it is designed to provide some help and some hope to people who have absolutely nothing.

The fact is that this resentment towards the United States has been growing. Last year, we had a historic act of grace that frankly was bipartisan in nature, and that, to some degree, disturbs me about the debate tonight.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), was, in fact, at the end of the day instrumental in being able to provide up to $200 million in debt forgiveness and to permit the IMF to use some gold reserves in an additional effort to relieve the debt payments of the poorest of the poor. Is all of this going to be right? No.

I will tell my colleagues this, this Congress just this year appropriated $100 million for local firefighters and EMS squads, and the last time I checked my Republican philosophy, that did not fall into the category.

When we look at the amount of money that we waste on both sides of the aisle for projects, the simple fact of the matter is, the United States must do something to help alleviate poverty in this world. We cannot turn our back on people who have nothing.

Is it all going to work out right with the accountants? The answer is probably not. Foreign aid never does, because we are giving it to people who sometimes are the wrong people. But there is an effort in this bill and in this procedure to make sure that the money that we give to the poorest of the poor is going to be accounted for.

My feeling is that this bill is underfunded in this area. Some of us say lift the allocation. I am not interested in lifting the allocation. I am interested in priorities, and I think this ought to be a major priority. I think the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) should be complimented for what he did last year and let me say also that last year the people that engaged in the historic act of grace were people like the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT); the gentleman from Texas (Majority Leader ARMEY); my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK); over in the Senate, Senator CHRISTOPHER DODD, Senator CONNIE MACK, Senator PAUL COVERDELL, a long list of Republicans and Democrats, who believe that it is essential that we use debt forgiveness as a way to provide some hope to the poorest of the poor.

A little bit of the concern that I have tonight, because I am going to be very involved again this year. I am going to be very involved in trying to make sure we do more to help the poorest of the poor, and I believe we will have support, strong support, at the end of the day from the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN). Discussions were entered into yesterday with the administration.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) is very interested. And I tell my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that we are going to need to fix the IMF. There may be some institutional changes that affects a body that all too many times has imposed the wrong economic principles on poor nations. And there is going to be a push for this kind of reform in the IMF.

The fact is that I think at the end of the day we will have a package, and it will be a package that will call for increased accountability for the money that goes to the poorest of the poor. There will be increased reform on the International Monetary Fund that has imposed many times the wrong economic prescriptions on poor nations, but I would suggest in this body that we not make this issue a partisan issue.

I can also say to the groups that have been so involved in this, we have to work with the Members. It is a foreign aid bill. It is not always the most popular bill at home. But at the end of the day, I believe that we can on a bipartisan, congressional and administration agreement reach out again to provide another historic act of grace that will give hope to people who today all too often have no help.

Let us try to work together and let us try to recognize that this solution must be bipartisan, will be bipartisan, and let us keep, as one effective politician in this country has said, let us keep hope alive.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI). I come here tonight to strongly support the Pelosi amendment. It is troubling to see that we are using the General Accounting Office report as a litmus test for what we should do here in this Congress. To me, we have run out of procedural things to do and things that have common sense.

There are so many ironies that I have heard here tonight. We have given aid to people in civil wars. We have propped up dictators around the world. So tonight to come before this body and say because of someone buying an airplane that means that we are going to withhold the kind of relief which they need, it is disingenuous to do that. We know that is true. We have a moral obligation to work and help the continent of Africa.

Debt relief is desperately needed by the world's poorest countries. We talk a good game here in terms of poverty. But are we going to do something about the countries who need it most? These countries have had to make drastic cuts in essential human services, such as health and education. Do we want the AIDS epidemic, which is now becoming a pandemic to reach this country? It will.

Those of us who know history know about the black death. We are not immune to any of these health problems. If my colleagues do not think we are, read the history of the World Health Organization. We are dealing with a very serious virus here. We must do something to relieve this.

Debt relief is nothing new to this country, many of it was accumulated during the Cold War. As long as there was Communism, I did not hear too much fight against it. We gave debt relief.

We know that these countries are supported now because we are giving it to them in a very small way, very little money. So these corrupt dictators, which we propped up over all the years, they are not there any more, these countries are trying to straighten up and live within our guidelines.

The debt of the Congo was accumulated during the oppressive rule of Mobutu. Nicaragua's debt was accumulated during the dictatorship of the Somoza family and the subsequent civil war. It is unjust and immoral to expect the impoverished people of these countries to pay back these debts.

Mr. Chairman, all of us have heard of Jubilee 2000, those of my colleagues who profess Christianity and other kinds of religions, this is the year for us to come together and do some work for the poorest of the poor.

It is the right thing to do. The supporters of Jubilee 2000 now include a broad expanse of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religions. It is time for us to come together.

I rise to support the Pelosi amendment to increase funding for debt relief for the world's most impoverished countries.

As many of my colleagues know, debt relief is desperately needed by the world's poorest countries. In Zambia, Niger, Nicaragua, Honduras and Uganda, government spending on debt service payments is greater than government spending on health and education combined. Tanzania spends four times as much money on debt payments as it does on health and education combined. The governments of these countries have been forced to make drastic cuts in essential human services such as health and education in order to make payments on their debts. These debt payments constitute a transfer of wealth from the world's poorest countries to the world's most wealthy countries.

Debt relief for the world's poorest countries is supported by a worldwide movement known as Jubilee 2000. This movement was begun by Christians who believe that the year 2000, the two thousandth anniversary of the coming of Christ, is a Jubilee Year. According to the Bible, the Lord instructed the people of Ancient Israel to celebrate a Jubilee—or a Year of the Lord—every 50 years. During a Jubilee Year, slaves were set free, and land was a redistributed.

Activists know that forgiving the debts of the world's most impoverished countries in the Year 2000 is the right thing to do. Supporters of Jubilee 2000 now include a diverse group of Catholic, Protestant and Jewish religious groups, development specialists, labor unions, environmental groups and other non-governmental organizations.

Many of the debts owed by poor countries were accumulated during the Cold War, and many are the result of loans to corrupt dictators who are no longer in power. The debt of the Congo was accumulated during the oppressive rule of Mobutu. Nicaragua's debt was accumulated during the dictatorship of the Somoza family and the subsequent civil war. It is unjust and immoral to expect the impoverished people of these countries to pay back these debts. Supporters of Jubilee 2000 also know that debt relief is a moral imperative.

The Administration requested a mere $225 million for debt relief for the world's poorest countries in fiscal year 2001. Unfortunately, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill includes only $69.4 million in debt relief funds for these countries. The Pelosi amendment would increase debt relief appropriations to fully fund this modest request. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for yielding me the time, and let me also identify with his dilemma.

I think on behalf of the Congress, we all ought to recognize the difficulty the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) has with dealing with a slight budget and enormous obligations. This is a difficult job. This budget as it is presented to the Congress recognizes a need for debt relief. It also recognizes that we are going to have to respond more forthcomingly with the AIDS challenge.

On the other hand, I think most of us recognize that these principles of concern are inadequately attended to because of the budgetary constraints we have, and I personally believe this Congress before we adjourn is going to have to do much, much more.

Debt relief is rooted, as the prior speaker, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) mentioned in the religious concept, the word jubilee, which derives from Leviticus, which implies a re-ordering of relationships, and one of the great questions in this jubilee 50-year reassessment, is whether it is worthy of being reassessed in this debt relief context?

If my colleagues look at the poorest of the poor countries in the world, many today have more obligations in terms of debt service than they can apply to education or health care.

□ 2000

In this circumstance, I think that the religious precept of Jubilee does compelling come into play, and it is no accident that religious leaders from the Pope to Billy Graham to Pat Robertson have endorsed debt relief in this Congress.

As far as health care is concerned, this world is confronted with the greatest health crisis in human history. Within a year or 2, more deaths will have occurred because of the AIDS virus than because of the bubonic plague of the 1300s. We have an obligation to respond and respond compassionately.

In terms of both debt relief and the AIDS crisis, committees of the Congress have responded in certain ways. We have authorizing legislation that has passed. Now it is the obligation of Congress to move forthcomingly to appropriate funds and, frankly, to give consideration to appropriating beyond the levels that have already been authorized.

But I would say at this point in time that, what this debate is all about, is making it clear to all sides that there is not just bipartisan, but American concern for the plight of people in the less developed world and an understanding that that plight cannot be isolated; it can come here to roost very quickly.

This happens to be the most compassionate set of initiatives in the history of the United States' Congress for the developing world. Debt relief and support for AIDS eradication and prevention is something we in this Congress simply have to address as the appropriations process continues.

Here, it must be stressed, Mr. Chairman, that debt relief and AIDS prevention are intertwined. Intertwined because there is belated but growing recognition that a stronger commitment is needed to combat the HIV/AIDS pandemic, but that many poor countries—particularly in hard-hit Sub-Saharan Africa—owe several times more in debt payments than what their governments are spending on basic health and education.

I recognize the extraordinary budgetary constraints that Chairman CALLAHAN confronted in trying to fashion an adequate response to both issues and remain hopeful that substantial additional funding for debt relief and for the

House-approved World Bank AIDS Trust Fund can be secured as the appropriations process moves forward.

Last year debt relief received strong, bipartisan support in Congress, and important strides were made toward achieving debt relief for the world's poorest countries. As Members recall, last November Congress appropriated $123 million to begin canceling the debts that reforming poor countries owe the United States, and agreed that the International Monetary Fund (IMF) can use $2.3 billion of its own resources to finance its contribution to debt relief. In this regard, the Banking Committee fully authorized U.S. participation in international debt relief efforts during the first session of the 106th Congress (H.R. 1095, Rept. 106–483). The core of that debt relief bill was included in last year's consolidated appropriations package.

The Committee's authorizing language specified a number of conditions that countries must meet in order to receive debt relief. Countries must perform satisfactorily under an economic reform program, promote civil society participation, implement anti-corruption measures and transparent policymaking, adopt strategies for poverty reduction, and strengthen private sector growth, trade, and investment. Consistent with current law, the program excludes from eligibility countries that systematically violate human rights, support terrorism, or have excessive military spending.

However, Congress still needs to approve U.S. contributions to help defray the costs of regional development banks, such as the Inter-American Development Bank, to allow them to do their part in the international debt relief effort. Crucially, every dollar of the U.S. contribution will leverage $20 in multilateral debt relief. In addition, Congress also needs to authorize the IMF to fully mobilize the interest earnings on the off-market gold sales that occurred last year, solely to finance debt relief.

It is self-evident that debt relief alone cannot solve the problems of hunger and poverty. But when debt relief is coupled with credible economic and social reforms, it can help be a catalyst for economic growth. Sound debt relief programs can help free up resources for poverty reduction, basic human needs, HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment, child survival and environmental protection. By helping to put countries on the path toward sustainable development, debt relief can also benefit the U.S. economy through expanded trade and investment ties.

More broadly, securing full funding for debt relief remains a key legislative priority for a broad spectrum religious leader—from the Pope to Pat Robertson and the Reverend Billy Graham—who have endorsed the call for debt relief.

On the AIDS front, the release of the latest UNAIDS report just last month underscores the horrific impact HIV/AIDS is having around the globe, particularly in hard-hit sub-Saharan Africa. The stunning statistics on the rapid advance of this disease, despite what medically-advanced countries know to be effective preventive measures, represents a profound indictment of the international community and the leaders of nations most severely impacted. Experts predict that HIV/AIDS will soon become the worst epidemic of infectious disease in recorded history, eclipsing both the bubonic plague of the 1300's which killed an estimated 20 million and the influenza epidemic of 1918–19 which killed 18 million.

Already, according to the latest UNAIDS data, the death toll from HIV/AIDS stands at 18.8 million, including a heartbreaking 3.8 million children under the age of 15. Around the world, another 34.3 million are living with this disease. Of that total, 24.5 million live in sub-Saharan Africa, a disproportionate 70 percent of the world's victims in a region with just 10 percent of the world's population. Infection rates in some countries are nothing short of shocking: a 35.8 percent infection rate among adults in Botswana and a rate in South Africa of 19.9%. And the disease has left in its wake 13.2 million orphans, the vast majority of them in Africa.

What is also alarming is that even international health experts have been wrong about the pace at which this disease would spread. In 1991, the WHO estimated that 9 million would be infected and 5 million dead from AIDS in Africa by 1999. Eight years later, we find that the casualty rates are nearly triple that estimate.

In parts of Africa where the epicenter currently resides, as well as South Asia and the Caribbean where the disease is fast moving, AIDS and the precipitating HIV virus have jumped well beyond the population groups considered most at risk in America. Millions of women now have the HIV virus and it is being transferred in the womb to the unborn. Indeed, by virtually any measure, the global HIV/AIDS epidemic may be fairly described as a plague of Biblical proportions.

Experts also warn that the HIV/AIDS epidemic is no longer singularly a health issue; it has become a major issue for economic development. Assessments by World Bank officials call HIV/AIDS ''the foremost and fastest-growing threat to development'' in Africa.

Yet, as bleak as the global picture is, we know that there are effective HIV/AIDS prevention and education strategies. They are being successfully implemented in many Western developed countries as well as in such countries as Uganda and Senegal in Africa, and in Thailand in Asia. Those prevention and education strategies must be replicated many times over in a vastly greater number of countries.

Clearly the United States has a strong national interest in combating the HIV/AIDS crisis abroad as well as at home. Infectious diseases, like HIV/AIDS, know no borders. The number of Americans travelling overseas—often to countries with high risks of infectious diseases—has doubled in the last ten years, with more than 57 million travelling abroad in 1998. Millions of Americans and their families also struggle with HIV/AIDS and there are few among us who have not directly or indirectly experienced the loss of friends or family to this disease.

While it remains the paramount responsibility of national and community leads in each country to exercise strong leadership and commitment in dealing with the HIV/AIDS crisis, the United States, other governments, and non-governmental organizations—including private business, religious and humanitarian organizations—must be partners in providing critical resources and medical knowledge.

At present, international donors—including the United States—provide an estimated $350 million a year to address the HIV/AIDS problem in Africa. Yet, experts tell us that over eight times that amount—or roughly $3 billion—is actually needed to do the job. This extraordinary need for resources—and the reality of the budget constraints which limit our bilateral assistance efforts—underscore the urgent need for a change in U.S. strategy to emphasize a much stronger multilateral, ''burden-sharing'' approach to this crisis. It is my hope that as the appropriations process unfolds, additional resources for HIV/AIDS can be found to fund the innovation approach outlined in the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund, as passed by the House, This proposal offers the U.S. the opportunity to catalyze a much stronger global response to the AIDS epidemic. Implicit in approaches involving Bretton Woods institutions is the possibility of attracting additional contributions from other donors including, as uniquely authorized in H.R. 3519, the private sector. For a modest $100 million contribution from the U.S., it is my hope that we can leverage enough contributions from other donors—governmental and private—to reach a total of $1 billion a year for the trust fund.

In conclusion, let me stress that America has a particular obligation to do everything within its power to prevent and, ultimately, eradicate HIV/ADIS, particularly among its most vulnerable victims—children. Mortality may be a part of the human condition, but all of us have an obligation to put an end to conditions that precipitate premature death, particularly at young ages. Clearly, no nation is better positioned than the United States, with its wealth and research capacity, to lead the world in this cause. For the U.S. to fail to lead at this critical juncture in history would be moral dereliction. Out of a sense of self-preservation for mankind itself, if not simply humanitarian concern for those currently affected, this disease must be eradicated, whatever the cost. Before the 106th Congress adjourns, it is my hope that we will have the resolve and courage to meet this challenge.

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

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. I commend him for his service on this issue and many others of concern to people of our country and throughout the world. I commend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), chairman of the Committee on the Budget, for his favorably disposed presentation toward the thrust of my amendment.

I want to just state that this must be a bipartisan effort in the House of Representatives, and that is what we will all be working toward. Hopefully, at the end of the day, our position will prevail in a bipartisan way that we will fully fund the President's request for fiscal year 2000 and 2001 to meet our obligations to the G–7 and to the poorest people in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and has long been active in these issues of justice throughout the world.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been, at times, an ugly debate; but then we

should not expect anything else. This is an ugly bill.

There are multiple reasons to oppose this legislation, and I do oppose it. But the utter callousness of the cuts in what is really a very modest debt relief funding that has been asked by the administration, by the President of the United States, is reason enough to oppose the legislation.

The President asked for $472 million for debt relief program for this year, and that was cut by 82 percent to a total of $82 million. That is even more than a one-third cut from what was made available last year in the area of debt relief.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it may be folly to try to find what is common ground in a situation like this, but I do think that we can probably all agree that there are some, maybe many developing nations that have experienced declining economic conditions while accumulating higher levels of debt which are largely owed to the international lending institutions, the multilateral public lending agencies, the IMF, the World Bank, also to foreign governments, and the U.S. Government. I think we all would agree that that has happened.

Since 1989, the G–7 countries, at that time Canada, Japan, the U.S., Italy, Britain, Germany, and France, that seven, in recognizing that this mounting debt burden for some borrowers had undermined economic growth and even their capacity to finance absolutely basic social and even health programs started setting policies and extending a series of debt relief arrangements.

The most recent of those arrangements is the HPIC arrangement this last year. Now, the 41 nations in the HPIC arrangement, which are the nations of the heavily indebted poor countries, those 41 nations include four from Latin America, four from Asia, and 33 from Africa. Ninety percent of American debt among those 41 nations is in that group of 33 from Africa.

It is interesting that, of all that debt, which the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), one of the previous speakers, had pointed out, that the total debt in those nations had increased to $169 billion. Only $6 billion of that is debt to the United States, debt to this government.

We are a Nation which has 25 percent of the wealth of this world, of this whole planet, and 25 percent of the whole economic base of this whole planet; and something like under 4 percent of the debt to these poorest of the poor nations is owed to the United States.

These nations in Africa are the nations in sub-Saharan Africa who are suffering the worst of the AIDS epidemic, the worst of HIV/AIDS. There are nations there where one-third of all the adults are suffering from HIV/AIDS. There are nations there where as many as half of all the 15-year-old kids can expect to die of AIDS.

There are nations where, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) earlier pointed out, more money is expended on the debt relief, their payment of debt in some of those nations than they pay for all of health and all of education, all of their social programs. I have heard, though I cannot confirm this by any particular report, that in cases, it is as much as four times as much as going to attempt to pay for that debt that has been built up.

Yet, in this instance, the 82 percent cut in the program that the President asked for, cuts from the President's request, the reduction in the President's request from $472 million to $82 million, deliberately attacks the very program, the HPIC program which had been worked out by the G–8 nations as a way of dealing with the debts in these very poorest of countries.

Now, I just want to remind my colleagues that, and this has been alluded to by others as well, in the calendar years 1990 through 1992, there were a series of initiatives of debt reduction totalling more than $10 billion; actually it is slightly more than $12 billion. They included a debt forgiveness for Poland of $2.5 billion. They included a debt forgiveness for military aid loans to Egypt of $7 billion, a debt forgiveness of some $700 million that went to African and Latin American nations, and debt forgiveness that went to a series of African and Latin American nations and Bangladesh and Asia totalling more than $2 billion, all of them authorized and approved by this Congress under President George Bush, the former President George Bush; all of them approved at that time totalling $12 billion.

Here we are, we are now taking the callous position that we should cut the effort by the G–8 nations in the HPIC countries, the poorest of the poor, cut the President's proposal from $472 million to $82 million. It is virtually unconscionable, and it is for that reason that I support the gentlewoman's amendment that is before us today.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I join with my colleagues in support of the Pelosi amendment, and I do so because I have been told that to those to whom much is given, much is desired and expected in return. In reality, we are given much in this country; and we are simply being asked to share some of what we have with some of the most needy people in all of the world.

When we talk about the paltry sum that we are talking about providing now for debt relief for Africa and the Latin American countries, it reminds me of a system of share cropping, where individuals get just enough, where no matter how hard they work, no matter what it is that they do, they can never get out of debt, and they just keep working. When they do that, they lose hope. They lose the feeling that tomorrow is going to be brighter than yesterday.

So I would hope that we would recognize that the greatest gift that we can give to ourselves is the gift of hope to those who are hopeless and those who are helpless. I would urge passage of the Pelosi amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have any more speakers. I reserve the balance of my time and right to close.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 37½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 32½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I stand in strong support of her amendment and say the issue that we are talking about is very, very important. In fact, this bill is very important. But somehow it is very difficult for us to understand that foreign affairs and foreign relations, the monies we spend in aid really enable us as a country to be far more secure.

The issue we are talking about tonight, about debt relief, is a tool we have used to further our relationship with a number of countries historically. We do this as a way of enabling the country to be responsive. We do that as a way of enabling us to have better relationships. We did that with the Soviet Union. We have done that with other countries. We do that historically.

But here we are with a unique opportunity in a unique time, the year of the Jubilee 2000, all of the religious groups, and I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the subcommittee, not only did the poor support this, but the Protestant religions support this, the nonprofit groups support this because it is the right thing to do. It is right to, indeed, share what one has with others.

But the year of Jubilee is a time, 50-year time that says that we reexamine the debt we have as a part of our sharing our wealth with the world. I think that, as we consider this, we have to consider when we relieve the debt, we are enabling those countries to be responsible in self-development of their country, by investing in their education, investing in their health; or otherwise we are taking the monies that we know they cannot afford to pay, indeed, paying a debt oftentimes that has gone in by another regime that was completely irresponsible.

So I strongly support this amendment. It is the right thing to do. Our country owes it to ourselves to make sure we share our wealth, and it is in our security to do it.

□ 2015

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member, for yielding me this time.

As I listened to the debate this afternoon and evening I do say to the chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), that we have had an opportunity to work together, and I am reminded of the support he gave me in increasing the African Development Fund when I first came to Congress some one million dollars. So I know that he is a fair person and wants to do the right thing. But I think in his debating and discussion this evening that he is misdirected in his angst or his disappointment.

This is not the time to utilize the expending of a nation's funds, as he spoke of Uganda and President and Mrs. Museveni, who are people that I know and have worked with. Uganda is one of the shining stars in the fight against HIV/AIDS, and expends a large amount of its budget, which can be documented, to fight, treat and prevent AIDS in Uganda. I know the ambassador, Ambassador Ssempala, who is a strong leader on these issues. And I believe that was the wrong example for it begins to say that we dictate to countries what their needs are.

I support the gentlewoman's amendment of adding some $390 million to the paltry $82 million, which is really more than a shame. It does not in any way suggest that America is who America should be, and that is a world leader and an investor in helping people lift themselves up. I am reminded of the phrase ''Do not give them a fish but teach them to fish.'' That is what debt relief is all about. It is to ensure that countries who faithfully secure funds from their own population are able to use those dollars not for long-standing debt relief but for food and housing and for health care. That is what this investment means.

How can the chairman, in good conscience, when the administration asks for $472 million, put in the budget $82 million? That is punitive, that is a shame, and that is not befitting of this body.

I would simply say when people are dying in droves in Africa of HIV/AIDS, this is not a time to make an accusation about an airplane. This is a time to stand up and support this amendment and to relieve them of the burden that is unfair so that they can invest in world peace and world calm and we can live together as brothers and sisters.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of her very important amendment.

Before we discuss the particulars of the amendment, I think we need to look at what the base bill does. The base bill makes deep cuts in funds available for loans to the world's neediest countries. That has been said rather repeatedly here.

The 32 percent cut in funding for the International Development Association would severely impact the financing of investments in health, clean water supplies, education and other infrastructure needed to reduce poverty. Additional cuts are made in funding for the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the Asian Development Fund, and the Inter-American Investment Corporation.

The reality is that what we are doing here is crushing nations that have been pretty much crushed to the ground. By allowing the debt to continue to run and interest to rise on it, we ultimately affect all such particulars that we would not want to as a fair-minded nation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

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

Mr. Chairman, what are we talking about tonight? I want to quote from Charles Dickens. ''It was the best of times, it was the worst of times; it was the season of light, it was the season of darkness; it was the spring of hope, it was the winter of despair. We had everything before us, we had nothing before us.''

In 1859, it was the Tale of Two Cities, today, sadly, it is the tale of two worlds, one very rich, one very poor. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about two worlds, and we are talking about what our world will do to help the other world.

What is the cost of our world helping the other world? Doing what is right, whatever the material cost, should always be the imperative. Nevertheless, let us attempt to count the cost, the cost of acting and the cost of not acting. When we do, I cannot in good faith fail to embrace this unique opportunity to help so many at such a small cost to ourselves.

What is the cost of debt relief? At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce into the record what that cost would be for each citizen this year, and it is $1.20. I would like to submit that for the record: $1.20.

It is a nominal amount, it is a minimal amount, but it is not an insignificant amount or an inconsequential amount when we realize what it can do for that other world. It is the cost of an ice cream cone. It is the cost of a gallon of gas. In fact, a half gallon of gas. It is the cost of a Sunday paper.

Against this minuscule sacrifice for our world, what is the cost of not acting? Today, in dozens of poor countries all over the world, little boys and girls are born into poverty, disease and hunger. We in America are fond of saying, ''I had a bad day.'' We should realize that even on our worst days we are blessed with so much more; more food, more shelter, more clothes, more security, more than our poor brothers and sisters are on their best days.

We truly cannot comprehend what their day is like. However, I am going to attempt to do so with one quote from Sister Rebecca Trujillo of the Sisters of Notre Dame in Nicaragua. Here is what she writes about the plight of the poor.

''Often in my life,'' she says, ''when I talk about the needs of the poor with whom I work, people say, how do they survive? How do they survive? Since being in Nicaragua, I have taken to answer in a matter of fact way, 'Often they do not.'" That is what we are here tonight to decide, whether they survive or whether they do not.

Let me illustrate, in closing, the cost of not acting as it applies to 15 baby girls and baby boys born today into the poorest of countries. Of those 15, without debt relief, three will die before his or her fifth birthday. Of the remaining 12, four will suffer the scourge of malnutrition, with permanent consequences to their physical and mental development. Of the remaining eight, they are in no way fortunate. Their chances of graduating from high school, of drinking clean water, of suffering disease and deprivation, of being orphaned are great, sometimes as much as 50–50. Their burdens are day-to-day, they are painful, they are heavy.

We in America have been blessed with a period of almost unparalleled economic prosperity. Never in our history has one country had so much progress, wealth and luxury. Now, with the start of a new millennium, we can do so much for a billion of the poorest citizens of the world. I believe they are our brothers and sisters. At such a small cost to each of us, what a shame if history should look back on us today and say that we passed up so great an opportunity.

The responsibility is ours and ours alone. Our moral imperative is not qualified by the rest of the world failing to do what is right. We cannot use other countries' inaction as an excuse for our inaction. The decision is ours.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would say the decision is three things: First, it is a decision that will follow us. For the people living in these poor countries, their suffering is temporal. It will end with their lives. For us, the decision will follow us. We will not only live with this in this life, but we will live with it in the next.

Second, the decision will define us. It will define us as either a loving people,

a people filled with grace and compassion, or it will define us as a people focused on the monetary, the temporal.

And third, and I think this is most important, this is not a decision that the poor countries of the world will make, it is our decision. We have the responsibility, we have the obligation, and we have the direction as to what is the right thing to do. For this decision, whether we are a follower of the Islam religion, whether we are a Muslim, whether we are Christian, or whether we are Jewish, all those religions give us a moral imperative in such a case, and that imperative is to act.

To me, there is really only one decision.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume in thanksgiving for the beautiful testimony of our previous speaker, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), and thank him for that statement and for his incredible leadership on this issue of international debt forgiveness.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), a member of the subcommittee and an active champion for debt relief.

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, a few months ago this Congress was filled with ambassadors who proclaimed that they wanted trade not aid. Why is that? Because, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the economic elite of every country are really the primary beneficiaries of the global economy.

But it is not trade that is ravaging the people of sub-Saharan Africa and South America, HIV and AIDS are. More than 60 percent of the export earning potential of these countries associated with trade is being used for debt service. It is not being used for health care or for education. My colleague from Massachusetts made that very clear.

□ 2030

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear what we believe the problem to be, because we heard a number of our colleagues from the other side come to the floor and talk about responsible governments in sub-Saharan Africa. We spent billions here in America educating people in English and in Spanish about HIV and AIDS.

There are 1,500 languages in sub-Saharan Africa, and they cannot possibly educate their people about the devastating disease and maintain these debt payments. We spend billions to educate 280 million people in America. There are 750 million sub-Saharan Africans, and they cannot educate themselves and make these payments.

There are 5,000 sub-Saharan Africans who are dying a day in the villages, in the cities. The disease to many of them is not HIV or AIDS, it is surrounded by myth and superstition. Why? Because there are hundreds of religions in sub-Saharan Africa. And so every time, Mr. Chairman, that my colleagues argue that at some point in time in the near future we will address debt relief and we will condition that debt relief upon no future loans, we are actually making it more and more difficult for sub-Saharan Africans to educate their own people about the nature of the problem.

That is why some of us have called for unconditional debt forgiveness. But even if the Congress of the United States, Mr. Chairman, does not support unconditional debt forgiveness, the conditions should be placed upon that debt forgiveness on the use of those resources for the education, the health care, and the housing of their people.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) may control the time at this point controlled by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), and the gentleman yields 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

There was no objection.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I do not expect to use the entire amount of time. But I simply want to, first of all, associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), who gave a very moving and stirring speech a few moments ago and pointed out that what we are talking about is providing an appropriate amount of relief for a cost of only a little over a dollar per citizen in the United States, something which I believe almost all of us can afford quite readily. In fact, I would be willing to pay quite a bit more than that in order to cover the payment for those who cannot do so.

I would just also comment, I am aware that this issue is likely to be ruled out of order and, therefore, not to be voted on today. I would also add that I am a cosponsor of the authorizing bill which will deal with this issue. I believe it is very important that we address it.

There are many issues to be raised regarding this as to how to handle it appropriately, how to ensure that the relief that is given will be used in a meaningful way to aid the people for whom it is intended and a whole host of other issues. But the key point is simply that we are dealing with nations that are struggling for breath, that are dealing with huge amounts not just of poverty but of illness, that are almost immobilized by AIDS and other diseases; and it is incumbent upon us, as the wealthiest Nation in the world, to share some of our abundance with them.

I would also note, Mr. Chairman, that of the developed nations which are sharing their abundance with the poorer nations, the United States still, to the best of my knowledge, contributes the least per capita of any of the developed nations. This is not a record of which I am proud, and I hope we can improve that.

The key, however, is to make certain that the aid we provide does in fact alleviate the situation, does help those in need, and does improve the situation in those nations which need help.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished Democratic Whip of the House.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her leadership on this issue. I would like to also congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) for her leadership on this issue.

There are so many people who have been active on this and who have shown leadership. I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), my colleague, for his comments and, as he pointed out, a beautiful statement by our friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. Chairman, I have seldom been prouder of the House of Representatives than I am tonight listening to this debate. It is an extraordinary outpouring of concern and love and care for people who need our love and our concern and certainly our care in a very critical time.

St. Augustine once said that charity is no substitute for justice withheld. And I think today we face the question of justice. Clearly it is before us.

It has been estimated that the nations of sub-Saharan Africa now owe foreign creditors an average of almost $400 for every man, woman, and child. That is more than most Africans earn in a year. And that is why these nations now spend more to repay debt than they do on primary education or on health care.

In Tanzania, a nation where 40 percent of the population dies before the age of 35, the government today is forced to spend nine times more on debt repayment than it spends on health care. Debt relief is not about charity. It is about justice. And in this case, Mr. Chairman, it is about human survival. It is about helping to save millions of children from hunger and disease and helping prevent whole nations from falling even deeper into an abyss of poverty and neglect.

It has been said that justice is so subtle a thing that to interpret it, one has only the need of a heart. It is up to us today to look into our heart, and it is up to us to remember that the true measure of America's strength is not only our wealth, it is our compassion. I urge support of the Pelosi and Waters effort to provide lasting debt relief to save human lives and to effect justice.

I would daresay, Mr. Chairman, no matter what the outcome of this is today or this evening, that I sense from this Chamber that there is a majority of Members in this body who want to do something and do something substantial on this issue. And I hope we address this issue. I think we will address this issue before we adjourn for the year.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the international AIDS conference is happening right now in South Africa with countries around the world coming together to address the issue of AIDS.

I ask my colleagues, what is the position of the United States on this issue? We are ready to fight off the boogeyman with a $60 billion defense system. But the real boogeyman is AIDS, and we are standing by while it wipes out millions of people in Africa. And, folks, we are not excluded.

AIDS in Africa is a direct threat to our country, especially in today's interconnected world. It is no coincidence that recent reports show that just as AIDS cases in Africa are on the rise, AIDS in the United States is on the increase again. In fact, experts are predicting that 40,000 new infections will occur this year.

The boogeyman is here, folks; and we are going to be in serious trouble if we do not stop him. Debt relief is something that is desperately needed by the world's poorest countries. There are countries that have been forced to make major cuts in health and educational spending in order to pay their debt. I do not understand how we can debate $20 million for debt relief, and yet in the weeks to come my colleagues will come to this floor to support $60 billion on a cartoon defense plan.

Even though our heads may be in the sand, the boogeyman is already here. It is wiping out communities in this country, too.

Debt relief is something that is desperately needed by the world's poorest countries. These are countries that have been forced to make drastic cuts in health and education spending in order to make payments on their debts. I don't understand how we can debate $200 million for debt relief, and yet in the weeks to come my colleagues will be on this floor supporting $60 billion on a cartoon defense plan.

Even though our heads seem to be in the sand, the boogeyman is already here. It's wiping out communities in this country too. The only way we can stop him is through stopping the AIDS virus, and one of the best ways to do that is through debt relief. I rise in opposition to this bill because it fails to address some of the most critical issues in the world—debt relief and the international AIDS crisis that is wiping out the continent of Africa.

In Zambia, Niger, Nicaragua, Honduras and Uganda, government spending on debt service payments is greater than government spending on health and education combined! 4.2 million South Africans are currently infected with HIV. If these countries were granted debt relief, they would be better equipped to pay for health services for AIDS, which is ravaging the continent.

Almost half of all 15 year olds in the African countries worst affected by AIDS will eventually die. AIDS has wiped out households, destroyed families emotionally and economically, severely damaged entire economies, and in some countries, has killed so many teachers that it is beginning to affect basic education. Life expectancy in southern Africa is expected to drop to 30.

This disease has created 8 million ''AIDS orphans,'' who face increased risk of malnutrition and will have very little opportunity to get an education.

Was debt relief really ever given serious consideration in this Congress? No. Even though it was stated on the floor during this same debate in 1998 that ''AIDS had the potential for undermining all development efforts to date,'' many here in Washington still believe that assisting Africa is not in the interests of the United States. We do not live in a vacuum. AIDS in Africa is a direct threat to our country, especially in today's interconnected world.

I urge my colleagues to support the Pelosi amendment and treat the situation in Africa for what it is, a crisis.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the many Members on both sides of the aisle who are participating in this evening's debate. I am especially pleased that the last four or five speakers on the Republican side give us hope that we will be able to reach a bipartisan resolution to the question that is before us this evening.

I was, of course, inspired by the statement of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), encouraged by the statement of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), always taught by the statement of the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and so pleased to have expressions of support from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

So I am hopeful that when we go down this path the funding will be sufficient and the policy will match the need that we have for debt relief.

Mr. Chairman, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, in his beautiful remarks of support of international debt relief commented that something like $1.20 for every American would cover what we are trying to do here tonight and spoke very poignantly about that being the cost of an ice cream or Sunday paper. I could not help but think of some other statistics.

The World Bank estimates that sub-Saharan African countries owe foreign creditors an average of almost $400 for every man, woman and child, more than most Africans make in a year. More than $400 for every person is owed. This can be resolved by $1.20 for every American, a small price to pay to unleash an enormous amount of money relatively speaking to the economies of those countries that would solve the problem of $400. One dollar solves the problem of $400 for every person in sub-Saharan Africa.

Some of my colleagues have referenced the statistics. The writer George Bernard Shaw once wrote that the true sign of an intelligent person was that he or she was swayed and persuaded by statistics. I do not know if that is true, but the statistics here are staggering and I think very compelling and bear repeating if they have already been stated.

In Mozambique, one of every four children dies before the age of five due to infectious disease. Yet the government spends four times more on debt servicing than on health care.

In Tanzania, where 40 percent of the population dies before the age of 35, the government spends nine times more on foreign debt payments than on health care, according to Oxfam. We have heard these statistics, and they go on and on.

But I am really quite taken by the spirit of how this debate evolved this evening. And in that spirit, I wanted to quote from Bernard Cardinal Law, the Archbishop of Boston, and chairman of the International Policy Committee of the United States Catholic Conference.

He says, ''I am particularly disturbed by the woefully inadequate allocation for poor country debt relief. Last year's legislation supporting the new, more generous debt relief program agreed that the Cologne summit gave promise of a Jubilee Year 2000 that would bring hope to millions of impoverished children, women, and men around the world.''

□ 2045

I hope that we will take the hope that Cardinal Bernard Law references here and make it tangible in terms of the appropriation that we need at the end of the day.

I just want to say, though, in the larger context of assistance to other countries, what we do for other countries is largely what is in our national interest to do. It is a part of a vision of who we think we are as a country, and we think we are great, and we are great. And as other Members have indicated tonight, it would be a sign of our greatness for us to recognize the responsibilities that we have internationally.

It is about the knowledge that we have and, as I have said before, the diversity that we have in this body empowers us but gives us also the responsibility to do something about the issues that are before us. Our members of the Congressional Black Caucus, of the Hispanic Caucus, of the Asian-Pacific American Caucus know the cultures, the economies, the opportunities and the needs and the urgency in the countries of their knowledge. We should build a plan on that knowledge, and we have. The President has agreed to it, he has to return next week to the G7 meeting to answer for it. Unfortunately, we will not have the opportunity to give him the funding he needs to go there. But hopefully he can take a message that all signs are hopeful that Congress will meet the President's request of $472 million for international debt relief to meet the fiscal

year 2000 obligation and the fiscal year 2001, both of which I hope will be contained in this bill.

It is not about doing anybody a favor. It is about the recognition that this is in our national interest. It is about the idea that infectious disease knows no boundary. I would hope that a spirit of compassion would be enough to compel us to do this, but it has a pragmatic aspect of it, and, that is, as I said, infectious disease knows no boundary. And we know that as we see AIDS raging through Africa, Asia and spreading to the rest of the world, even the increase in the United States when we are so enlightened about the subject. And it is again about the spirit of who we are as a country. I think the American people expect and the American people deserve that we do our best to represent us not only as a great country but as a good country.

As I have been talking, Mr. Chairman, I was hoping that some of our colleagues who had requested time would return to the floor. May I ask of the Chair, are we going to have a motion to rise, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not heard such a motion. The Chair will entertain such a motion when offered.

Ms. PELOSI. I had been told that there might be an intervention into our debate.

Mr. CALLAHAN. We are waiting for the gentlewoman to consume her time and once she does there very possibly could be a temporary motion to rise.

Ms. PELOSI. I appreciate the gentleman saying that, but that was my point exactly. If there is going to be a motion to rise, I would reserve my time and use it for other colleagues.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Before we do that, we would like for you to either finish your discussion on this issue or I will ask for my point of order.

Ms. PELOSI. I see. The gentleman is clear.

Mr. Chairman, in that case I may have another speaker available.

Mr. CALLAHAN. We have no more speakers.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I want to thank her for her eloquence and commitment, and I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) raising the question as to whether we have a moral imperative to act, and that we do.

Might I put into the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, the very points that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) was making, and I simply want to say to the gentlewoman, you realize that Honduras had a terrible, terrible hurricane in 1998. Right now a Honduran makes $838 a year, and similar to the $1.20, that is a television set, and they owe some $3 billion in debt. If we were to help the Honduran government, this is what they could do. They could improve basic health services for at least 100,000 people, and they could hire 1,000 new teachers among other projects.

To the gentlewoman, I simply believe this goes to my point of not giving a fish but teaching people to fish. How can they pay $3.3 billion in debt and how can other nations around the world fighting off AIDS be able to do so with the enormous debt?

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

Since the gentlewoman ended on the word AIDS, I just wanted to pick up on that for a moment and say that if you compound AIDS with poverty, you have a very, very deadly formula. These subjects are very definitely related. In the course of the evening we will have an amendment on AIDS, but we will not have as much time to debate that issue. But this issue of the debt forgiveness is not unrelated to the spread of AIDS in these countries which have inadequate access to quality health care and to education and, therefore, prevention.

I also wanted to make the point that it is in our national interest because disease knows no boundary, nor does environmental degradation. So I am very pleased that the American Lands Alliance, the Friends of the Earth, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Sierra Club, the International Rivers Network, Environmental Defense, Rain Forests International, and World Wildlife Fund have all written in support of our amendment, indicating that when poor countries place their environment in jeopardy, they will frequently have to liquidate their natural resources as a quick way to service their debt. We do not want that to happen. That is why it is very important for us for personal, environmental, health, economic, cultural, political, for every reason to do the right thing by supporting the President's request on debt forgiveness.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the vice chair of the Democratic Caucus.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. I am glad to be on the floor to strongly support her amendment. This is a question not only of moral imperative but of national importance. The question is not a question of charity towards other countries. The question is what is in the national interest of the United States in the context of debt relief.

This bill contains only $69 million of the $472 million of the administration's request for debt relief, and that amount of aid will not even provide enough resources to enable two countries, Bolivia and Mozambique, for example, who have met all the necessary conditions to obtain debt relief, to actually get it. The bill already shortchanges our friends and neighbors in Africa and Latin America and elsewhere and most significantly in that part which is the most significant program that offers highly indebted peoples the greatest hope for digging themselves out of the pits of poverty.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard many of my colleagues here speak over the course of the last several years about illegal immigration. When people flee their countries, they flee because of civil wars or they flee because of poverty. We spent in Latin America, for example, in the decade of the 1980s well over a billion dollars to promote democracy. And once we believed that we achieved that, we abandoned those countries, and overwhelmingly in the hemisphere where 40 percent of the people live below the poverty level, what do we do? We have basically said that we no longer have a commitment to you. Yet when people cross that border, they are crossing because they are fleeing poverty or because they are fleeing oppression in their own countries.

When people, in fact, are ill, that knows no borders. The diseases that have now begun to spring up here within the hemisphere know no borders. We are not immune as a country in that regard. When we talk about biodiversity issues and we are concerned about the quality of air here and we are concerned about the diminution of the rain forests throughout Central America, the Caribbean and into the rest of Latin America and we say, ''Don't cut down your rain forests,'' but by the same token we give them no relief so that in fact they will not face a mountain of debt in which they will seek to do whatever they need to do in order to meet their national needs.

So this is not about them. This is about us. The gentlewoman's amendment is not a question of charity. It is not even in the context of the spirit of the religious orders of this country about the golden jubilee. It is about the national interest of the United States, whether you talk about in the context of immigration, whether you talk about in the context of disease, whether you talk about in the context of the environment, and how much more are we willing to spend for the meager amount that the debt relief would provide in terms of a beneficial consequence to those countries, how much more are we willing to spend when those countries turn, as we are seeing serious questions within the hemisphere, turn away from democracy and open markets and turn into a renewal of totalitarian governments? Then we will spend billions of dollars to defend democracy. But when we could spend just millions to preserve and promote democracy, we will not. It is not only shortsighted, it does not meet the moral imperative that we clearly have, it does not meet the national interest that we have.

I urge my colleagues to join in support of the gentlewoman's amendment.

It is an amendment that pursues the national interest of the United States, and I would venture to say within this hemisphere even the national security of the United States.

And, lastly, our friends have spoken eloquently here about the pandemic that we see in the question of AIDS. That also knows no borders. It knows no color. It knows no gender. And in fact we have a serious consequence if we do not respond. We cannot silently sit by with our eyes closed believing that this major international health consequence will not ultimately come upon the shores of the United States and that there will be no consequence to us. Those who believe that despite all of their claims of internationalism in terms of trade are myopic when they are unwilling to give the type of debt relief as simple and as meager as it might be here but which is significant to these countries.

I urge the support of the gentlewoman's amendment, in our interest, in average Americans' interest, in the national interest of the United States and ultimately so that we can meet the moral imperative and be the beacon of light to the rest of the world that we should be.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Then I will have to yield the gentleman from Virginia 1½ minutes to close for our side.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for her attempted generosity. I will do what I can.

Ms. PELOSI. Perhaps the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) would like to yield some time to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, after he hears what I have to say probably not, because I support the Pelosi amendment very strongly and I do not support this bill. It is the wrong bill from a diplomatic standpoint, from an economic standpoint and perhaps most importantly from a moral standpoint. In many ways it is like walking down the street seeing a starving kid with his hand out in front of a store front, putting your hand on a couple of bucks and then decide, no, and walking in the store and buying yourself a cigar instead.

Why are we doing this? Why are we so dramatically cutting debt relief, family planning, the assistance that starving people in Asia and particularly in Africa need, the health care, the educational assistance? We are doing it to give ourselves a trillion dollar tax cut. That is the only reason we got such stringent allocations to our appropriations subcommittees, so we can afford a trillion dollar tax cut.

We are the wealthiest nation in the history of the world. In fact, one-earner families making $40,000 are paying 5 percent on average in Federal income taxes. Two-earner families making $70,000 on average pay 10 percent. We have never been better off. We have never had more capacity to do what is right for the rest of the world. And so here when we are confronted with the opportunity to do what is right, to change the lives of millions of people, one-quarter of the population in many of these African countries are dying of AIDS. Think of the suffering. We can relieve that suffering. Instead we decide to give ourselves a trillion dollar tax cut. It is wrong and it is immoral.

STATUS AND MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

On June 27, the House Appropriations Committee ordered reported its version of the FY2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations (H.R. 4811), providing $13.3 billion, about $200 million less than the FY2000 Act (after adjusting for Wye River aid package), and $1.8 billion, or 12%, below the President's $15.1 billion FY2001 request.

The House bill increases the President's request for child survival and infectious disease programs ($815 million) and international fund for Ireland ($25 million). Like the Senate measure, the House bill reduces the President's proposed budget in many areas: aid to the former Soviet Union ($740 million; −$90 million), debt reduction ($82.4 million; −$180 million), the World Bank's International Development Association ($576.6 million; −$260 million), and the Global Environment Facility ($35.8 million; −$140 million). The House measure further continues current abortion restrictions applied to USAID population aid.

H.R. 4811 dramatically cuts funding for the poorest countries in the world, disproportionately hurting African and Latin American countries. The bill contains only $82 million of the $472 million (requested for multilateral debt relief assistance—in complete disregard of the commitment made by the G–7 countries more than 2 years ago to provide urgent debt relief. Overall cuts to programs that assist Africa and Latin America total 15%. The bill cuts funding for international financial institutions that provide loans to poor countries by one-third.

Cuts of this magnitude will make it impossible to halt the spread of infectious disease, alleviate poverty, and provide access to family planning. The countries of sub-Saharan Africa are forced to spend more each year repaying debt than they are able to spend on primary education and health care. According to the World Bank, sub-Saharan African governments owe foreign creditors an average of almost $400 for every man, woman, and child—more than most Africans make in a year.

H.R. 4811 cuts funding to fight AIDS by nearly 20%, providing only $202 million of the $244 million requested. In many countries, up to one-fourth of the adult population is infected with this horrible disease and funds are desperately needed to combat its spread. In addition, H.R. 4811 cuts funds requested for family planning 29% below the amount requested. The bill codifies the ''Mexico City'' restrictions on international funds for family planning and extends those restrictions to all forms of lobbying.

The President's senior advisors are recommending that he veto the bill.

DEBT RELIEF AND H. RES. 546

A group of Democratic House members urged colleagues today to vote down the rule (H. Res. 546) governing floor debate on a fiscal 2001 foreign operations appropriations bill because it would not permit amendments to boost funding for debt relief to the world's poorest nations.

The rule would not protect an amendment by Representative PELOSI, to provide an extra $390 million on top of the bill's $82 million allocation to match the amount President Clinton requested for debt relief over fiscal years 2000 and 2001.

Treasury Secretary Summers and AFL–CIO President John Sweeney joined lawmakers at a press conference criticizing GOP leaders for not supporting Clinton's request. ''It is imperative for our country morally, economically and diplomatically to provide this debt relief,'' Summers said.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has expired.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my concerns over the level of funding for international financial institutions. Specifically, I want to talk about this nation's debt relief efforts. Unfortunately, this bill reduces debt relief efforts by $40 million from last year. I fully understand the budgetary environment that Chairman CALLAHAN is working under and it is my hope that when this bill becomes its final product, that we increase the amount we appropriate to debt relief.

I would also acknowledge the thoughtful and inciteful statement of our colleague from Alabama, Representative BACHUS.

Last year with bipartisan support, Congress made important steps in addressing the problem of debt relief for poor countries. Congress appropriated $123 million to begin canceling the debts that reforming poor countries owe the United States, and agreed that the International Monetary Fund (IMF) can use $2.3 billion of its own resources to finance its contribution to debt relief.

The Banking Committee, the committee of jurisdiction, authorized U.S. participation in international debt relief efforts when it passed H.R. 1095. Many important elements of H.R. 1095 were included in last year's Omnibus appropriations package.

These elements included that:

Poor countries must engage in an economic reform program,

Poor countries must promote civil society participation,

Poor countries must implement anti-corruption measures,

Poor countries must create programs for poverty reduction, and

Poor countries must strengthen private sector growth, trade, and investment.

Our bill excluded poor countries that violated human rights, supported terrorism, or spend too much of their resources on their military.

Much of the effort to provide for debt relief came from the work of so many people of different faiths during Jubilee 2000. Jubilee 2000 drew its inspiration from the Book of Leviticus in Hebrew Scriptures. In the Jubilee year, social inequities are rectified, slaves are freed, and debts are forgiven. I know that it is the Committee's position that it supports the efforts of Jubilee 2000. That is not in question here.

The question is how best to proceed. I want to work with the Chairman on this important issue and work to find more funding for debt relief.

I know that debt relief alone cannot solve the problems of the world's poorest countries. But it is an important start and a start that we must make.

I look forward to working with the distinguished chairman on this issue. I also want to thank Chairman CALLAHAN for his service on this subcommittee. It has not always been an easy job. But his knowledge, graciousness, and willingness to reach across the aisle to do what is right is a hallmark of his service. I look forward to continue to work with him in his next capacity.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, AIDS—such an ugly disease to think about. This ugly disease which emerged from the shadows 2 decades ago, has devastated whole regions, knocked decades off national development, widened the gulf between rich and poor nations and pushed already-stigmatized groups closer to the margins of society.

Well, shouldn't we do more to extinguish such an ugly disease at home and abroad? The time to act is now. AIDS is one of the most critical development issues confronting our world.

A decade ago, HIV/AIDS was regarded primarily as a serious health crisis. During that time, estimates in 1991 predicted that in sub-Saharan Africa, by the end of the decade, 9 million people would be infected and 5 million would die. Well, that was a threefold underestimation. Today, it is clear that AIDS is a development crisis, and in some parts of the world is rapidly becoming a security crisis too.

The cumulative effect of millions of AIDS deaths is causing havoc in households, communities and economies in countries where HIV started spreading 2 decades ago. Altogether, 95% of the global epidemic is concentrated in the developing world, which has inadequate resources for halting the HIV spread and alleviating its devastating consequences. It is a fact that AIDS is unique in its devastating impact on the social, economic and demographic underpinnings of development.

The time to act is now. Support our colleague's amendment to include an additional $42 million, per the President's request, to the $202 million provided for the USAID global HIV/AIDS program.

□ 2100

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentlewoman withdraw her amendment?

Ms. PELOSI. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am going to, if the gentlewoman does not withdraw it.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman for his course of action.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. The rule states in pertinent part:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. PELOSI. Only to make two points, Mr. Chairman: A, this is an emergency; and, B, there is precedent in the legislation with the funding for flooding in Mozambique and southern Africa.

So it would be consistent with what is in the bill already for the majority to withdraw the point of order and give the body a chance to work its will on the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. With the emergency designations in the amendment, the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2(c) of rule XXI, and therefore the point of order is sustained.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to announce to the membership that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) will make a motion to rise. The Committee will not be rising for the evening, it will be for the purpose of appointing conferees on the defense appropriations bill. Then we will go back into the committee and go back to the consideration of the foreign operations bill.

The intent is to work as late as we can this evening. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have been working diligently to come to an agreement that we will be able to get the House adjourned at least no later than 5 o'clock tomorrow, having completed the foreign operations bill.

So we will tend to this business, then come back to the foreign operations bill, get through as much of it as we can this evening, and try to finish it tomorrow before 5 o'clock so Members can make their plans for the weekend.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BLUNT) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 4576, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida? The Chair hears none and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEWIS of California, YOUNG of Florida, SKEEN, HOBSON, BONILLA, NETHERCUTT, ISTOOK, CUNNINGHAM, DICKEY, FRELINGHUYSEN, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, DIXON, VISCLOSKY, MORAN of Virginia and OBEY.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 4576, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida moves that pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the committee meetings on the bill, H.R. 4576, be closed to the public at such time as classified national security information is under consideration, provided, however, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have the right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, this vote must be taken by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 7, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 395]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	Delahunt
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	DeLauro
Aderholt	Bryant	DeLay
Allen	Burr	DeMint
Andrews	Burton	Deutsch
Armey	Buyer	Dickey
Bachus	Callahan	Dicks
Baird	Calvert	Dingell
Baker	Camp	Dixon
Baldacci	Canady	Doggett
Baldwin	Cannon	Dooley
Ballenger	Capps	Doolittle
Barcia	Capuano	Doyle
Barr	Cardin	Dreier
Barrett (NE)	Castle	Duncan
Barrett (WI)	Chabot	Dunn
Bartlett	Chambliss	Edwards
Barton	Clayton	Ehlers
Bass	Clement	Ehrlich
Bateman	Clyburn	Emerson
Becerra	Coble	Engel
Bentsen	Coburn	English
Bereuter	Collins	Eshoo
Berkley	Combest	Etheridge
Berman	Condit	Evans
Berry	Conyers	Everett
Biggert	Cook	Ewing
Bilbray	Cooksey	Farr
Bilirakis	Costello	Fattah
Bishop	Cox	Filner
Blagojevich	Coyne	Fletcher
Bliley	Cramer	Foley
Blunt	Crane	Ford
Boehlert	Crowley	Fossella
Boehner	Cubin	Fowler
Bonilla	Cummings	Frank (MA)
Bonior	Cunningham	Franks (NJ)
Bono	Danner	Frelinghuysen
Boswell	Davis (FL)	Frost
Boucher	Davis (IL)	Gallegly
Boyd	Davis (VA)	Ganske
Brady (PA)	Deal	Gejdenson
Brady (TX)	DeGette	Gephardt

Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—7

Blumenauer
DeFazio
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kucinich
Stark
Waters
Watt (NC)

NOT VOTING—20

Archer
Baca
Borski
Campbell
Carson
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Diaz-Balart
Forbes
Gekas
Hunter
Jones (OH)
Kasich
Matsui
McNulty
Ney
Nussle
Simpson
Smith (WA)
Vento

□ 2124

Mr. KUCINICH and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. SHOWS and Mr. ACKERMAN changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4632

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, my name was mistakenly added as an original cosponsor of H.R. 4632. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as an original cosponsor of this bill.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 546 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4811.

□ 2125

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) had been disposed of, and the bill was open for amendment from page 2, line 22 to page 3, line 17.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

OFFERED BY: MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

In title I of the bill under the heading ''EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE–SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $25,000,000)''.

In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT–DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $49,500,000)''.

In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT–OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $30,000,000)''.

In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–DEPARTMENT OF STATE–INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $99,500,000)''.

□ 2130

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) in offering this $99.5 million counternarcotics aid amendment for Colombia.

The gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON) and I have long worked together to aid the nation of Colombia, source of most of the world's cocaine and more than 70 percent of the heroin sold or seized on our Nation's streets.

Mr. Chairman, the Colombian National Police, the CNP, has long led the fight against drugs and has been doing its work effectively, although with the limited tools that they have had.

We reluctantly went along with the recently-passed Colombian emergency supplemental because that is what the Colombian government and the Clinton administration wanted; specifically, more aid to the Colombian military to fight drugs.

In the end, however, everyone knows that it is going to be the CNP that is going to have to eradicate the coca leaf and move gasoline from the helicopters and spray planes along with the herbicide to the distant and hard-to-reach fronts in places like southern Colombia, to eliminate the thousands of hectares of coca once the army takes control of those areas.

Drug fighting is a police function, not a military one, both in our Nation and in Colombia. Today the CNP lacks any real capacity to move the massive amounts of fuel that they and the army counternarcotics battalions may need. In fact, they have but only one workable supply plane, an old 1950 DC–3.

Last year's foreign ops appropriation bill in the committee incorporated report language at our request directing

the State Department to buy a more modern supply plane for the CNP, a Buffalo, which is a small version of the C–130 suitable for the jungles and remote runways in Colombia.

Predictably, the State Department ignored congressional advice and failed to act. In a recent operation near the Venezuelan border they have had to make so many fuel runs with small aircraft and their one DC–3 that they alerted the drug traffickers and narco guerillas of their plans, thereby losing their element of surprise.

Unless we in the Congress rectify this supply line situation, we are going to have dozens of good helicopters for which Congress has provided the sorely needed funds sitting idly on the ground in Colombia. We are going to have to have some of the world's most expensive flower pots growing weeds under them in Colombia unless we act appropriately.

Mr. Chairman, the CNP are the best anti-narcotics police in the Americas. Yesterday they seized three tons of cocaine headed for Mexico and ultimately toward our Nation. The CNP needs this modest aid proposed by the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON), and we should be giving it to them, both for the CNP and the future for our youngsters in America.

This effort to fight drugs at the source is in our Nation's interest. I urge a yes vote for its adoption.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple in nature. It moves money from three accounts bloated with bureaucracy and into an account which helps fight the scourge of drugs which are devastating our society.

As the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) just said, our allies, the Colombian National Police, just yesterday seized three metric tons of cocaine destined for the United States through Mexico. This is just the latest testament that the Congress has provided aid to the right people in Colombia.

With the six Black Hawk Helicopters the Congress provided to the CNP last year, the CNP has eradicated more opium, which is used to make heroin, than it did in 1998, and nearly as much as it did last year, and they have only had the Black Hawk Helicopters for 4 months.

Yet in the Colombia supplemental aid package, the Clinton administration chose to virtually ignore our CNP allies and start a duplicative Colombian army unit, providing only $100 million to the CNP while spending nearly $1 billion on an army unit.

Throughout the process, the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and I have tried to explain why there needed to be a more equitable distribution of aid between the two. Yet, despite our long involvement with Colombia, not to mention our role as authorizers, we were ignored.

To this end, I include for the RECORD a letter and a request which the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and I wrote to have the needs of the CNP addressed in the supplemental. I wanted to offer another amendment which would have directed funding to the CNP, but that amendment would have been subject to a point of order that I am sure my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), would have raised.

I hope that after I withdraw this amendment, the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) will consider a more equitable distribution of funds in the conference with the Senate.

The letter referred to is as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 7, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We were pleased to support your Colombian aid proposal last week, and we will continue to provide any assistance necessary to see that the package is enacted into law. To that end, senior committee staff members from both our committees have just returned from a bipartisan staff delegation to Colombia. They met with many Colombian officials, including our friend General Serrano, and were able to gather information about the current situation there, and about the Clinton Administration's Colombian aid proposal. Their analysis can help improve the efficiency of our aid package.

BLACK HAWKS

On a bright note, the Colombian National Police (CNP) have finally received all six Black Hawk utility helicopters that Congress provided for them under your leadership, and the last three are scheduled to begin missions next week. The earlier problems with the floor armoring have been resolved, and the weapons systems seem to be operational. The only concern remains that FARC terrorists likely have surface-to-air missiles, and these Black Hawks are not equipped with inexpensive flares and chaff, which provide the best protection against such attacks by diverting the missile away from the helicopter. Finally, the CNP appears to be able to absorb the two additional Black Hawks we provided to them in the supplemental appropriations package passed by the House. They are grateful!

The Black Hawks have already paid for themselves. On a recent mission FARC terrorists ambushed a squad of CNP officers just 30 miles from Bogota in La Pena. A single Black Hawk was able to land and extract 21 fully armed CNP officers, lifting them to safety. It is comforting to know that the Congress' efforts helped save the lives of these good men.

AMMUNITION

The .50 caliber ammunition supply appears to still be a problem. As you may remember, the State Department bought 2 million rounds of .50 caliber ammunition for the GAU–19 defensive weapons systems that were manufactured during the Eisenhower Administration, in 1952 (see photo). Even worse, the State Department purchased 5 million additional rounds of this aged and useless ammunition (spending a total of approximately $10 million). The 50 year-old ammunition was suitable for the weapons of the Eisenhower era, but according to the manufacturer, it cannot be safely used in the defensive rapid-fire weapons systems that we purchased for the CNP to protect our nearly $100 million U.S. taxpayer-financed helicopter investment.

The State Department insists it can operate the weapons at a reduced rate of fire. However the manufacturer has explicitly warned the State Department not to use this aged ammunition because of serious risk of endangering the operator and/or weapon. The manufacturer says only ammunition manufactured after 1983 is safe to use in this weapon. Clearly, this situation must be addressed immediately, before someone is injured or killed and/or an expensive weapon is damaged or destroyed. The easy answer is to buy new ammunition, instead of trying to do this on the cheap.

SUPPORT CAPACITY/SUPPLY LINE

The most disturbing revelation from the trip was the discovery that there had been little consideration given to how the push into southern Colombia would be supported. The only certainty is that increased levels of fuel and herbicide will have to be flown in due to the remote locations of the forward operating bases, where often even contracted commercial planes refuse to land or there is no commercial source to purchase gasoline. Possibly even more critical than defending the helicopters themselves is the ability to support and maintain a supply line to keep the helicopters flying. Otherwise many if not all, of the helicopters provided in this package will constantly be waiting for their next tank of gas or spare part.

Shockingly, the State Department plans to use the CNP's 2 aging DC–3's (their third is being cannibalized to keep the other two in the air) as the backbone of the support effort. These planes from the FDR/Truman era are 60 years old (see photo), do not have a reliable spare parts supply line, and have some sort of mechanical trouble on nearly every mission. Almost every flight is flown with the potential of engine failure on take-offs and landings due to a recurring malfunction in the electronics system—which has been ongoing for the last two years.

As you may remember, General Serrano requested a Buffalo transport plane over a year ago (in his 1999 $51 million priority list). Congress placed report language directing the State Department to purchase the Buffalo supply plane in this year's House Foreign Operations Appropriations Report. However the State Department chose to ignore the report language, saying it was non-binding.

In order to sustain the operations tempo necessary to be the primary supplier of fuel and herbicide for the push into southern Colombia, the CNP needs to update and increase its number of supply planes. The Buffalo appears to be the best platform for the project.

One specific example of the need for increased supply plane capacity is a recent CNP operation that required 18 staging flights by inadequate fixed-wing aircraft, like the DC–3, to supply in advance a supposedly ''secret'' mission in Vichada to destroy a clandestine cocaine lab. The 18 staging flights (10 for fuel alone) cost the CNP the critical element of surprise. Unfortunately, FARC terrorists had already taken their cocaine and all incriminating evidence, and abandoned the lab well before the CNP was able to execute its mission. If the CNP had the Buffalo supply plane Congress directed the State Department to purchase, the 18 trips could have been decreased to one or two.

CRITICAL NEEDS

Mr. Speaker, we have been pleased to help gain the support needed to pass the supplemental appropriations bill, however there are a few things which have been over-looked in the construction of this package. General Serrano, when asked by committee staff if he needed anything further to support both the CNP Black Hawks and the Colombian

Army's push into southern Colombia, favored the following modest list of items that he felt were critical to the CNP's ability to successfully execute the supply mission for Plan Colombia. It is our hope that the House would push for the following items in conference, if and when it occurs.

$52 million—to purchase 4 Buffalo transport/supply aircraft ($13 million each).

$3.5 million—to update the CNP sidearms with Sig-Arms for the DANTI, DIJIN, COPEZ, and CIP, the key units involved in the day-to-day struggle against narco-traffickers and their FARC terrorist allies.

$200,000—to purchase anti-missile defense kits for the 6 CNP Black Hawks to help protect them from surface-to-air missiles.

$10 million—to purchase new .50 caliber ammunition for CNP GAU–19 weapons systems.

$1.5 million—to purchase one additional two-seat T–65 Turbo Thrush spraying aircraft for CNP training purposes.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

DAN BURTON,
Chairman, Government Reform Committee.
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,
Chairman, International Relations Committee.

Enclosures.

P.S. Just yesterday a newly modified Huey II was shot down by the FARC, who look 8 CNP officers hostage, including those wounded in the crash. This only further proves the point that we need to get the CNP the best equipment possible, including FLIR and capable defensive weapons systems, as this shows anything less is dangerous, penny wise and pound foolish.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 27 offered by Ms. WATERS:

Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $82,500,000)''.

Page 3, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $7,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 8, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $155,600,000)''.

Page 33, line 6, after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $5,250,000)''.

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $200,000,000)''.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase debt relief appropriations by $155.6 million to fully fund the administration's request for $225 million for debt relief for the world's poorest countries.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard an awful lot this evening about debt relief. I would like to again thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the wonderful leadership that she has given in this debate.

I suppose there are many who would be wondering why are we going to hear more about it. We are going to hear more about it because this issue is not going to die easily. It is not going to die easily because we have reneged on our commitment as leaders in this world, and at the G–8 conference we made a commitment. We made a commitment to debt relief that has not been honored. We made a commitment to debt relief for the world's poorest countries, the world's poorest countries that are being impoverished by their debts.

In Tanzania, Zambia, Niger, Nicaragua, Honduras and Uganda, government spending on debt service payments is greater than government spending on health and education combined. These debt payments constitute a transfer of wealth from the world's poorest countries to the world's richest countries.

Debt relief is supported by a worldwide movement known as Jubilee 2000. This movement was begun by Christians who believe that the year 2000, the two-thousandth anniversary of the coming of Christ, is a jubilee year.

According to the Bible, the Lord instructed the people of ancient Israel to celebrate a jubilee, a year of the Lord, every 50 years. During a jubilee year, debts are forgiven.

Supporters of Jubilee 2000 now include a diverse group of Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religious groups, developmental specialists, labor unions, environmental groups, and other nongovernmental organizations.

These activists know that forgiving the debts of the world's most impoverished countries is simply the right and Christian thing to do. Supporters of Jubilee 2000 also know that debt relief is a moral imperative. Most of the debts owed by poor countries were accumulated during the Cold War, and many are the result of loans to corrupt dictators who are no longer in power.

The debt of the Congo was accumulated during the oppressive rule of Mobutu. Nicaragua's debt was accumulated under the dictatorship of the Samosa family and the subsequent civil war. It is unjust and immoral to expect the impoverished people of these countries to pay back these debts.

From June 18 to June 20, 1999, representatives of the United States and other creditor countries met at the G–8 summit in Cologne, Germany, and they knew the Jubilee 2000 movement was watching. These creditor governments agreed to provide faster and deeper debt relief to heavily-indebted poor countries, and required these countries to target the savings from debt relief to HIV-AIDS prevention, health care, education, child survival, and poverty reduction programs.

On September 24, 1999, Gordon Brown, the chairman of the IMF's Monetary and Financial Committee, and the chancellor of the United Kingdom made the following statement about the Cologne debt initiative:

''If we are successful, it will be a matter of not years or months but weeks before the first country will benefit from debt relief.''

Tragically, the promises of Cologne have not been fulfilled. The entire Cologne debt initiative is now in jeopardy because the United States Congress has failed to fund its contribution to the program. Last year, the administration proposed a multiyear package totalling $920 million in appropriations for debt relief. For fiscal year 2001, the administration requested only $225 million.

This relatively small investment could leverage millions more from other creditor governments and international financial institutions. However, without American leadership, debt relief will never become a reality.

Pope John II said, and I quote, ''We have to ask . . . why progress in resolving the debt problem is still so slow. Why so many hesitations? Why the difficulty in providing the funds needed even for the already-agreed initiatives? It is the poor who pay the cost of indecision and delay.''

Let us declare an end to the indecision and delay.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to the amendment being offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

While I support the thrust of her amendment in increasing funding available to the Heavily-Indebted Poor Country Trust Fund, I am troubled that it calls for a large reduction in our foreign military funding programs.

The proposed $200 million reduction in this account could end up hurting some of the very countries we are trying to help in the important HIPC initiative. For example, there is a proposal for $18 million in FMF funding for African regional stability, an effort which would be undercut and perhaps even zeroed out by the adoption of the gentlewoman's amendment.

Israel currently receives close to $2 billion in FMF funding. Do we want to cut that program, possibly putting that program for Israel in jeopardy at the same time that the President is playing host to the leader of both the Palestinian Authority and Israel in an effort to achieve a comprehensive peace in the Middle East?

□ 2145

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that many of our colleagues would agree that the answers should be a resounding no. The cuts being proposed in this amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) would also impact the International Military Education Training account thereby cutting possible funding for many of the same HIPC beneficiaries.

Do we truly want to cut off support for military education training for countries such as Sierra Leone and Nigeria and South Africa at the same time that regional conflicts are threatening to engulf most of West Africa.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that that is a wise course of action. This amendment would also cut the administrative budget of the Export-Import

Bank thereby putting in jeopardy the small business programs of that agency and its ability to produce quick turnaround for business applicants.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly ask for the defeat of the Waters amendment. The gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) has put together a well-balanced bill, and I cannot support this effort to upset that balance.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) on this debt relief issue. I think at this period of time in terms of our global economy when this House has voted so many times before to extend free trade around the world that it is about time that we also think about what the consequences of our global economy is on those who are most impoverished in this world.

Mr. Chairman, the criticism of the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is that she takes money from military training and assistance and the hope that the former speaker, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) was trying to convey in his remarks about the Waters amendment was the fact that by drawing away from these funds that we were, in essence, compromising our national security, because we would be taking away funds that would otherwise be going to the training and equipping of the military in these various countries.

The very fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, I cannot think of any issue more fundamental to our national security as a Nation, moreover than whatever we do with our national defense budget, which we just closed hearings on for the benefit of our conference committee, more so than any of this equipping and training of our military, is the fact that we are about to see a mass epidemic. In fact, we already have an epidemic. We have a pandemic.

We are going to see literally half the population of major countries in Africa die within the next year. We are going to see literally the life expectancy, the average life expectancy of people living in South Africa going down to below 30 years of age. My colleagues if we do not think this is a national security issue, if we think that the Waters amendment somehow compromises national security because we are taking away from the military to support debt relief, then I am sorry, the fact of the matter is, between the short funding of AIDS in this bill, in addition to the fact that we are not even providing these countries with the ability to dig themself out of debt, those are two national security issues.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how this House could be so narrow-minded in its perspective that they can honestly think that we can pass a national security bill and think that we have the national security of our country protected and yet, on the other hand, cut the kinds of funds necessary to provide debt relief to the poorest countries of the world and not think that we are not going to be in there in the next weeks or months or years in a military capacity trying to bring stability from a situation that has gone awry because we have not provided the stability there economically or healthwise.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is pound foolish, pennywise for us to be talking about national security and what we are going to do to preserve our national security when we are underfunding our debt relief obligations. This is what goes around comes around. There is no one who can convince me that it is not going to save us money tonight to put money into debt relief, it is going to save us money in our military accounts tomorrow, no one who can convince me of that.

Mr. Chairman, anybody who sees that we are in 182-plus different countries today with our military trying to provide stability in every other place in the world, because there is an eternal conflagration because of this economic instability, to think that we are somehow saving money by borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, by borrowing out of the debt relief monies that the World Bank has said that we need to provide these countries, is just incredible.

The fact of the matter is, this $82 million in debt relief is a fraction of what is truly needed. So that is a national security issue.

The other national security issue is the fact that we have an AIDS epidemic that is literally destroying the continent of Africa, and it is threatening to destabilize lots of countries there. I might add, the two are intertwined, not only should we be providing debt relief but we should be providing the necessary AIDS money so that we also bolster these countries that are now suffering internally from two epidemics, one economic and another health.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise tonight in opposition to the proposed amendment by my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) but with some explanation. Also I rise to answer some of the questions that my colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), just challenged us to answer.

Debt relief in and of itself is a very positive humane and honest goal and should be considered by this body, especially debt relief in Third World countries that are developing and struggling to build new societies. Yes, if debt relief was the only issue at hand and it was done correctly, then my colleagues would have my support.

Mr. Chairman, I, in fact, am very supportive of the idea that the Pope has suggested with the Jubilee 2000 concept reaching out to developing countries and Third World countries and alleviating that burden from them, taking it off their shoulders, this debt burden. However, for this to be successful, and to answer the challenge of my good friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), for this to be successful, we have to have more than transferring money from this pot to that pot.

We have to have more than just saying we are going to give these underdeveloped countries debt relief and expecting that is going to do them any good; it will not do them any good. It will do them no good at all if they are still being run by the same gangsters, the same corrupt dictators, the same hooligans and monsters that have been repressing the people in the Third World over the last two decades.

Mr. Chairman, one of my biggest gripes about the financial institutions, the World Bank and many of the financial institutions that are funded through this body is the fact that we do give money to corrupt administrations overseas. For example, the people of Indonesia right now are burdened with billions of dollars of debt.

The fact is, in Indonesia, they are struggling to create a democracy. By the way, let me add, our training of the Indonesian military has been one of the greatest forces for building a democracy in Indonesia. Let us admit that some of this military training, for example, in Indonesia permitted an evolution towards democracy and, perhaps, people like in Indonesia do deserve to have some of that debt relief taken off of their shoulders, unless there is a requirement saying that these countries be headed towards democracy or there be a certain amount of reform, we are just pouring money right down a rat hole.

Mr. Chairman, all the things that have been said here today about the horrors that are going on in a developing world will get no better if we simply transfer money to regimes that are controlled by dictators. This shift that is being proposed by this amendment is, as I say, being done with the best of motives. It cannot be done in this manner.

It has to be done as part of a reform and a comprehensive authorization project in which we will look at how monies are dispersed throughout the Third World, not simply throwing money from one pot to another, which will result in corrupt dictators getting their hands on the money and all the problems that we talk about being exacerbated rather than being solved.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) often advocates that we reduce the commitment of America in its overseas obligations. The fact of the matter is the gentleman cannot reduce America's commitments militarily unless we are prepared to help those countries make it,

and they cannot make it if you are squeezing every last penny out of them. In addition to that, we do not support them addressing their health epidemics.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, none of that makes any sense at all unless we have a government in that country that is willing to seek out those goals and try to implement them. Simply by changing money from this pot to their pot is not going to make those things better.

Again, I am in favor of debt relief for these Third World countries, but let us not give money to countries that are not democratizing, not going through reform. Talk about pouring good money after bad, talk about pouring money down a rat hole, that is the way to waste more money.

The money the gentleman is talking about will go straight in Swiss banks, unless we require a certain amount of reform and democratization to go forward with this.

Mr. Chairman, in terms of military training, again, I would agree we need to put restrictions on our military training as well. The Waters amendment which I would like to address at this point, the lady from California (Ms. WATERS) has the right idea, we should not be spending money just like we should not be spending money without democratic reform.

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

Mr. Chairman, we have spent a long time discussing this issue and I hope that we will soon be able to move on. But before we do, I would simply like to make one observation about the comments of the last speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), we had some talk in the House tonight about the position of the Pope and the Catholic Church and various other churches. To me, what we ought to be asking ourselves is what we really believe our individual duties are both to our own citizens and to citizens of the world who do not reside next door.

□ 2200

Mr. Chairman, let me say that this debt relief that we are talking about tonight is not meant to aid a single illegitimate government. It is meant primarily to help the victims of previous illegitimate governments who have brought economic havoc on to countries and who in the process have ruined those countries' abilities to provide a decent future.

If they cannot provide a decent future for their citizens, they become very dangerous neighbors to us, not just politically and economically, but from the simple standpoint of public health. All one has to do is to look at the AIDS epidemic to understand that.

Before we get too arrogant about the other parts of the world, I think we ought to remember one simple thing. We are not in this Chamber tonight because we have any special value. We were not born Americans because we were of special worth. We were lucky enough to be born in this country simply because God was good enough to put our soul in a body that was born in this part of the planet rather than some other.

Given the fact that we have won the luck of the draw, we owe it to our fellow creatures around the world to provide an element of justice for a people who had probably not had one whit of it from all of their own lives from their own governments.

So we can sit here and chuckle and make snide remarks and use an example of one foolish leader or even a handful of them as an excuse to avoid our moral responsibilities; but in the end, all we are being asked to do is to write off the books debt that will never be repaid anyway.

We have the concept of individual bankruptcy in every civilized country in the world. We have also had the concept of collective national bankruptcy for a number of countries throughout history. We have provided debt relief to many East European countries and Middle Eastern countries. This time we are being asked, at very little, at minuscule costs to our Treasury in comparison to some of the things we have had on this floor, we are being asked to take the one action that might enable some of these countries to edge their way just a bit out of misery. That is what these amendments are meant to development.

We are not permitted under the rules of the House to have a real debate on this or to prepare a real amendment. But before this bill is finished, that is exactly what we ought to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to applaud this body because tonight we are talking about some issues that we ought to all address. We ought to address the issue, are we committed to the principles of liberty and justice? Do we stand against slavery? Do we stand against involuntary servitude? If we are against these things, if we are for justice, if we are for liberty, does our commitment stop at the shoreline, or does it extend beyond our country?

In dealing with other countries, should we extend those principles to them? Or should we be against involuntary servitude only in our country, but it is fine for us to impose it on the rest of the world? That is a question we should ask.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) said these countries are ruled by monsters, by hooligans. He had it half right. They were. It is those monsters and those hooligans that we loaned this money to. It actually was not money we loaned them. We financed the defense industry and allowed them to sell these monsters and these hooligans weapons. These monsters and these hooligans bombed their people. They napalmed their people as their people fought for democracy like we did 2 centuries ago.

At the end of the Revolutionary War, what if Britain had required us to pay them the cost of the war? What would we have said to Britain? These people that we are not imposing this debt on and requiring them to repay, they are the very people that were beaten down by the dictators and the monsters with arms and weapons that we sold them as ''foreign aid.'' It is immoral to require them to repay this money.

Let me close by saying this: debt relief is not an end in itself; it is a means to an end. It is not a total solution to poverty, to hunger, to disease; but it is the first step. It is a necessary step. It is where the journey should begin to free these countries of the burden of debt, the chains of poverty, the shackles of despair, to enable them to minister to the economic and social needs of their people, of their children. It is the first step in raising the standard of living of those living in these impoverished nations, those in most need, those most vulnerable, the most helpless.

Without debt relief, these nations and their citizens are overwhelmed by debt, far exceeding their ability to pay. These nations do not have the ability to pay, to repay the debt and, at the same time, to offer necessary social and economic support to their people.

Here is the choice. We can continue to require the debt to be paid, and as long as we require the debt to be paid, children will not be fed. Require the debt to be paid and children will not be clothed. Continue to require the debt to be paid, and children will not go to school.

It is our decision. Let us make the decision. Let us not withhold from these poor children clothes on their backs, food in their stomachs, the right to attend school. The decision is ours.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take 5 minutes, but I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS). The world community is crying out for help. The people of the world all over this little planet that we call spaceship Earth are not crying out for bombs, for missiles, for more guns. They are crying out for food, for shelter, for medical assistance, for economic assistance. They are crying out tonight for debt relief.

This is the year of Jubilee. This is the year to help, to help our brothers and sisters in need. We have a moral obligation to help. We shall respond to the Macedonian call of old. There are people in need. They are hurting. They are suffering.

In Africa, a modern day Holocaust is in the making. Five thousand people will die every single day. We cannot stand solemnly by. If we fail to act and we fail to stand up and help, in the end, we are not worthy of a great people or great nation. The spirit of history will not be kind to us.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have a moral obligation, a mandate to do what we can to bring relief to our sisters and to our brothers in other lands. We do not live on this little island, on this little piece of real estate alone.

Just maybe, just maybe our foremothers and our forefathers all came to this great country in different ships. But we all are in the same boat now. If we want to live in a world at peace with itself, we must reach out and help those in need. It is Africa. It is a Third World today. We do not know who it will be tomorrow.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we had a 3-hour debate on this issue. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the sponsor of this amendment, made very eloquent statements, and her compassion was evident; and I support, I think, her cause.

But we have differences on whether or not there ought to be some restrictions on future borrowing, and that is to be expected. There will always be differences. But the difference between that debate and this debate is that, under the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), she was declaring an emergency and thus getting new money to provide for HPIC assistance.

Under the proposal of the gentlewoman of California (Ms. WATERS), as advocated by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) just a few minutes ago, she is advocating that they take the money away, or a great portion of it, from the FMF fund, the military financing fund that goes to Israel and to Egypt and to even Africa, $15 million for countries south of Egypt.

So the question here that we have on the gentlewoman's amendment is do we want to take the money away from Israel and Egypt? Maybe there is some logic to that. Do we want to take it away from Africa?

But I am just surprised that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) is standing up and telling us that he supports the gentlewoman from California, yet he is such a strong advocate of assistance to Israel, that he would be supporting an amendment that takes money away from Israel. I just am surprised at that.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama. Does he know where this money comes from?

Mr. BACHUS. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Let me say this to the gentleman, the bill that reached this floor should have had this money in it.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time.

Mr. BACHUS. It is not we that had chosen one or the other.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not yielding to the gentleman for that type of conversation.

The CHAIRMAN. Both gentlemen will suspend. The time is controlled by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. No, I will not yield.

Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) because it is her amendment. I am rising simply to say that, if we are going to do it, we ought to do it at a time when there is an opportunity to either increase the budget allocations or have it declared an emergency.

I had a conversation with the gentlewoman earlier before this discussion. I think there is going to be an opportunity before we leave this session, as a result of the debates taking place at Camp David, to discuss emergency supplemental appropriations; and that would be the appropriate time, I think, for her to bring this message to the House.

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that, certainly, if the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for an emergency appropriation had been honored, and maybe that is the appropriate way or the better way to do it, I would not have come with this amendment that would have to find offsets in other places. But given that it was not, I have come with this amendment.

However, we have had a conversation where the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has indicated a sincere desire to work with us and to find money in light of the fact there will be some continuing negotiations about money as the whole peace agreement is being discussed.

But what I would like to say is this, I would not like to have my amendment cast as an amendment that is for or against Israel.

□ 2215

I do not think that gets us anywhere in doing that.

And I want to say something to my colleague about the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS). The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and I serve on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and we disagree on a lot of things and over the years we have disagreed. I believe that debt relief was our finest moment. I think it was a superb moment for the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the leadership that he provided in the most honest and sincere way. And I want to tell my colleague that it softened my real concerns about what and who I thought the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) was.

This has been a learning experience for all of us, and so he is not opposed to Israel and I do not want it cast that way.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would tell the gentlewoman that of a total $3.5 billion in the bill for FMF, such a huge percentage, right or wrong, goes to Egypt and Israel that the only way we could get the money would be to take it from those funds. So maybe it all could come from Egypt. That might be the best way to do it. Maybe it all could come from Israel. Maybe there would be no need. Maybe they could use the balance of the $200 million and not give financing to anyone else in the world.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have spoken at length on support for international debt relief earlier and was not going to seek time now, but I do want to set the record straight. My distinguished chairman represents that support for the legislation of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), and implied in that that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) in his support of that amendment, is taking money from Israel or the Middle East peace, and that is not so. The offset in the Waters bill is $200 million. The non-Middle East foreign military financing money in the bill is $230 million.

So it is possible to take this $200 million from FMF without touching the Middle East peace money, and it is really, I am sad to say, disingenuous to say that if we support this bill the money is coming out of the Middle East. It is coming out of the FMF account which has $230 million beyond the Middle East peace money and $200 of that is what the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is drawing upon.

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

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Well, I would like to approach it in a different way, and I think a consensus has been built on the floor of this House from everyone.

I have heard no one stand up and say that this is something that should not be done. I have heard the gentleman from California, and the gentleman from California obviously has not read the legislation because he says that it will go to monsters in countries who abuse human rights. In the legislation it restricts money for those countries. So I would simply say to you, when you speak on this legislation, have some understanding of it. Do not claim that we need things in the legislation which are already there and have been since the beginning of this legislation.

But despite that, let me simply say this. A consensus is building here tonight, and whether it is on the floor of this House tonight or it is 2 weeks from tonight, if everyone has spoken the truth on the floor of this House tonight, with some exception, some are not supporting debt relief, some do not believe that it is a good idea, and I applaud their honesty, I applaud their honesty to say $1.20 is too much to

spend to save 40,000 people a day. If my colleagues believe that, say it and we will have a vote. But sometime before we go home this year, we should fund this, if we believe that we should do something about 40,000 people a day, that we could save a number of those people. No one that has looked at this issue believes that it will not help. There is no one that has looked at this issue that has said it is not the first step.

If we are not concerned enough for children, half the children in these countries who never go to school, not attend one day in school; if we are not concerned that children in these countries are not vaccinated, a 50 cent shot, and as a result they are dying every day; if $1.20 a year is too much, then vote against debt relief. But I would say that the majority of this body recognizes that it is not only in their interest, it is in our interest, it is in our best interest.

If my colleagues have looked at this, if they have looked at this issue, far more than anything else they are convinced that this is in our national interest. We have diseases that were thought to be extinct that are now spreading across the globe because of conditions in these countries. They are reaching our shores. They are killing our people. We cannot turn our backs on these conditions without them spilling over our shores. We spend $400 billion and $500 billion making the world safe through arms, yet we turn our back on $1 billion for food, for security and peace.

Why can we not do as Eisenhower did with the Marshall Plan? Why can we not give peace a chance? Do we have to change the world only through shipping arms around the world? And if we do it and it is necessary, is it necessary to the tune of $400 billion, yet we cannot find a billion for this? Those are questions we will all have to answer.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, whereas my name has been used several times and I was not paid the courtesy of being yielded to by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); yet, when I was on the floor I was very happy to yield for a question, even when I had not used another Member's name, I think we should reexamine the courtesies that we are trying to pay to each other to maintain a debate on a very important issue. And I am very pleased and thank the gentleman from North Carolina very much for yielding to me.

There have been some very, very heartfelt points made here tonight. And this, of course, is an issue that tugs at our heart strings. But if we do not use our heads, none of the things that were just talked about that were so important, immunizations, schooling for children, food for people who are starving, not one of those goals will be achieved. Because although the gentleman may think that I do not know about this bill, the gentleman may not know about this bill if he claims that there is a demand in this bill for democracy, for freedom of the press, for opposition parties, for everything that ensures that the countries that receive this type of debt relief will use the money honestly that they get and the resources that they have available; that they will use them honestly or for immunization or for these benevolent purposes.

No, the only thing in the bill that even touches on that says the money is not going to go to countries that have egregious human rights violations. All right, that is a step in the first direction, but that does not even go 10 percent of the way.

All the speeches we have heard tonight that have tugged at our heart strings, yes, the benevolent souls, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), who has a wonderful motive in proposing this today, I will say that this does not achieve any of the ends that we heard about on the floor today because it ignores the central requirement that will achieve those ends, and that is that the countries that we are giving debt relief to have to be under the control of democratically elected governments, governments that have opposition parties, and freedom of the press, or all the resources that the gentlewoman is talking about that will be used for immunization will not go to those noble purposes. They will go, instead, to Swiss bank accounts, they will instead go to arms to repress their own people.

Because, yes, believe it or not there are gangsters in this world that control countries. Believe it or not there are monsters that are murdering people throughout this world. And the last thing we should do is give debt relief to regimes that are controlled by those kind of people. If my colleague wants the votes of people like myself, please add this into the bill.

I am on the Committee on International Relations. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and I, and the rest of the members of the committee, can work out an authorization bill that accomplishes the ends that we are talking about. Just like the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), who 3 years ago challenged us as to why we were sending so many weapons to all these countries in the developing world. And I said to her that I would support her, let us not send any weapons to dictatorships, and we came up with a code of conduct.

I challenge those of my colleagues who are speaking with their hearts tonight to work with us on this side of the aisle to put together legislation that will prevent money from going to these vicious dictatorships, prevent these loans to these vicious dictatorships, so that when they have democratic peoples on the ascendancy, they will not be burdened with these burdens like the people of Indonesia. We can do that.

I, in fact, have tried to propose that to Export-Import Bank loans and to other World Bank financial dealings. But, no, we have not gotten any support from this side of the aisle or that side of the aisle for something like that. Let us help the decent people of the world who are struggling to have the inoculations of their children, to teach their children. Let us make sure that the money is going to those regimes that have a chance.

What good would it have been to the people of Eastern Europe, for example, had we provided debt relief, which we did by the way to those countries, when they were still Communist dictatorships? That makes no sense at all. So let us make sure that we include the one element in the gentlewoman's proposal that will make it work rather than make it achieve just the opposite, and that is to put those type of requirements that we are dealing with countries that have democratic institutions in place.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Chairman, let me quickly make two points. Twenty-two nations under this legislation are eligible for debt relief. Not one of them is a dictatorship. Let me repeat that. Twenty-two nations are eligible for relief under this legislation. Not a one of them is a dictatorship.

Number two. Yes, we loaned much of this money, most of this money, to dictatorships. We never should have done it. We have loaned it to these monsters, and they did take it and they put it in Swiss bank accounts and that is where it went.

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

I also think that it is an abomination that out of the $472 million requested that $82 million has been approved. I heard earlier the chairman of the subcommittee talk about a person that bought a plane in Uganda. He said that it was really a horrible thing that was done. Well, let me just say a few things about Uganda.

First of all, the President of Uganda reduced the military budget by 75 percent, and he put the money into working with the people. The President of Uganda has had the first country in Africa where the AIDS pandemic has been leveled off and is in the possibility of being decreased. The President of Uganda has started elementary education for girls in that country. The President of Uganda had to pay back money to Asians expelled on December 4 of 1972 by Idi Amin, and those people have been able to come back to Uganda and the World Bank said that President Museveni had to restore their property and pay them back the land,

which he did. President Museveni reduced the civil service by 50 percent in his country.

President Museveni of Uganda, the one that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) castigated earlier, went to Sudan on the border and fought the Lord's Resistance movement, who are people who were dealing with the terrorism in Sudan that went ahead to blow up U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania.

□ 2230

President Museveni has reduced crime in his area. President Museveni is looked at as a leader in the country. And I am not defending buying a plane. But we have ECOWAS, which is a West African group of countries, we have the OAU, we have SADAK in the south, we have other kinds of North African countries, we have people that have to get around.

They do not have commercial airlines like we have here. And so the worst thing that I have heard is that a president who has done magnificent things in his country bought a plane. Now, perhaps he should have bought maybe one of our used planes perhaps. But right now we have the former president of Botswana stuck in Istanbul trying to get to an OAU meeting because a meeting in Algiers was canceled.

I think that we take an issue where Russia, hundreds of millions of dollars have gone down into the Mediterranean where Russian people are very wealthy at this time. We have heard the reports of Bosnia, hundreds of millions of dollars. We have seen what is happening in Kosovo. But no one talks about that. I think it is racist to pick out one simple issue and put it in an appropriations bill because someone decided that they had to get a plane to move around the continent and, therefore, debt relief should not go on.

It is absolutely absurd. We take one simple issue and make that a magna issue. If people knew what was going on in some of these countries where debt relief takes 50 percent of the budget, where they have reduced the whole question of the military, where they have gone and fought AIDS, where they support the United States by fighting terrorism in Sudan, then we turn around and have people say, well, somebody bought a plane; and, therefore, our debt relief is being wasted. I think it is obscene; it does not make any sense.

When we look at what is going on in the Cold War, we gave Mobutu money, we said go and deal with South Africa with P.T. Bolton and the white regime in South Africa because they were against communism. We went to UNITA in Angola and said, here is all the money you need to fight against the Communists. We do not care how much you steal. And we supported them. We took President Doe who killed the first family in Liberia and sent him all the money in the world for 10 years because he was against Communism.

I was against Communism, too. But all those debts that we have is because the blood was shed in Africa for the Cold War. Nowhere else was there blood shed other than a country or two in South America. It was all on the continent of Africa where Communism was going to have its line in the sand.

What we did was we should not have supported Mobutu. That is why they need money to do away with the debt in the Congo. We should not have supported the people in UNITA that we said give them all the guns they want, we do not care what they do to their people, we know they are stealing the money, but you know what, they do like a Communist. Well, I do not like Communism either, but now we are going to sit back and pontificate about how we have this money that was owed. It was a disgrace that we gave the money in the first place.

It is absolutely wrong to sit back and talk about we are not putting the money in the right place. It is wrong. This money should be restored. I think it is absolutely unconscionable to think that with AIDS and all the other problems going on that we could sit around talking about we do not have a need for debt relief.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am a new member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services; and over this past session, I have had an opportunity to hear us debate the issue of debt relief.

More recently in Banking, we have had a discussion of a bill called Prohibiting Predatory Lending, where lenders have preyed upon low-income mostly inner-city minority senior women and caused them to put themselves deeper in debt than they were before the lending was had.

Tonight we have the opportunity to step up to get rid of the predatory lenders, to not be predatory lenders any more for the African nations. We have the right and the opportunity to make it right, to let these nations step away from these predatory loans and allow them the opportunity to begin anew, to provide relief so that African growth and opportunity can be had, so that African people can have jobs, so that African people can be relieved of unnecessary debt.

We want and we should as a country be prepared to step up to the plate because we all want to get into Africa and do business. We know how rich Africa is, what opportunities there are for growth not only for that country but for our country as well. So why not give them the opportunity to be relieved of debt?

And do not think that we can run through Africa and do business and not get AIDS. AIDS is a serious issue. It is an economic security issue that will affect us all. So it is time now for us to in fact do the right thing and give debt relief.

And, see, I am not talking about heartstrings. The gentleman from California kept talking about my heartstrings are tugged, I feel sorry for the African people. It is not about heart. It is about money. We need money to relieve the African countries of the debt. Let us stop talking about heart. Let us stop talking about morality. Get them from under the debt.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Let me say I rise in support of the amendment by the gentlewoman from California. Let me say that the camera of history is now rolling on us and the camera of history will judge us and we will be judged by how we treat the least among us. We will be judged by how we treat the least among us.

This is a question about motivation. For sure, as my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), indicated, we had motivation to find some money when the Cold War existed. Where is the motivation to find money for humanitarian interests? Five thousand people are dying a day. Where is the motivation to find money?

Now, sometimes we forget our own history right here in this country. I hear my colleagues talking about all the things that are going wrong in Africa. Do we have to remember the history of this country, the wild wild West and all the crazy things that were going on here? Do we have to remember that many of the individuals who now are the upper echelon in this country, their families were crooks and did illegal activities? It was an evolving thing.

Many of the countries that we want to help, as my colleague from New Jersey so poignantly said, we, in order to fight against Communism, we financed it, we did not care what they did, and we gave them money; and now we have this debt.

We live in the greatest fiscal times of our lives; yet we are going to turn our back on people who have blood like we do, on people who have needs like we do. How can we turn our backs in this time and in this day and in this age?

We must never forget who we are and where we came from. This was not just given to us here in America. As I indicated earlier, those to whom much is given, much is required. Much is required of us now. We must not turn our backs on the least of us. We must support, we must pass this amendment by the gentlewoman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 546, further proceedings on

the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) will be postponed.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4811, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4811 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 546, no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except:

(1) pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

(2) the following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 60 minutes:

One of either the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 11 or the amendment numbered 15; and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), regarding Child Survival and Disease Program Fund;

(3) the following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes:

The amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 28; and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding Development Assistance;

(4) the following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes:

One of either the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 5 or the amendment numbered 6; the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) regarding conscription under the age of 18; and the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 18;

(5) the following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes:

The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) regarding North Korea; the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BAKER) regarding Panama; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) regarding biotechnology research; the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) regarding Child Survival and Disease Program Fund; the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) regarding the Tariff Act; the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) regarding peacekeeping operations; the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) regarding Economic Support Fund; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding Congo; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding sanctions against Angola; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding peacekeeping operations; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding Sudan; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) regarding restrictions on assistance to governments destabilizing Angola; the gentleman from California (Mr. MENENDEZ) regarding Peru; the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) regarding Economic Support Fund; the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) regarding section 558; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) regarding Armenia Azerbaijan peace and democracy initiative; the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) regarding termination of unilateral agricultural or medical sanctions; the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) regarding honor crimes; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) regarding the African Development Bank; the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) regarding international financial institution loans; the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) regarding the Ukraine; the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) regarding Child Survival; and the amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 7, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25 and 26.

Each additional amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee, and shall be considered as read. Each additional amendment shall be debatable for the time specified equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I make the following announcement: that it is our intention if this unanimous consent request is agreed to that the Committee will reconvene and will continue working on this bill until 1 o'clock in the morning. However, any votes will be rolled until tomorrow. We would convene at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning and, hopefully, be able to finish this bill by 4 or 5 o'clock in the afternoon and be able to adjourn for the weekend.

So I just use the time to make that announcement.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the chair of the Black Caucus, for their leadership in putting all this together.

□ 2245

I want to say to my distinguished chairman, at last we have found something to agree on this evening. So I support his unanimous consent request. I just want to make note that I am not certain in paragraph 3 whether the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD amendment is 27 or 28. Do we know what that is?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. It would be No. 28 in the printed unanimous consent request. We completed No. 27.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, but I do ask the gentleman for clarification so that the Members will understand. By continuing on until 1 o'clock in the morning, the amendments as printed will come up in that particular order. Is that our understanding?

Mr. CALLAHAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I then withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that it is the Chair's understanding that the amendments will be considered in the order in which they appear in the bill.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 546 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4811.

□ 2245

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today,

a request for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) had been postponed and the bill was open for amendment from page 2, line 22, to page 3, line 17.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except pro forma amendments offered by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate and the following additional amendments, which may be offered only by the Member designated in the order of the House or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed or a designee, shall be considered read, shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question:

(1) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 60 minutes:

One of either the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 11 or the amendment numbered 15; and amendment by Ms. LEE, regarding child survival and disease program fund.

(2) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes:

The amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 28; and the amendment by Mr. PAYNE, regarding development assistance.

(3) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes:

One, one of either the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 5 or the amendment numbered 6; two, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, regarding conscription under the age of 18; and, three, the amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 18.

(4) The following additional amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes:

The amendment by Mr. BEREUTER regarding North Korea; Mr. BAKER regarding Panama; Mr. SMITH of Michigan regarding biotechnology research; Mr. BROWN of Ohio regarding child survival and disease program fund; Mr. BROWN of Ohio regarding the Tariff Act; Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding peacekeeping operations; Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding Economic Support Fund; Mr. Payne regarding Congo; Mr. PAYNE regarding sanctions against Angola; Mr. PAYNE regarding peacekeeping operations; Mr. PAYNE regarding Sudan; Mr. PAYNE regarding restrictions on assistance to governments destabilizing Angola; Mr. MENENDEZ regarding Peru; Mr. FILNER regarding Economic Support Fund; Mr. CONYERS regarding section 558; Mr. CAPUANO regarding Armenia-Azerbaijan peace and democracy initiative; Mr. CAPUANO regarding termination of unilateral agricultural or medical sanctions; Mr. NADLER regarding honor crimes; Mr. JACKSON of Illinois regarding the African Development Bank; Mr. LATHAM regarding international financial institution loans; Ms. KAPTUR regarding the Ukraine; Mr. SHERMAN regarding child survival; and the amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 7, 9, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Are there further amendments to this portion of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan and insurance programs (to be computed on an accrual basis), including hire of passenger motor vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $30,000 for official reception and representation expenses for members of the Board of Directors, $62,000,000: *Provided*, That necessary expenses (including special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the collection of moneys owed the Export-Import Bank, repossession or sale of pledged collateral or other assets acquired by the Export-Import Bank in satisfaction of moneys owed the Export-Import Bank, or the investigation or appraisal of any property, or the evaluation of the legal or technical aspects of any transaction for which an application for a loan, guarantee or insurance commitment has been made, shall be considered nonadministrative expenses for the purposes of this heading: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 117 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1992, subsection (a) thereof shall remain in effect until October 1, 2001.

OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

NONCREDIT ACCOUNT

The Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to make, without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by 31 U.S.C. 9104, such expenditures and commitments within the limits of funds available to it and in accordance with law as may be necessary: *Provided*, That the amount available for administrative expenses to carry out the credit and insurance programs (including an amount for official reception and representation expenses which shall not exceed $35,000) shall not exceed $37,000,000: *Provided further*, That project-specific transaction costs, including direct and indirect costs incurred in claims settlements, and other direct costs associated with services provided to specific investors or potential investors pursuant to section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall not be considered administrative expenses for the purposes of this heading.

PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, $24,000,000, as authorized by section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to be derived by transfer from the Overseas Private Investment Corporation noncredit account: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That such sums shall be available for direct loan obligations and loan guaranty commitments incurred or made during fiscal years 2001 and 2002: *Provided further*, That such sums shall remain available through fiscal year 2010 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal years 2001 and 2002: *Provided further*, That in addition, such sums as may be necessary for administrative expenses to carry out the credit program may be derived from amounts available for administrative expenses to carry out the credit and insurance programs in the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Noncredit Account and merged with said account: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading or in prior appropriations Acts that are available for the cost of financing under section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall be available for purposes of section 234(g) of such Act, to remain available until expended.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $46,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002.

TITLE II—BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

For expenses necessary to enable the President to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes, to remain available until September 30, 2001, unless otherwise specified herein, as follows:

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CHILD SURVIVAL AND DISEASE PROGRAMS FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapters 1 and 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, for child survival, basic education, assistance to combat tropical and other infectious diseases, and related activities, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, $834,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this amount shall be made available for such activities as: (1) immunization programs; (2) oral rehydration programs; (3) health and nutrition programs, and related education programs, which address the needs of mothers and children; (4) water and sanitation programs; (5) assistance for displaced and orphaned children; (6) programs for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, polio, malaria and other infectious diseases; and (7) basic education programs for children: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for nonproject assistance, except that funds may be made available for such assistance for ongoing health programs: *Provided further*, of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $125,000, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used to monitor and provide oversight of child survival, maternal health, and infectious disease programs: *Provided further*, That the following amounts should be allocated as follows: $290,000,000 for child survival and maternal health; $30,000,000 for vulnerable children; $202,000,000 for HIV/AIDS; $99,000,000 for other infectious diseases; $103,000,000 for children's basic education; and $110,000,000 for UNICEF: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, up to $37,500,000 may be made available for a United States contribution to the Global Fund for Children's Vaccines.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LEE:

Page 6, line 25, after the dollar amount insert (''increased by $42,000,000).

Page 7, line 21, after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $42,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $42,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 30 minutes on her amendment.

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

This amendment adds $40 million to the child survival and disease fund to the amounts allocated in that account for HIV/AIDS and really derives that funding from the FMF account.

Mr. Chairman, I had the privilege to be part of the official United States delegation at the 13th International Conference on AIDS in Durban, South Africa. I returned yesterday with an even more sense of urgency regarding the HIV/AIDS pandemic throughout the world and especially in sub-Saharan Africa. There are over 10,000 people in Durban, South Africa breaking the silence on HIV/AIDS about the devastation of the AIDS pandemic this week. Our United States delegation is led by our very able Surgeon General, Dr. Satcher, and Sandy Thurman, Director of the Office of National AIDS Policy.

Can you imagine that in several countries now, life expectancy has been reduced from 70 years of age to 30 years of age because of this killer disease? This means also that many 13-year-old girls and boys will not live beyond 30 years of age because they will die from AIDS. This also means that years of development and progress have been really wiped from the face of the earth.

Also, can you imagine now that there are over 12 million orphans in Africa? These children's fate lay unknown because their parents have died. And by the year 2010, there will be 40 million orphans in Africa. This is the number of children in America's public schools. Also, believe it or not, it is mind-boggling to know this, but in Durban, we talked about this and documented this and discussed this, that in many countries 20 to 38 percent of the country's populations have HIV/AIDS.

This further cripples Africa because it does move to threaten economic stability which is a security threat as well, not only in terms of African security but in terms of our own national security. Can you imagine that this is really only the beginning? It is only the tip of the iceberg. India has nearly 7 million people infected with HIV/AIDS. This epidemic is spreading and it is spreading very rapidly.

The conference in Durban, which is continuing this week, is really helping us break the silence with regard to the devastation of this pandemic. We must listen to what is coming out of that conference. We all have a sense of urgency about this, but many of us do not know what to do. But we do know that there is a state of emergency in sub-Saharan Africa.

So the administration requested $244 million, minimal request, for HIV/AIDS this year, and we only have $202 million in this budget request. All this amendment does is add $42 million to bring to the level of the administration's request the AIDS funding to address this pandemic. This is not nearly enough. The United Nations has estimated that we need approximately $3 billion a year just to begin with the crisis in sub-Saharan Africa. So, Mr. Chairman, adding $42 million to this account is a mere pittance.

I ask for your consideration. I ask for your real commitment to ensure that the United States of America goes on record tonight and passes this amendment to do the right thing and to send a message to the Durban conference and to those who are working so desperately to save lives in Africa that we are stepping up to our moral obligation, and we do want to restore this mere $42 million to our account.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

(Mrs. MEEK of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank my dear colleague who has spearheaded this strong effort for yielding this time.

As we are becoming a more global community, we must become more concerned about what is going on with our national borders as well as the people we know are now suffering from AIDS throughout this world. It just does not take very much unless you understand man's inhumanity to man to think that in a country as rich as ours we have not placed the amount of money on the prevention and treatment of AIDS as we should. Now it is reaching catastrophic dimensions and we must realize that it is now an epidemic that is an impediment to our national security.

A study by the National Security Council prepared in January projected that a quarter of South Africa's population is likely to die of AIDS. I have only 1 minute, 60 seconds' worth of distance run to say to you that to place money in an AIDS prevention and treatment program in Africa will be money well spent. If not, we are on a disastrous course. It is time now to place money where we can help man and his humanity.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for calling this special order to highlight the global HIV/AIDS epidemic.

As our world becomes more of a global community, we must become more concerned about what's going on beyond our national borders. As the Washington Post aptly described, the global spread of AIDS is reaching catastrophic dimensions and is now seen as a threat to our own national security.

A study by the National Security Council prepared in January projected that a quarter of southern Africa's population is likely to die of AIDS and that the number of people dying of the disease will rise for a decade before there is much prospect of improvement. Further, based on current trends, that disastrous course could be repeated, perhaps exceeded, in south Asia and the former Soviet Union.

50 million people—1% of the world's population—have become infected with HIV.

Sub-Saharan Africa has been by-far more severely affected by AIDs, than any other part of the world. Africans make up 10% of the worlds population, but nearly 70% of the worldwide total HIV/AIDS cases.

In many African countries 35% of all adults are infected with HIV/AIDS, and it is estimated that half of today's teenage population in parts of Africa will die of AIDS.

In Africa, as in the case throughout the world, young girls are most infected.

In a study of eleven African countries, the rate of infection in teenage girls was more than five times higher than in boys of the same age. Each day more than 15,000 people become infected. 1,600 of them are children, infected during or shortly after birth.

Infection rates in the Caribbean are also high.

There is an epidemic in Asia with more than 6 million people infected, and the potential for millions more.

Fortunately, we now have the opportunity for a much more effective response to the HIV epidemic.

We now know how to prevent the spread of HIV and provide care for those infected. The tools are complex and imperfect. But we know that when used correctly, these tools can help slow the epidemic, relieve suffering and enable millions of people to have additional years of quality life.

Yet, with opportunity comes responsibility and challenge. There are no more excuses. The millions who are infected and the hundreds of millions who are at risk will not forgive us if we do not take advantage of the opportunities for action that exist today.

No one constituency can act alone to change the face of this epidemic, and America must step up to play a leadership role in reducing the global spread of HIV/AIDS. Wherever there is inequity, conflict or lack of mutual respect, the virus feeds on our divisiveness.

It is distressing what is happening in the world with this pandemic, particularly when we have found interventions that work—interventions that can reduce HIV incidence by up to 80%.

Yet, we have not seen any systematic action to reduce the global spread of HIV/AIDS because all too often we have been shortsighted and refused to take action outside of our borders to help ease the suffering and loss of life which is taking place with respect to this pandemic in Africa and throughout the world.

This isolationists' mentality must stop. If America is to remain a global leader we ought to act like one and take the lead on helping to reduce the global spread of HIV/AIDS.

On this issue, we can't claim the high horse, and then take the low road.

More than ever, we need to unite with the nations of the world and exert our leadership in responding to the destruction to society that has been wrought by HIV.

Here at home, and throughout the world, the consequences of HIV/AIDS are clear, HIV affects more people than it infects. It makes

families poor as they try to meet the costs of health care and funerals: they become poorer as they cope with the loss of income following the death of a breadwinner.

Miami-Dade County, Florida has the third highest incidence of HIV/AIDS cases in the United States. With 24,000 reported AIDS cases, Miami-Dade County has more cases than all but four states. A disproportionate number of these cases tend to be comprised of racial or ethnic minorities.

With strong prevention initiatives, we have helped slow the rate of new HIV infections in the U.S. And, we have made widely available new medications and treatment to those who are infected.

As a world leader, we have a responsibility to help other nations reduce infections and treat those who are ill, and to act locally and globally toward a cure for this dreaded disease.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) seek to claim the time in opposition?

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. We have heard the information. We understand the ravages of this tremendous disease running rampant throughout the continent. And so we know what action is needed. We know that we need resources. We know that we need to add additional money so that there can be health education information, so that there can be medicine and supplies, and so that individuals who are greatly in need of assistance can receive it. I simply want to commend the gentlewoman for this amendment, pledge undying, unstinting support for it, and urge all Members of this House to vote in favor of the Lee amendment.

□ 2300

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment which would make a critical investment in combatting HIV-AIDS around the world. When one looks at the numbers, it is astonishing. More than 16.3 million people across the globe have died of AIDS. More than 33.6 million are currently living with the disease. Over the course of the year, approximately 5.6 million more people will become infected with AIDS.

This is a pandemic of immense proportions, and if we hold back on investing and finding solutions to the world's AIDS crisis now, there will be consequences, both domestically and internationally later on.

The AIDS crisis has disproportionately affected the developing world. Sub-Saharan Africa has been particularly hard hit. Already 13.7 million Africans have died of HIV-AIDS, leaving behind social and economic devastation that will affect the nature and pace of African development for years to come.

AIDS is hurting Africa. It is crippling Africa's viability as a destination for business. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the amendment of my colleague and friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), and I urge everyone to support this amendment, because it is really a moral issue that we are talking about tonight.

The devastation caused by this pandemic has been most severe in sub-Saharan Africa where over 23 million people are infected with HIV, and nearly 14 million Africans have already died from AIDS. This is indeed, my friends, a moral issue, and we have an obligation and a responsibility to heed the warning here.

The funding, $42 million, is not a cure-all for HIV-AIDS, but it is an urgent and necessary step in the right direction. This AIDS epidemic has also drastically decreased life expectancy in Africa, and I urge everyone within the sound of my voice to know that our children are being left as orphans because of the death of their parents.

I urge Members to support the Lee amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman for presenting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope we are listening. I really do hope that we are not going to close our eyes and turn our ears off and ignore this problem. Let us try to listen to this one more time. A total of 5.4 million people globally became newly infected with HIV in 1999. A total of 34.3 million people globally are living with HIV-AIDS.

We cannot sit here and allow this to happen without some kind of intervention. There have been a total of 18.8 million global AIDS-related deaths since the beginning of this epidemic. A total of 13.2 million children globally have become orphaned since the AIDS epidemic. There are 34.3 million adults and children living with AIDS in the world.

We have to act now. This is an emergency. Experience shows that the right approach, applied quickly enough with courage and resolve, can and does result in lower HIV infection rates and less suffering for those affected by this epidemic. An ever-growing AIDS epidemic is not inevitable; yet unless action against this epidemic is scaled up drastically, the damage is going to be done.

We have got to act now. We have got to eradicate this ugly disease. The time is now. It is urgent. Support my colleague's amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. As the only major power in the world and one that takes its moral responsibilities seriously, this is a small step, but one we must take. I also supported the Waters debt-relief amendment for the very same reason.

I found it offensive that the manager of this bill would suggest that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), or anyone else, was anti-Israel for supporting debt relief. I think that was factually incorrect, and this deficient foreign aid bill makes me think now it was designed in a way to try to drive wedges between people and divide us; and that should have no place on issues as serious as AIDS and debt relief.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the Waters amendment, and I am going to vote for the Lee amendment; and I am very seriously thinking that this bill ought to be defeated.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wonder, where is this compassion we often hear talked about? Compassion. You know, where I come from, they have this saying; they say that talk is cheap. Put your money where your mouth is.

When we talk about HIV-AIDS, we can talk about it and talk about how bad it is and talk about how awful it is, but you know what? That talk means nothing.

We need to put our money where our mouth is. Until we do that, we are doing nothing but whistling Dixie. It is time for us to reverse that, to understand that this world is much smaller than it was just 10 years ago. If you do not believe it, let us not put our money where our mouths are. You think the epidemic is over there; but you know what, there is a boomerang, and what goes around will come around.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, the Lee amendment deserves our enthusiastic support. This amendment provides $42 million for our effort against AIDS abroad. We can be thankful, Mr. Chairman, that many people in America today are living longer and more comfortable lives with AIDS. Not so in Africa. We can be grateful that the life expectancy of a person in the United

States afflicted by AIDS has increased significantly since this Nation began paying attention to this disease some 20 years ago. Not so in Africa.

AIDS has lowered the life expectancy in some places in Africa almost 20 years in just the last 10 years. In America, the number of new AIDS cases in recent years has declined, or at least has leveled off. Not so in Africa. In Africa, in some places, up to 35 percent of all adults are inflicted by the HIV-AIDS. The survival rate of women and children affected by AIDS in the United States is steadily increasing. Not so in Africa.

In some parts of Africa, half of all the pregnant women are infected, and 15 percent of the children have been left as orphans due to AIDS. Drug therapy in response to AIDS is almost $20,000 annually. There is no money to pay. In fact, they commit less than $10.

Every day, in Africa, more than 5,000 people die from AIDS—18 million lives have been lost to AIDS in Africa, in recent years.

AIDS in Africa, Mr. Chairman, has been declared to be a threat to this Nation's national security. AIDS in Africa undermines efforts to extend democracy. AIDS in Africa contributes to political instability and encourages civil wars. AIDS in Africa puts American citizens at risk who may be there for business, military, diplomatic or other purposes. AIDS in Africa is a menace to America.

In recent years, the introduction of newer and more effective therapies, on the whole, has led to dramatic reductions in mortality and morbidity and an increase in the number of people living with HIV/AIDS. This progress has been due, in large part, to the fact that funding in the United States for research, prevention, care and treatment has multiplied, from a few hundred thousand dollars twenty years ago to $6 billion in the fiscal year.

In Africa, funding programs for the prevention and research for AIDS and HIV have fallen far short. The Lee amendment, in a very modest way, seeks to bring some balance to that imbalance.

Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, there is no vaccine or medication that will cure AIDS. Yet, as the Washington Post indicated today, there is hope due to a new tests. And, we know that through intervention, we can, and we have, caused effective prevention of the spread of AIDS.

By preventing the spread of AIDS, we have reduced the demand for care services. And, consequently, we have reduce the costs associated with AIDS.

We are making progress in America. Not so in Africa. Support the Lee amendment. The women, the children, the people of Africa are worthy of our support.

□ 2310

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Los Angeles, California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I am amazed that we have spent so much time on the Africa Trade bill talking about how we want to be involved with trade in Africa. In South Africa, we have spent years getting rid of apartheid. We have worked hard to make sure that we give democracy a chance in Africa.

But what good is all of this if, in fact, we do not recognize that HIV/AIDS is devastating Africa? I just spoke with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) who just returned from Botswana; a beautiful infrastructure is that country. However, they are about to be wiped out because of the way that AIDS is ravaging that small country.

The same thing is true in South Africa. What good does it do to have done all of that work to talk about getting rid of an apartheid government, to have a new opportunity here for housing and for health and for all of those things that we have fought for for so many years, when we have AIDS run amok.

This country cannot, cannot in good faith talk about wanting to have a relationship with Africa and South Africa, which it has embraced and all of these other nations, and ignore the fact that AIDS is ravishing this continent.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask everyone to support this amendment. This is a very mild amendment. As a matter of fact, the amount of dollars that are being asked for is insignificant, almost. So I cannot understand why anyone would be opposed to supporting this amendment. I believe there is $42 million in this amendment. We are spending more money than that on giveaways, practically, in the budget, throughout the budget of the United States.

So I would ask my colleagues, please, please allow us to leave this floor this evening with some renewed faith in our ability to have just a little bit of a conscience as it relates to the continent.

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her extraordinary leadership on this global AIDS issue.

Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues know, this past week the world's leading experts on HIV/AIDS gathered in Durbin, South Africa for the 13th International HIV/AIDS Conference. The participants shared their knowledge and attempted to find solutions to the challenges of prevention, affordable treatment, and eventually a cure for HIV/AIDS. We must do our part in this country to respond to what has truly become a global crisis.

Mr. Chairman, when those experts met in Durbin, South Africa, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) was there, and she is here tonight, less than 36 hours since her arrival in this country; she is here tonight leading the way. The world is finally waking up to the scope and seriousness of the HIV/AIDS problem, as more resources are devoted to expanding the infrastructure to fight the disease. It would be a serious blow if the United States did not live up to its commitments at this time. Again, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is here to lead the way in that regard.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to commending my colleague, I want to introduce into the RECORD a USAID report project which projects a dramatic increase in AIDS orphans. Over the next 10 years, there will be more than 30 million orphans because their parents will die of AIDS. This represents a dramatic increase.

How many more parents have to die? How many more children have to become orphaned? Many of those children, HIV-infected themselves. How many more children will have to die before we wake up to an appropriate, appropriate response to AIDS?

This increase that the gentlewoman is proposing brings what is in the bill up to the President's request of $244 million. Frankly, it is the least we can do. It is certainly not enough, but it is a good start for us. USAID will use these additional funds for education, prevention and interventions to reduce mother-to-child transmissions. Funding will be used to aid countries to establish their own HIV interventions.

I commend the gentlewoman for her leadership and I urge my colleagues to support her amendment.

USAID REPORT PROJECTS DRAMATIC INCREASE IN AIDS ORPHANS

DURBAN, SOUTH AFRICA.—The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) today released the executive summary of Children on the Brink 2000, a study of AIDS orphans across the globe. The study finds that by 2010, at least 44 million children will have lost one or both parents to all causes in the 34 countries most severely affected by the AIDS pandemic.

Of these 44 million orphans, 68 percent of their parents will die of AIDS. This represents a dramatic increase from 1990, when AIDS accounted for 16.4 percent of parental deaths. Orphans are distributed among world areas in the same patterns as HIV-prevalence, so that countries with the highest infection levels usually have the highest orphan rates.

The orphan crisis is most acute in sub-Saharan Africa. In at least eight countries in this region, between 20 and 35 percent of children under 15 have lost one or both parents. By 2010, 11 countries will reach this rate.

Children on the Brink 2000 finds that with few exceptions the number of children being orphaned will accelerate through at least 2010. In many countries, the proportion of orphaned children will remain exceptionally high until 2020 or 2030.

One country studied was Zambia. Children on the Brink 2000 finds that in Zambia, currently 27.4 percent, or 1.2 million children, who are under age 15, are orphans. Chronic malnutrition is widespread. Orphan caregivers are predominantly poor women. Children in these households are significantly more disadvantaged than children in two-parent families, largely because women have less access to property and employment. Female-headed households are larger and poorer than male-headed households in all regions.

The executive summary of Children on the Brink 2000 was released at a USAID press conference at the XIII International AIDS Conference in Durban, South Africa.

Since 1986, USAID has dedicated over $1.4 billion dollars for the prevention and mitigation of this epidemic in the developing world. USAID's HIV/AIDS budget of $200 million for 2000 is four times as great as the

next-largest donor's budget. USAID is working in 46 of the hardest hit countries around the world. Nearly 70 percent of USAID's HIV/AIDS program assistance goes to small nongovernmental organizations that have direct connections to the poorest of the poor and those most vulnerable to infection.

Children on the Brink 2000 updates USAID's 1997 report on orphans, and provides estimates of the number of orphans in 34 developing nations, as well as offering strategies to support children affected by HIV/AIDS worldwide. The original report included the first international orphan estimates published since 1990 and contributed to a growing sense of urgency about the impact of HIV/AIDS, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. The complete Children on the Brink 2000 will be released this fall.

Children on the Brink 2000 presents new orphan estimates for the 23 countries studied in the 1997 report, as well as 11 additional developing countries. The report also provides a summary of new statistics on the HIV/AIDS pandemic; new programming recommendations for children, families, communities, and governments; and an updated overview of actions taken by international organizations to assist families and children affected by HIV/AIDS.

The executive summary of Children on the Brink 2000 is available at www.usaid.gov.

The U.S. Agency for International Development is the U.S. government agency that provides development and humanitarian assistance worldwide.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time and for bringing this important issue to the floor of the House.

We have made a substantial amount of progress in our country in dealing with AIDS and HIV. Unfortunately, that same kind of progress has not been evident in Africa where 10 percent of the world's population resides, but nearly 70 percent of the worldwide total infected AIDS cases exist.

A number of countries in Africa are beginning to make progress such as Senegal and Uganda, and we need to do what we can in this country to assist in meeting this crisis, not only here in our country, but worldwide. I cannot think of any other issue that is more important to address than the HIV/AIDS crisis in the world. Therefore, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership. Mr. Chairman, $42 million. Juxtapose that against the $82 million, only 16 percent of what the administration asked for, to relieve the burden of debt on these countries so that they could at least deal with this travesty of AIDS.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) just came back from South Africa and she has been on this mission for a long time, and I have joined her, along with many other Members. We were in Africa just about a year ago. Tell me if my colleagues have ever experienced going into a hut, that is right, and seeing a 4-year-old being the only person able to care for dying relatives. Cleaning up the excrements, providing the medicine, helping them to the rest room, if you will. Dying babies being held in one's arms. Families burying six members of their family at a time. Have my colleagues ever lived through a pandemic or a dying Nation or continent? That is what we are talking about.

For us to be on this floor tonight in the most prosperous times, when the gentleman from Alabama indicated that we merely would be missing a Sunday newspaper if we did not provide debt relief or, in this instance, maybe a candy bar if we put $42 million against a nation of 200 million plus people in the United States of America. How can we reject the opportunity to provide funds to eliminate 4-year-olds taking care of dying relatives. It is an outrage that we even have to diminish the request to this amount.

Mr. Chairman, I would only say to my colleagues, when they begin to talk about a tragedy of this size, they are beginning to talk about a continent that not withstands this attack, but falls to this attack. We cannot do any less than to support the amendment of the gentlewoman from California and stand up against this terrible tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment by my democratic colleague Representative BARBARA LEE from California in an amendment to H.R. 4811, the Foreign Appropriations bill before this body. This amendment if adopted would make an additional $100 million available to the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund.

HIV/AIDS has been declared the world's deadliest disease by the World Health Organization. HIV/AIDS has become a plague on the Continent of Africa of biblical proportions by claiming over 18 million lives in recent decades. This crisis is having a direct impact on the future viability of many sub-Saharan African communities. For this reason, I am joining Congresswoman LEE of California in support of additional funding for the World Bank's effort to fight the spread of the deadly HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa.

This amendment would fund the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund at $100 million. This will allow the trust fund to distribute additional resources through directed grants so that an effect response can be mounted against the HIV/AIDS tragedy, which is being played out in too many African nations.

According to the UNAIDS Update report released last week on HIV/AIDS infected rates in many countries up to 35 percent of all adults are infected with the disease. The report also estimates that half of today's teenage population in parts of Africa will perish from HIV/AIDS. The most vulnerable group being affected by HIV/AIDS is the women of Africa; their infection rate is far greater than males. About 55 percent of all adults living with HIV are women, and this rate is expected to continue to rise in countries where poverty, poor health systems, and limited resources for prevention and care are present. What fuels the spread of this disease or any disease is ignorance, misinformation, cultural practices, passivity on the part of leaders, neglect on the part of those nations with resources that if engaged would make a difference in the fight to win out over the disease.

I would like to commend Congresswoman LEE for her efforts to offer a clear perspective on the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa. She recently returned from Durban, South Africa, after participating in AIDS 2000, which was the 13th International AIDS conference.

Now, more than ever, the leadership of the United States is needed in order to avert a tragedy on the Continent of Africa. Therefore, I implore my fellow colleagues of the House to seriously reconsider the level of funding that has been appropriated for this critical area. It is critical that we join efforts to support the comprehensive, bipartisan World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund to address this crisis.

Many people have asked why this is important to the United States. I reiterate that aside from the humanitarian perspective, the CIA has issued a report that declares HIV/AIDS a threat to our national security. HIV/AIDS undermines democracy and progress in many African nations and the developing world. Left to its own course HIV/AIDS will lead to political instability and may result in civil wars, which may affect the global balance of power as well as economic viability of many African nations. In many of these instances, our military service personnel may be pressed into to service in order to defend American interest in any attempt to bring stability to those nation's that decline into civil strife because of the ravages of HIV/AIDS. HIV/AIDS like any plague cannot be contained in any specific geographical area it will roll across borders of the rich and poor nations alike. Unfortunately, when this dreaded disease came to our shores many felt that it was a calamity for gay people, drug users but AIDS knows no boundaries. With globalization, we also must be conscious of the potential for AIDS and other infectious diseases to be carried across borders.

Now is the time for this body to act to remove the threat of AIDS from our global community. Therefore, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for going to the International AIDS Conference representing the United States.

At this crucial time in this country, the world is looking at what we are doing here in the United States, and they are wondering, what is our position on AIDS and HIV. I would like to have a colloquy for a moment with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS). I know that other countries are providing treatment, they are providing drugs. Why are we, the most powerful country in the world, who stand on the Bible and believe and talk all the time about to whom God has given much, much is expected, and we have some obligation as leaders in the world, where are we on this crucial issue of AIDS and HIV?

□ 2320

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

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for yielding to me.

As we look at what the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is doing and the tremendous work she is putting into this international AIDS crisis, tonight there is a category called Child Survival and Disease Program Fund in the budget for $202 million, and she is adding to that fund so perhaps just one or two more babies will have medicine, one or two more children may be able to survive HIV or full-blown AIDS, even.

Let me just say that what we are doing is minuscule. It is not nearly enough. We need to do more. That is why we have to take up all of this time on the floor to beat everybody across the head on this issue, and not let this epidemic continue in the way that it is doing. We have to keep pushing this issue, keep pushing the envelope, because we have not even begun to do what we should be doing.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the information fact sheet about AIDS in Africa.

AIDS IN AFRICA—FACT SHEET

Today there are 34 million people living with HIV and AIDS.

Sub-Saharan Africa has been far more severely affected by AIDS than any other part of the world.

Africans make up about 10% of the world's population but nearly 70% of the worldwide total of infected people.

An estimated 18 million Africans have lost their lives to AIDS.

2.8 million people died of AIDS in 1999, 85% of them in Africa.

The overall rate of infection among adults in sub-Saharan Africa is about 8.6% compared with a 1.1% infection rate worldwide.

20% of people in South Africa are infected with HIV and the rate has reached 35.8% in Botswana.

5.4 million new AIDS infections in 1999, 4 million of them in Africa.

An estimated 600,000 African infants become infected with HIV each year through mother to child transmission.

An estimated 8 million African children have lost their mother or both parents to AIDS.

It is estimated that within the next decade more than 40 million children will be orphaned in developing countries.

Some have estimated that approximately half of all today's 15-year-olds in the worst affected sub-Saharan countries will die of AIDS.

Community awareness has had some success, particularly in Senegal and Uganda where the rate of infection has been cut in half.

Aside from Africa, India has more infected people than any other nation, more than 3.5 million.

A 1999 South African study found that the total costs of employee benefits in that country will increase from 7 percent of salaries in 1995 to 19 percent by 2005 due to AIDS.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding time to me.

I would also like to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the extraordinary leadership she has provided in this measure, as well as my colleagues in the Republican party who have come forward and demonstrated how they feel with reference to this issue.

Of course, people like the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and countless others have been here for us, as well as all of the women of this House, providing the kind of leadership that we need in an effort to speak out about these matters.

Please know this, that what we are failing to do is to assist a continent of people who, in the final analysis, are finding their life expectancy, according to reports in today's New York Times, reduced to 30 years of age.

Ron Dellums, who the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) replaced in Congress, spoke often to this House with passion regarding this issue, and now finds himself involved in this issue, trying to avoid, ultimately, the death in the next 5 years of 35 million people.

Research and development is needed to rid this scourge in Africa and America. Please support this measure.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, as so many speakers before me have said, it is a shame that we are not providing more. Thirty-four million people in Africa with HIV, and even if we pass this amendment, that is less than $10 per infected person, less than $10 per person who will probably lose their lives.

After we consider this amendment, I will call up an amendment that will add another $10 million to this program, and shame on me that that amendment is not larger.

We should be doing a lot more. This is a national security problem for not only Africa but for the entire world. This is a continent with 34 million infected people, most of whom do not know that they are infected, that figure comes only from estimation, so they could end up infecting others.

This is not just a problem in Africa, this is a likely disease that will mutate and spread to various places around the world. We should do more.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

Mr. Chairman, the horror that we are dealing with is so unspeakable that it is literally very difficult to imagine the extent of what is going on, but let us try for a moment.

In at least eight countries in sub-Saharan Africa, between 20 and 35 percent of children under 15 have lost one or both parents. Let us stop and think what that would mean to our hometowns or our State. One-third of the children under 15 have already lost one or both parents.

I think after all is said and done, what we are learning tonight is that we live in one world, and whether we like it or not, we cannot ignore the horrendous suffering that is going on in Africa. Our souls will be tarnished if we do not respond, and ultimately, mark my words, it will become a national issue, as well.

We live in one world. We have got to respond. We should support this amendment, and do a lot more than that.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, let me rise in strong support of this amendment, and commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and those who have worked with her, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. CHRISTENSEN).

Let me also admire the work of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who has for many years been there fighting for the right causes.

Mr. Chairman, about 8 years ago I started to discuss the problem of HIV-AIDS with President Museveni. At that time he was totally opposed to any kind of prevention programs, especially the use of preventative things. We talked about that. He finally decided that he would move to having prevention and education. Now in Uganda we have seen it level off. If we put in the correct amount of funds, we will be able to put a moratorium and start to win the battle.

A week ago on Wednesday I was in Gaborone in Botswana. I met with President Festus Mohae. His whole discussion at our meeting a week ago was simply about the HIV-AIDS virus. He said that his life expectancy in his country was 71. Two years from now the life expectancy in Botswana will be at 39, they have lost that much. In about 5 years from now, there will be a minus population growth in the country of Botswana.

We can no longer sit by and watch the world die. Let us pass this amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues, in this country today we have a societal condition of grandparents raising grandchildren. Imagine the situation that exists in Africa, where we have grandparents raising as many as 35 grandchildren.

The condition of AIDS in Africa is a security risk. It is an economic issue. It is a workforce issue. It is a global issue. We as a country must step up to the plate and take care of the children of Africa. They, too, are our own children.

That epidemic, that disease, can spread worldwide. Next year we will be talking about AIDS in every other country, because we travel so frequently together.

Let us resolve this issue. Let us take care of the children. Let us take care of our families, as well, and support this amendment.

□ 2330

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that we in the United States have nearly a million people suffering with HIV/AIDS at the moment. We spend something over $10 billion every single year on this issue, and that averages out to well over $10,000 per person in what we do here in this country in relation to AIDS. In Africa, the amendment that is being offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the amendment by itself would involve $2 per person of the roughly 25 million people now suffering from HIV/AIDS, 20 percent in a country like South Africa, as high as 35 percent of the population in Botswana.

It is a very small, a very small pittance for us to contribute to dealing with the AIDS pandemic around this world. We should adopt the amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to first thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for her extraordinary leadership on this issue and also for her support consistently and constantly on helping us really raise the level of awareness on the HIV/AIDS crisis here in the United States Congress, and also to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. CHRISTENSEN), to all of the Members who spoke here tonight.

I want to pay a special recognition and tribute to my former boss and predecessor Congressman Ron Dellums who often has been the lone voice in the wilderness speaking about this pandemic in Africa.

Finally, I believe we are breaking the silence here in the United States Congress. I want to thank all of my colleagues for engaging in the debate tonight. I believe many of you read the incredible series of articles that was in The Washington Post last week. These articles demonstrated and documented the fact that we knew as early in the 1990s that the potential for this pandemic in Africa was going to be so great, we chose to put our heads in the sand on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, it is chilling to think that we have not done much of anything in the last 10 years, so tonight we are just asking for a mere $42 million, that is it. We heard the arguments for that. I implore and plead with the other side to please join us in a bipartisan effort and restore $42 million to the budget.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and simply want to say that I think that the committee has been most understanding. In response to many requests that I received from many of those that spoke tonight, we have increased this year's assistance to HIV/AIDS problems from $175 million to $212 million, an 18 percent increase.

Mr. Chairman, I just do not want my colleagues to think that I have ignored their plights and their pleas when they came to me hearing the message. In addition to that, I spent last week in Africa talking to some of the political leaders there, and I recognize fully especially in Africa the tremendous problem with HIV/AIDS. And if, indeed, we reach a stage in this process of the conference committee, as I have told the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) with respect to the HIPC problem, if we reach a stage where additional allocations are given to us, certainly we would request this, but to take it out of the FMF program we think is not proper.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go through that debate again, but I might remind my colleagues that now we are, if we adopt the Waters amendment and we adopt the gentlewoman's amendment, then we will be into the Middle East portion of the FMF, but I hope that we do not do that. I hope that it is better resolved to your satisfaction at some other point in the process. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a no vote.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 546, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) will be postponed.

Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT–AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CHILD SURVIVAL AND DISEASE PROGRAM FUND'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $40,000,000)'' and in the fifth proviso after the fourth dollar amount (relating to other infectious diseases) insert ''(increased by $40,000,000)''.

In title IV of the bill under the heading ''MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT–CONTRIBUTION TO THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND'', after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $40,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of earlier today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) will be recognized for 5 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the threat of tuberculosis is spreading rapidly through the developing world. TB is the greatest infectious killer of adults worldwide. It is the biggest killer of young women. It kills 2 million people per year. Over more than 1,000 people in India die everyday. TB hit an all time high in 1999 with 8 million new cases, 95 percent in developing countries.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for their good work in increasing the appropriations to tuberculosis in the last 3 years up to $60 million.

Our amendment asks for an additional $40 million added to the other infectious diseases component of the Child Survival and Diseases Program. This increase is meant specifically for TB control efforts. This level of spending for health is much lower than any other multilateral development bank despite the fact that the majority of deaths globally from TB and childhood infectious diseases occur in Asia, that is why we are taking dollars from the Asia Development Bank, which does not meet its mission to save the poor, in order to fund a program that will absolutely save millions of lives and preserve communities in the best interests of Asia, in the best interests of Africa, and in the best interests of Latin America, and only in the best interests of the United States where TB is becoming a more and more serious problem.

Gro Bruntland, the director general of the World Health Organization has said that tuberculosis is not a medical issue, it is a political issue. Getting Americans engaged in an international medical issue like tuberculosis, even when addressing that issue serves our best interests as a Nation is an uphill battle.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity to save millions of lives now and prevent millions of needless deaths in the future. We are asking for $40 million from the Asia Development Bank, a bank that has not done well at serving the poor, and we can clearly save thousands and thousands of lives by upping our contribution to the world TB effort, according to the requests of the World Health Organization of $100 million.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not seek time at this point, but I rise in opposition to the amendment and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), who was the cosponsor and the cowriter of this amendment last year when the chairman helped us increase tuberculosis spending $5 million more.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for yielding me the time and thank the gentleman for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to extend my thanks to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the committee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the work they have done in raising the amount for tuberculosis. This is really very important.

Mr. Chairman, TB kills more women than any single cause of maternal mortality, and it is the biggest killer of people with AIDS which was just recently discussed. It accounts for 40 percent or more of all AIDS deaths in Africa and in Asia. I could go on and on with what is happening in the developing world in terms of attacking its victims in their most productive years, medical costs rising, families that are dissipated, children that are put to work, lack of educational opportunities.

According to the WHO, recent studies in India found that 100,000 women are rejected by their family because of TB every year.

□ 2340

Because there is no way to stop TB at national borders, the only way to eliminate it here in the United States is to control it worldwide, especially in nations with the greatest burden. It is not a matter of doing just what is right; it is a matter of doing what is smart. A single case of drug-resistant TB can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to treat in the United States. Let us ratchet the amount up.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment to increase funding for global TB control because, although we have a cheap, effective treatment for TB, the tragic fact is TB will kill more people this year than any year in history—someone every 15 seconds.

TB is the biggest infectious killer of young women in the world. In fact, TB kills more women than any single cause of maternal mortality. TB is the biggest killer of people with AIDS—accounting for 40 percent or more of all AIDS deaths in Africa and Asia.

In the developing world, tuberculosis also destroys girls' and women's futures. TB tends to attack its victims in their most productive years, often killing or sickening the primary breadwinner of a family. In order to pay for medical costs and generate income, families frequently take their young girls out of school and put them to work. TB means the loss of educational opportunity for girls. It means dire poverty for families.

In some parts of the world there is a great stigma attached to contracting TB. This leads to increased isolation, abandonment and divorce of women. According to WHO, recent studies on India found that 100,000 women are rejected by their families because of TB every year. In Nepal, there are numerous stories of young widows with no income and no prospects for another marriage turning to prostitution in order to support their families. Currently an estimated one third of the world's population including some 10–15 million people in the United States are infected with the TB bacteria. Because there is no way to stop TB at national borders, the only way to eliminate TB here in the U.S. is to control it worldwide, especially in nations with the greatest TB burden.

The real tragedy is that effective TB treatment—with drugs costing as little as $10 for a full 6 month course—is only reaching 20 percent of those ill with TB.

It is crucial that we act aggressively now to expand access to this cost-effective treatment and thereby control the spread of TB worldwide. There is only a small window of opportunity available to us to do so. If we fail to act now, resistant strains of TB will continue to develop which will be incredibly costly and possibly even impossible to treat.

I want to acknowledge and thank the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, especially Chairman CALLAHAN and Ranking Member PELOSI, for their efforts this year and over the past several years to give TB greater priority. I stand here today because I believe we need to ratchet up that effort even more, to go even further. $100 million is needed to help jumpstart effective control programs globally.

This is not just a matter of doing what is right, it is a matter of doing what is smart—a single case of drug resistant TB can cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to treat in the U.S. We must invest now in preventing and treating TB worldwide or we will pay the price later in lives and dollars if we fail to do so.

I urge support of this amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), who is the co-author of this amendment; and I thank her for the good work that she has done.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for his leadership on this public health issue and also the chairman of the committee for increasing the investment in TB in this bill over the last 4 years from really nothing to $60 million.

Tuberculosis is back with a vengeance, and it is back with drug-resistant strains that are affecting parts of the world where it was thought to be under control.

In March of this year, there was an outbreak of resistant tuberculosis in Toronto, Canada; in Germany; in Denmark; in Mexico; in Italy; in Puerto Rico. Drug-resistant TB is on the rise, and we are not immune to it here in the United States.

I am one of those who believes it is better to play offense than defense when it comes to public health issues, if one has got a good offense to play. We have a very limited window of opportunity to attack TB with a proven public health strategy abroad where resistant TB is growing.

The reason the resistant TB is growing is because of inconsistent and inadequate treatment. But a treatment does exist. It is called DOTSC. That means Directly Observed Treatment Short Course. If we invest in it now, we can treat TB when it first shows up so that those resistant strains do not have an opportunity to grow. We will not be faced with a huge and very expensive epidemic worldwide and in the United States.

It costs between $11 and $20 to treat a case of TB that is not resistant. It costs about $250,000 to treat drug-resistant TB. In the early 1990s, there was an outbreak in New York City that cost $1 billion to suppress it, and half of the people affected with it died.

Let us do the right thing from a public health point of view. Let us invest in this while the window of opportunity was there and reduce the cost over the long term.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) insist on his point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. No, I do not insist on the point of order, but I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am almost surprised at the fact that the gentleman brought this amendment to the House. In response to his request and to the request of many of my colleagues, we have increased this fund from $12 million to $55 million, a fourfold increase in response to the recognition of the problem.

While I know that they have serious concerns about tuberculosis; we all do. The very fact that we have quadrupled the aid in just 2 years is amazing to me that they still insist upon bringing an amendment to reconstruct our bill.

We have constructed this bill to the best of our ability, providing as much as we can afford to provide to every need that has been presented to this committee. So I would respectfully request that the gentleman withdraw his amendment; and if he does that, I will agree to work in conference to conceivably get it increased if we receive a higher allocation. I offered him that, and yet he seems to reject that offer. So if he wants me to remove that offer, I will be happy to do it. But I would respectfully request that he withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I am happy to yield briefly to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, before withdrawing the amendment, if I could, I would like to ask, and I will do that and appreciate the good words and the good work already that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has done in the last 3 years. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman Callahan) if he would yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), who was in his office and hurried over and would like to say a few words on this issue if he could get some time from the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN). I unfortunately used my time, but I will withdraw the amendment after that if that is possible.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

(Mr. GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues, and I appreciate the work of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. This is money well spent, because if we do not deal with tuberculosis nationwide, literally in Texas, we are seeing it cross our border. So I thank the subcommittee for their work.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, which I am pleased to have cosponsored along with SHERROD BROWN and Representatives HEATHER WILSON and CONNIE MORELLA.

Seven years ago, the World Health Organization declared Tuberculosis to be a global emergency.

TB is an emergency in Africa—in Asia—in Latin America—in the Caribbean. TB could soon be an emergency in the United States.

No area has been more harmed by the epidemic than Asia. In the past ten years there have been over 35 million cases in South and South-East Asia.

In East Asia and the Pacific there have been over 21 million cases.

In India, over 1.8 million new cases are diagnosed each year. In China, 1.4 million. In Bangladesh, half a million.

While the majority of Tuberculosis cases are found overseas, this is disease that could be passed on to you . . . or to anyone in your family.

TB is highly contagious and spreads just like the common cold—through hand-shaking, coughing, or contact.

With the increase in international travel we are seeing more and more cases of TB right here in North America—and those cases will continue to increase unless we act now.

Our amendment increases funding for TB control by $40 million. Much, much more is needed but to comply with budget rules we are only proposing a $40 million boost.

Our amendment is offset by reducing funding to the Asian Development Bank by an equal amount.

The Asian Development Bank has not been effective. Its lending for health has averaged just 1.5% of total lending annually from 1978–1998.

This level of lending for health is much lower than any other multilateral development bank despite the fact that the majority of deaths globally from TB and many childhood infectious diseases occur in Asia.

While the amount of its lending for the health sector has increased since 1978, the proportion of total lending devoted to health has stayed the same at about 1.5%.

This low number cannot be accounted for simply because the Bank does not make low-interest loans to India or China while, for instance, the World Bank has.

Even excluding China and India, World Bank lending for health in Asia and the Pacific in 1996 was 7.3% of lending, more than 4 times the Asian Development Bank's lending.

The $40 million we are taking away from the Asian Development Bank is better spent combating the adverse economic impacts of TB.

TB has had a devastating social and economic impact on Asia and other regions.

Because patients lose an average of 3 to 4 working months a year, they lose 20 to 30 percent of the family's income.

Seventy five percent of TB infections and deaths are people between the ages of 15 and 54—most of them workers.

In India, the annual cost to that nation's economy is $3 billion. About 70% of households went into debt because of health care bills related to TB.

This is not surprising when you consider that, in India, the cost to patients for treatment is about $125 U.S. dollars, more than half the annual income of a daily wage laborer.

By using this $40 million to combat TB we will keep hundreds of thousands of folks working and that has a direct impact on Asia's economy—an impact that cannot be matched by the Asian Development Bank.

We need to battle TB abroad because it is appearing on our borders.

That's a sound investment—and one we should all support.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I do want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his tireless leadership on this issue. The challenge of tuberculosis is a great one throughout the world, not unrelated to AIDS. Many people with HIV die of tuberculosis.

But I do want to commend the chairman because he has responded at least two times that I am aware of to the appeal for increases last year and in the committee accepted my amendment for the increase to the point that we are now.

The gentleman is a man of his word. If he says that he is going to help in conference, then the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) has already graciously agreed to withdraw.

So I look forward to working with the gentleman from Alabama on that. I commend the gentleman for his leadership and acknowledge the strong bipartisan support and commend all of the cosponsors on this legislation. It is very important to all of us.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHERMAN:

Page 6, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 7, line 21, after the dollar amount for HIV/AIDS insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 23, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of earlier today, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and a Member opposed each will be recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am presenting this amendment on behalf of myself and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). This entire bill is woefully underfunded. We should be adding several billions to this bill, perhaps many billions to this bill. But within the scope of the bill as presented, all we can do is move money from one part of the bill to another. That is an important task, because there are parts of this bill that are more in need of funding than others.

As explained by the speeches for the last hour, the most important part of this bill is the funding for AIDS. With some 34 million people in Africa, with over 10 million people in South Asia and Southeast Asia stricken with HIV, we need to do more, not just the $202 million provided in the bill, not just the $242 million which will be available if the Pelosi-Lee amendment is passed, but we need to do all we can.

This amendment will increase the amount for AIDS by an additional $10 million. That is still not even $10 for every infected person in the continent of Africa, let alone less than $5 for each infected person on the face of the earth.

The question is not why is it important to provide more funds to combat AIDS, but where do we get those funds?

This bill, this amendment takes those funds from the allocation from the World Bank and more particularly from IDA. Now, IDA is a good program of the World Bank, but it is not as important as dealing with AIDS. Just as important, those of us who are concerned with promoting foreign aid in this country have to make sure that the foreign aid we appropriate is consistent with American values.

Last month, the World Bank loaned $231 million to Iran, while ignoring the fact that Iran would jail 10 Jewish citizens just because of their religion, hence a desire, a need to transfer $10 million. Not only that, but I talked to the President of the World Bank today who was unable to assure me that the funds appropriated in this bill would not be lent to Sudan, Afghanistan. The funds provided to IDA in this bill can be lent to any corrupt government anywhere in the world. That is why it is better to spend the money through American agencies fighting AIDS.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) claim the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is rather ironic, here we have the HIV program in need, and IDA is also in need. I know that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking member on our subcommittee, has been such a strong proponent of IDA. I am just wondering if she is going to object to this.

□ 2350

In any event, I think with the same argument I have used on every amendment, there is nothing wrong with the destination the gentleman is seeking, I just think this attempt to restructure and to reallocate the monies that we have been working on for 6 months to try to fairly distribute under the limitation of the allocation given to us, in my opinion, is wrong. It could cause an avalanche of problems, and then we start going back and we start taking money from one program which is doing a great deal of good, to give it to another program to do a great deal of good.

So while I know that the gentleman's intentions are noble and I respect that, I know that the needs of the HIV/AIDS problem is great, at the same time, at this point, I would urge my colleagues to object to the amendment, or vote ''no'' on the amendment, because of the restructuring argument that I presented earlier.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out that the World Bank does do some good, but it also does substantial harm when it loans American money to Iran at this time and when it is possible that it would loan American money to Sudan or Afghanistan at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I think it needs to be pointed out that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has put $834 million into the Child Survival and Disease program, and it is a significant increase, but the explosion of AIDS certainly makes it an issue that requires more attention.

We know that there is very little being done in the area of shelters, of helping those people who have the disease to get a longer and a higher quality of life. Much of the focus has been on prevention, and surely much of the focus should be on prevention. But for those who have it, those who have the ''slims,'' as they call it in Africa, need to be helped through their terrible ordeal, and there is much more that we could be doing to help in that way.

I commend my friend for offering the amendment. I am glad to be one of the cosponsors, but, again, I do think it should be underscored there is $834 million in here for child survival and diseases. This is a tweak, but it is an important tweak.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and perhaps I can respond quickly to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

I am a proponent of the International Development Fund, IDA, and I am also a supporter of the measure that is being offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN). Ultimately, what it boils down to is that we have budgetary constraints that we have created in a time of prosperity. And in all fairness, if we had sufficient motivation, I believe that we would come up with the necessary funds.

Thus, we are going to not only have in this appropriation measure, but in countless numbers of other amendments and other appropriations yet to be done and ones that have passed, offsets that are required that pit one program against another. No one can argue that I am not for IDA, and no one can argue that I am not against the spread of AIDS not only in Africa but throughout the world.

Let me give some more statistics. HIV/AIDS infects more than 10 million children worldwide. Africa is most affected by the disease, with 70 percent of the world's 34 million HIV infected people. In Botswana, for example, a third of all girls and 16 percent of all boys are infected with HIV. In South Africa, 25 percent of all girls and 11 percent of all boys are infected. Furthermore, they do not educate our children on how to protect themselves.

We should support this measure and we should be prepared to support others with offsets.

The CHAIRMAN. Time of the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) has expired. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Has all time expired on the other side?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to rise once again in opposition to the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106, and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, title V of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–533) and the provisions of section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, $1,258,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2002: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, up to $10,000,000 may be made available for and apportioned directly to the Inter-American Foundation: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, up to $16,000,000 may be made available for the African Development Foundation and shall be apportioned directly to that agency: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this Act nor any unobligated balances from prior appropriations may be made available to any organization or program which, as determined by the President of the United States, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions; and that in order to reduce reliance on abortion in developing nations, funds shall be available only to voluntary family planning projects which offer, either directly or through referral to, or information about access to, a broad range of family planning methods and services, and that any such voluntary family planning project shall meet the following requirements: (1) service providers or referral agents in the project shall not implement or be subject to quotas, or other numerical targets, of total number of births, number of family planning acceptors, or acceptors of a particular method of family

planning (this provision shall not be construed to include the use of quantitative estimates or indicators for budgeting and planning purposes); (2) the project shall not include payment of incentives, bribes, gratuities, or financial reward to: (A) an individual in exchange for becoming a family planning acceptor; or (B) program personnel for achieving a numerical target or quota of total number of births, number of family planning acceptors, or acceptors of a particular method of family planning; (3) the project shall not deny any right or benefit, including the right of access to participate in any program of general welfare or the right of access to health care, as a consequence of any individual's decision not to accept family planning services; (4) the project shall provide family planning acceptors comprehensible information on the health benefits and risks of the method chosen, including those conditions that might render the use of the method inadvisable and those adverse side effects known to be consequent to the use of the method; and (5) the project shall ensure that experimental contraceptive drugs and devices and medical procedures are provided only in the context of a scientific study in which participants are advised of potential risks and benefits; and, not less than 60 days after the date on which the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development determines that there has been a violation of the requirements contained in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (5) of this proviso, or a pattern or practice of violations of the requirements contained in paragraph (4) of this proviso, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, a report containing a description of such violation and the corrective action taken by the Agency: *Provided further*, That in awarding grants for natural family planning under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 no applicant shall be discriminated against because of such applicant's religious or conscientious commitment to offer only natural family planning; and, additionally, all such applicants shall comply with the requirements of the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this or any other Act authorizing or appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, the term ''motivate'', as it relates to family planning assistance, shall not be construed to prohibit the provision, consistent with local law, of information or counseling about all pregnancy options: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for any activity which is in contravention to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna (CITES): *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for assistance programs for displaced and orphaned children and victims of war, not to exceed $25,000, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used to monitor and provide oversight of such programs: *Provided further*, That, of the funds appropriated by this Act for the Microenterprise Initiative (including any local currencies made available for the purposes of the Initiative), not less than one-half should be made available for programs providing loans in the following amounts (in 1995 United States dollars) to very poor people, particularly women, or for institutional support of organizations primarily engaged in making such loans: $1,000 or less in the Europe and Eurasia region (including North Africa), $400 or less in the Latin America region, and $300 or less in the rest of the world.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing in the bill beginning with ''Provided'' on page 11, line 23, through page 12, line 8, on the grounds that it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that the provision includes language imparting direction. The provision therefore constitutes legislation, in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and that provision is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 18.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 18 offered by Mr. ROEMER:

In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $2,100,000)''.

In title IV of the bill under the heading ''MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—CONTRIBUTION TO THE MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT GUARANTEE AGENCY'', after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $4,900,000)''.

In title IV of the bill under the heading ''MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTER-AMERICAN INVESTMENT CORPORATION'', after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $8,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of earlier today, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) will be recognized for 10 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to say that this is a bipartisan amendment. I have the strong support of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LUTHER), who has been so helpful, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL).

This amendment is simple. It increases by $15 million the microenterprise loans for the poor, the poorest people in the world, to get loans that are repaid. And because of the budget rules, we take $15 million that is offset from three different accounts to plus up the microenterprise loans for the poor account.

Now, we have wide bipartisan support for this. And when we are talking about $15 million, Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about how simple this amendment is and talk about $1. One dollar is what the Secretary of the United Nations says that 20 percent of our population in the world lives on per day. Not that they eat on; that they live on. One dollar or less per day.

Now, microenterprise loans for the poor loan $25, $50, $100 at a time to people in poverty in Bangladesh, in India, in Africa, mostly women, to start small businesses. Let me give my colleagues an example of why this program is so important and why we need to fund it with another $15 million.

Sarah Doe, formerly of Liberia, fled to the Ivory Coast. She lost her husband in the war and she has 10 children. She gets a loan for $16 from microenterprise loans for the poor and starts a small business selling donuts. Now, that does not sound like a lot to us, because so many people in the world live on less than a dollar a day, but to her she is now running a successful small business. She has been able to send four of her children to school and establish savings accounts. Sixteen dollars is the original loan helping to save her children, starting a small business.

□ 2400

This is some of the best money we can spend when we decide to do it efficiently in foreign aid, money that is loaned that is repaid at 95 to 99 percent repayment. We need to do this, Mr. Chairman. It is right. It is efficient. It is bipartisan. And it is an investment in getting people out of poverty, helping them help their children, and eventually making them part of this world economy.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I tell the gentleman that we support the microenterprise fund. That is not the issue. The gentleman and I have discussed earlier and I have pledged to help him if indeed we get an additional allocation to meet his goal. But I do not know if the gentleman heard what the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) requested of the Chair just prior to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) rising; and that is, he, through a point of order, removed the section he is trying to put the money in. So all he is doing, instead of giving it to the microenterprise program, is giving it to the big pot of assistance that will be available.

Now, if the gentleman will take my request and withdraw his amendment, I

will be happy to work in conference to try to get additional monies for the microenterprise program. That is not a problem. But if the gentleman prefers to try it this way, then I will just remove my commitment.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, first of all, the offer and pledge of the gentleman. Secondly, I deeply appreciate his commitment to microenterprise loans for the poor. I know he is genuine. I know he is a fighter for programs that are efficient and work. I know he wants to do something to help bring the poorest of the poor into the world community and the world economy.

Before I agree with the gentleman to withdraw the amendment and then get the $15 million, I want to remind him, which he already knows, that this $15 million would merely take us up to the authorized level of what the House has approved. So I appreciate his fight, his vigor, his support, his pledge.

Before I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, I have four or five cosponsors of the amendment that are still here past midnight that would like to speak on it and that would take probably another 8 or 9 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I am sorry, we do not have another 8 or 9 amendments.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, no, I said 8 or 9 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, we do not have another 8 or 9 minutes in order to do that.

Mr. ROEMER. I have more time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman had yielded back his time.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I reserved the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me the time and for his commitment to do more in conference on this microenterprise issue.

I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his leadership and for his constant attention to this very important issue.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Chairman, we have traveled many places in the developing world. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the committee, and I have visited many microlending sites, microenterprise activities.

It is hard for us in the United States to understand how a little bit of money can go such a very long way and make such a very, very big difference. I could go into it chapter and verse over the map, but I would be abusing the good nature of my distinguished chairman so I will not do that, except to say that this is a program that has a tremendous base of support in our country at the grassroots level. It is effective. It works. And I commend the gentleman for pushing it even further because I know that it will reap tremendous benefits.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), a cosponsor of the amendment who has worked so hard on this.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his leadership here. I also want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

Clearly the work is going to be done in conference, and that is the important thing. The fact that the gentleman is going to support this, is willing to work, that is good enough for me.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LUTHER), who has been very helpful and his staff has been extremely helpful.

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for his outstanding leadership as well as the other cosponsors and also the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who has been a terrific supporter of this whole concept of microcredit.

I will be very brief, Mr. Chairman. I merely want to say that currently more than one billion people, one-fifth of the world's population, live in extreme poverty. And that is what we are talking about here this evening. As long as poverty continues to plague the world, there will not be a lasting peace, there will not be the kind of stability that we all want, not to mention the pain and suffering in the lives of so many people and families.

What is great about the microcredit program is that it is not a handout. It is in fact start-up loans that will be repaid by the people. It is basically using precious foreign aid dollars in the best possible way that we can spend them.

Now, what this amendment would do and why I think it makes so much sense is it would bring the level of this particular category up to the authorized level, as already pointed out, that has been passed by this Congress. And I would submit that there is no more cost-effective way for us to provide for the self-sufficiency of the people of the world and to spread democracy around the world than to do this very thing that is being proposed here, all at the same time while we are improving the lives of our fellow inhabitants of the world. I think that that is something that we can be very, very proud of as we work on this this evening.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying that, in a time of budget constraint like the one that we are in, we have to prioritize. I believe we need to give priority to this particular activity. I thank the other Members. I appreciate the help that has been expressed on the floor.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), who has been an early and strong supporter.

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

Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), particularly for his promise, and he has always fulfilled it, in terms of expanding that $15 million as he can for microenterprise. I want to thank the other cosponsors of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, directly aiding the poorest of the poor, especially women in the developing world, has a positive effect not only on family incomes but on child nutrition, health, and education. As women in particular reinvest income in their families, the poor in the developing world, particularly women, turn to self-employment in order to generate a substantial portion of their livelihood.

In Africa over 80 percent of employment is generated in this informal sector of the self-employed poor. These poor entrepreneurs are often trapped in poverty because they cannot obtain credit at a reasonable rate to build their asset base or expand their otherwise viable self-employment activities.

We know from experience that microcredit financing helps, that the poor are able to expand their incomes and their businesses dramatically when they can access loans at reasonable interest rates. Through the development of self-sustaining microfinance programs, poor people themselves can lead the fight against hunger and poverty. It also develops confidence, dignity and self-sufficiency.

So, again, I thank the chairman in advance for putting this money into microenterprise.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), who has been a tireless supporter of these microenterprise loans, a friend from the Committee on Intelligence, as well.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished colleague from Indiana for yielding me the time.

I particularly rise on this measure for asking the House to support it. The Committee on Appropriations, each day that there is an appropriation measure, submits a report in explanation. The chairman of this subcommittee, my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), previously said that he had written the perfect bill.

Certainly on economic growth and microenterprise, I wish to join in suggesting that he is absolutely correct about that part. Let the House hear what he said:

''Microenterprise has proven its effectiveness in promoting economic growth in many of the poorest countries and allowing poor people, especially women, to lift themselves out of poverty and to create and expand microbusinesses which raise living standards.

□ 0010

The committee recognizes that microenterprise cannot lift an entire Nation out of poverty. Broad policy reforms and responsible stewardship of resources at the national level are essential. But microenterprise programs can complement sound macroeconomic policies.

I say to the gentleman from Alabama, he did write something perfect.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who is not only concerned about this issue of poverty, but also a strong supporter of education.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his hard work on this issue. He has really been a leader. I want to thank the ranking member; I want to thank the chairman, and I particularly want to thank the chairman, because we appreciate his commitment to work in conference to raise these numbers on this issue, and I know that the chairman will succeed, and we will all succeed as a result of his important work.

For those of us who have been watching this process for a long time, the success is really extraordinary. To see a woman open a small restaurant or buy some chickens and sell their eggs or make bread to sell to her neighbors, the small amount of income and the small amount of savings that this loan makes possible will pay for a school uniform for a daughter who may not otherwise have gone to school in many parts of the world; it will pay for doctor visits for her family, nourishing food to keep everyone healthy and active. Most important of all, it makes her stand tall and be a person and help support her family.

So I thank the chairman again for his commitment.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), a friend on the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, let me just commend the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), and the number of cosponsors of this amendment.

Microeconomics is very important. First of all, it puts women in charge because many of these loans go to women. Secondly, when we looked at the accounts, interestingly enough, the payment return rate is exceedingly high, between 90 and 95 percent of these microeconomic loans. It means a lot of empowerment, not only because it brings in extra revenue, but it gives women a position in many instances of working for women's rights and independence and self-reliance.

So I think that the money that we are talking about will go a long, long way. It will also show as an example by what happens to the women.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, with the 15 seconds I have remaining, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for all of her hard work and dedication to these issues. I look forward to working with her in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), who is truly a gentleman, and we look forward to working with him to get this $15 million in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to objection, I just want to briefly respond to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), when he read a portion of my bill and he agreed that that section that he read was just like that song that I mentioned earlier in the evening that I have written the perfect country song, the same as David Allen Coe did when he wrote that song about ''You don't have to call me darlin', darlin'. You don't even have to call me by my name.''

Well, I will tell the gentleman from Florida, he can call me by my name as long as he stands up and says those kind things about this perfect bill I think I have written.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

Page 12, line 8, before the period insert the following: ''*: Provided further,* That of the amount appropriated under this heading, $30,000,000 shall be made available for plant biotechnology research and development''.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that I think is tremendously exciting in terms of the potential to help developing nations of the world in two areas: food production and health.

This amendment sets aside $30 million for plant biotechnology research and development. Its language reflects language put in the Senate bill by Senator BOND of Missouri. It is technology aimed at solving the health and humanitarian and environmental challenges, particularly in the developing world. Indeed, the fruits of this research promise to address some of the most serious challenges faced there: hunger, malnutrition, drought, pestilence, and disease. Can we imagine if we develop a kind of plant that can now grow in those arid soils where food cannot be grown at the present time.

Since we first cultivated about 10,000 years ago, mankind has searched for ways to improve them. Traditional selection and cross-breeding has been very useful in improving crop plants, but this is a time-consuming process that commonly produces unwanted traits that must be eliminated. We now have over 1,000 biotech products on the market.

With the development of biotechnology, plant breeders are now able to develop new varieties of plants in a level of precision and range unheard of just 2 decades ago. The potential benefits to mankind are limited only by the resourcefulness of our scientists. Just today, it was announced that genes are the major cause of cancer, breast cancer and colon cancer.

U.S. farmers, of course, have been quick to adopt the plants modified by biotechnology, and it is also spreading around the world. But as great as the potential of biotechnology here in the United States is, it holds even greater promise to solve many intractable problems facing farmers and hungry people, consumers in the developing world. Improved crop plants promise to mitigate common agricultural problems in much of the developing world through weather, pest and drought resistance, improved nutrition, and higher yields.

On April 13, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Basic Research, I issued a report on the benefits of safety and oversight of regulation, Seeds of Opportunity, a large section of which is devoted to a discussion of the potential benefits of this technology in improving nutrition, health, and feeding a growing worldwide population.

A white paper issued just yesterday, a white paper was issued by the National Academy of Sciences, joined by the Royal Society of London, the Brazilian, Chinese, Indian, Mexican, and Third World Academies of Science put the situation plainly, and I quote: ''Today there are some 800 million people who do not have access to sufficient food to meet their needs. Malnutrition plays a significant role in half of the nearly 12 million deaths each year of children under 5 in developing countries.''

Still quoting, ''In addition to lack of food, deficiencies in micro-nutrients, especially vitamin A, iodine and iron, are widespread.''

They conclude that agricultural biotechnology research and development should be aggressively pursued, and I quote again, ''to increase the production of main food staples, improve the efficiency of production, reduce the environmental impact of agriculture, and provide access to food for people and farmers around the world.''

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude. I am excited about this. I think agricultural biotechnology and gene technology offer tremendous opportunities, only limited by the creativity and funding for research dollars.

□ 0020

It can play a major role in helping developing countries become self-sufficient in food production.

One example of its promise is the development of a new strain of rice. It is called golden rice. It contains both beta carotene and iron, and work is underway to get this new variety to the field.

The merging of medical and agricultural biotechnology has opened up new ways to develop plant varieties with characteristics to enhance health.

It was announced today that this kind of gene research has huge potential in the developing world. Researchers are now working on developing plants that will develop medicines and edible vaccines through common foods that could be used to immunize the kids around the world. This is significantly important.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) insist on his point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill, and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part, ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.''

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am excited about this, Mr. Chairman. I would ask the chairman if he would consider looking at the Senate language in this amendment and consider the potential and the appropriateness of moving ahead in this area of doing something in the area of biotechnology.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman is aware, the language is already in the Senate version of our bill, so we will have to address it. We will certainly take the gentleman's views into consideration.

If the gentleman would like to withdraw his amendment, then I will withdraw my point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. SANDERS:

Page 8, line 10, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 33, line 6, after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $2,500,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) will be recognized for 5 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is cosponsored by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Slaughter), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

What this amendment does is increase U.S. AID's development assistance account by $2.5 million to provide assistance to indigenous and locally-based nongovernmental organizations for the protection and reintegration of women and children who are victims of international trafficking.

The committee's bill provides, unfortunately, no funds, zero fund, to assist the millions of people, primarily women and children, who are trafficked across international borders each year and forced into prostitution, sweatshop labor, and domestic servitude.

The fastest-growing international trafficking business is the trade of women, trailing only behind trafficking in drugs and arms.

According to the U.S. State Department, between 1 and 2 million women and girls seeking a better life abroad unexpectedly find themselves in brothels, the sweatshop labor industry, or exploitative domestic servitude. This tragedy continues to grow as economic globalization expands, increasing the movement of people across borders.

In a world of rich nations and poor nations, these exploitative and inhumane practices feed on the poverty and despair of poor women, children, and families in the developing world, particularly in Southeast Asia and the former Soviet Union.

Earlier this year, the House passed legislation sponsored by my colleague and cosponsor of this amendment, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) highlighting the problem of trafficking in persons and authorizing funds to assist victims. These initiatives have bipartisan support in the House and Senate and the support of the administration, which requested $10 million in assistance for trafficking victims.

Unfortunately, this legislation does not provide any funds to deal with this tragedy. The $2.5 million for this vitally important assistance comes from the international military education and training IMET account by reducing the amount in the bill for this program by $2.5 million which level-funds IMET.

I should add that IMET has seen a 100 percent increase in the last 5 years. In other words, Mr. Chairman, we are level-funding a program that has increased by 100 percent in 5 years in order to provide a small amount of funding to an area which is in dire need of these funds.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) seek to control time in opposition?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but not with the intent of the amendment. I agree, first of all, with the intent of the amendment, but in our bill already we provide significant resources to help prevent trafficking in women and children.

In recent years we have supported AID programs designed to end trafficking. In Asia, for example, funds are already contained in this bill. We will continue to support the following programs with anti-trafficking components: One, AID's South Asia Regional Initiative; two, AID's Regional Women's Initiative; three, AID's South Asian Democracy Program. AID is undertaking similar programs in Africa and Latin America to fight trafficking of women.

I assure the gentleman that the Committee on Appropriations will continue to support these anti-trafficking programs. I had hoped that we would be able to resolve this issue with a colloquy, since we have already increased development assistance by $30 million over the fiscal year 2000 appropriation.

There are sufficient funds, I believe, to address the concerns the gentleman has raised. I see really no reason for the amendment, because I think we are taking care of the gentleman's concerns anyway. I would like him not to try to reconstruct the bill to make a point, which is exactly what he would be doing, when we have already agreed.

I would also, even though I will not be chairman next year, I would have appreciated this year if the gentleman had contacted me a little earlier, like probably 300 Members of the House did, and we tried to facilitate everyone who contacted us earlier with their concerns. I am sure we could have had sufficient language in here to do what the gentleman is doing by reconstructing our bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate the gentleman withdrawing his amendment if he possibly could consider that, and we will be happy to work to further

complement the language and instructions we already have in the bill where a sufficient amount of money is already designated.

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

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the amendment being offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) specifically addresses a program which funds local indigenous nongovernmental organizations to engage in this protection for women.

Can the chairman tell me specifically, and please forgive me for not knowing this, if what U.S. AID is doing has that component to its initiative to stop trafficking of women?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, in the amendment that the gentleman offered, or as we have, I do not see that.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) is correct in interpreting the intent of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. I will be happy to work with the gentleman, but I do not think we ought to restructure the bill for any reason. I have opposed it all night long and I oppose it now.

I find it strange that we are debating an issue that we have already expressed our total support of in the bill, and provided sufficient amounts of monies.

Let me just once again say that we are talking about amendment No. 20. Are we talking about amendment No. 20?

Mr. SANDERS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. There is no indication in the language I have here that it does what the gentleman says it does.

Mr. SANDERS. It increases U.S. AID's development assistance account by $2.5 million to provide assistance to indigenous and locally-based NGOs.

Mr. CALLAHAN. It does not say that. The amendment I have just simply says it increases it by $2.5 million and decreases an account by $2.5 million. It is not specific in the amendment that I have here.

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

□ 0030

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for yielding to me, and just let me say I am very much supportive of this language and the intent. The $2.5 million is really a small amount of money, and it does highlight an often neglected part of this whole trafficking problem and tragedy that we face, and that is, that the locally based indigenous organizations like Miramad in Russia or LaStrada in the Ukraine do not get much funding if they get funding at all, and they are in the front line when women are either trafficked out of the country and they are intercepted in some way, often through some good law enforcement, or when they are returned after being abused.

In order to break the cycle, these NGOs are right there providing treatment, providing psychological counseling and rescuing women.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has now expired.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word and ask the Clerk to read the amendment, because the amendment as I understand it, it says on page 8, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert increase by $2.5 million. Then it says on line 6, after the first dollar insert decrease by $2.5 million. Technically, the money that we transfer could be used by anything. It could be used for population. It could be used for anything.

The amendment does not specifically say what the gentleman is expressing, and I would ask the Clerk to read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. SANDERS:

Page 8, line 10, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 33, line 6, after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $2,500,000)''.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) I think that the amendment says what I am telling the gentleman. It does not transfer the money to the program of trafficking that the gentleman is concerned about.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is technically correct, what it does do is take $2.5 million from IMET and transfer it and increases funds for USAID's development assistance account. Clearly the intent of everything that I am speaking about is to use that $2.5 million to go to NGOs to combat the trafficking crisis which exists, but the gentleman is technically correct.

Is the gentleman supportive of what we are trying to do?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, yes, I am, and that is why I was trying to express, I will be happy to work with the gentleman to try to get the money. I would not like to reconstruct my bill at this time in order to give an additional $2.5 million to the agency, but I will be happy to work with the gentleman to try to get that, if the gentleman reads the language we already have it in the report or in the bill.

It is a very lengthy report, which says almost what the gentleman is saying, whereby we are instructing them to do that. So I would think that there would be no need for this. But to answer the gentleman's question, yes, I will be happy to work with the gentleman to try to facilitate your goal.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I concur with the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and ask the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) to withdraw the amendment and work with the Committee on Appropriations. We certainly feel that the gentleman's goal is meritorious, and we will try to resolve this matter and come to some agreement on its merits. So I would urge the gentleman if he would consider withdrawing the amendment at this time.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, the issue here is I know that we all agree on the crisis and we all want to do something about it. My concern is that at least $2.5 million go to indigenous NGOs.

Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman saying that he is prepared to try to find money to do that?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, I will be happy to attempt to ensure to the gentleman that that language will be put in during the process, but it shall not be taken out of the IMET training money that he has suggested.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont, unless the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) wants to respond to mine or the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) can use the 2 minutes, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, if what I am hearing the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) say is that he is prepared to put $2.5 million from a source that he will determine into indigenous NGOs to combat trafficking.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Reclaiming my time, that is correct that we will do it. We will readjust the figures of the existing appropriation levels to spell out what the gentleman is seeking to do. Whether or not we get additional allocations or not, we can still do it, but I do not agree that we should take it out of the IMET training program.

Mr. SANDERS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, at the end of the day there will be $2.5 million going to local NGOs to combat that?

Mr. CALLAHAN. That would be my serious attempt if I can get the Senate to agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Vermont, no, I will just get time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont should use the balance of his time.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I want to exercise the same privilege as the distinguished chairman did as is spelled out in the unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is correct; although, the Chair would tell the gentlewoman that if she would like to at this point, the Chair will permit her, although it is really inappropriate to do so while an amendment is pending.

The Chair was attempting to facilitate a conversation, and the Chair will not make that mistake again.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thought it was in keeping with the unanimous consent request, but I will tell you what, Mr. Chairman, heeding what the gentleman is saying there, I will not use the full 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I just want a clarification because I do not know what options are available to us. Certainly if this bill goes to conference, and one never knows around here, if the bill goes to conference, I would certainly and I know the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and others Members of the subcommittee would have this as a very high priority, and I know the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) can get her own time to speak on this, but I just wanted to know what options were available. Can we be specific in conference? Are we talking about very specific report language?

I think this conversation is very important on the floor to talk about the legislative intent, because this is a very important issue, and I really do not have enough time, even if I use my full 5 minutes to tell you how much it means to women.

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

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to assure the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) that I am going to make every effort I can to ensure that the money is spelled out in the bill. I think the intent is clearly spelled out sufficiently for them to spend the money anyway, but if the gentleman is concerned that it is not, well then we will insert the figure $2.5 million or whatever the number is.

Ms. PELOSI. Reclaiming my time, I look forward to supporting the gentleman in that effort.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, just briefly the hour is late, I want to thank again my ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), my colleague, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and our chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for the commitment to put money into this effort.

Having recently returned from India, visiting a school where we spoke with the young girls who had been trafficked, the tragedy of this throughout the world is so immense and I know the gentleman from Alabama is aware of it and I appreciate the gentleman's commitment to invest the money in this effort, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CALLAHAN. If the gentlewoman would further yield, I do not know how many times I can say yes, maybe if I talked a little slower.

Mr. SANDERS. I am hearing a yes, Y-E-S; is that correct?

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief since I think we have come to the conclusion, but just to remind the body and I think it is important that this House on May 9th did pass the comprehensive legislation that would impose very, very tough new criminal penalties, up to life in imprisonment on those who traffic people into the United States or any part of that process and also to prevent automatic deportation, a protection for the women so that they can be helped while they are here. Eventually many of these women will get back to their country or at least some of them, I will not say many, and they will need protection when they get back, and that is what I think the gentleman's amendment and my amendment seeks to do.

We had authorized in that legislation $10 million for victims, and this is a modest down payment on that authorization. So I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) and I think his word is his bond and I think we are off to a good start here.

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

I would just conclude by thanking the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and everybody else.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thought the purpose of this discussion was to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if that is the purpose of it, then I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. As long as the gentleman says yes, I will withdraw the amendment.

□ 0040

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PAYNE:

Page 12, line 8, insert before the period the following: ": *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not less than $720,000,000 shall be made available to carry out chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961''.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama reserves a point of order on the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to request that the important Development Assistance Fund, which is a fund that much of the appropriations for development assistance around the world is a very important instrument for development in Africa.

The House has taken a step backwards by eliminating the earmark for the Development Fund for Africa which was in legislation up until 1994. But we are not asking for the earmark to be replaced since it was removed. But we are asking that $220 million be added into the Development Assistance Fund, which would fall under the Development Assistance Fund for Africa, the DFA, although we are not asking for the earmark.

Now, what I am saying is simply that, during the 1990s, 1993 and 1994, when the development from the DFA was designated, we actually appropriated $850 million in 1994, $804 million in 1993. So we had a continued increase in the Development Fund for Africa.

The 1998 level was $700 million. In 1999, it was approximately $700 million. This year, it has dropped to approximately $500 million. So we are asking that $220 million be allocated within the Development Assistance to be earmarked for Africa.

It seems, as we have been talking about all of the problems in Africa, we have been talking about the AIDS pandemic, we have been talking about the need for loan forgiveness, it seems like it is a move in the wrong direction to reduce the Development Fund for Africa, the monies that are designated, although not earmarked, because these funds go to assist in famine prevention. They go in to helping dialogue in countries to ward off ethnic strife. They go into many very, very important issues that help to make stable countries in Africa.

I might mention that, during the last decade, about 85 to 90 percent of the nations in Africa have gone under democratization. We have had elections in practically every country. Many people have the misconception that there are dictators still in Africa, but that was in the past. We have had elections in Mozambique and in South Africa. We have had elections in Namibia and Kenya. We have had elections in Senegal. We can go on and on and on. So there is no longer these dictators who speak with the one voice.

I have talked earlier about the fact that we did have that problem in the past during the Cold War where we created Mobutu, when we went and destabilized Patrice Lumumba and took him out of office with our United States intelligence operation, and put in Mobutu, who of course supported the South African apartheid government of P.W. Botha. He supported Ian Smith in Rhodesia who had the same sort of government. He supported the Southwest Africa, which did the same thing.

This was a Mobutu that we put in because of the fact that it was during the Cold War. We can go on and on in Africa. But there have been elections in most countries. We are looking for elections in the former Zaire, the Democrat Republic of Congo in the future. We have seen elections in most other countries.

So it seems to me that, in order to alleviate poverty, which is of course one of the great problems in Africa, in order to look at the amount of funds that go into Africa, the population of Africa is about 700 million people, we are talking about 500 million, less than a dollar a person in Africa where we have seen other places around the world with much smaller populations getting billions of dollars.

So it seems to me that, in order for us to look at Africa, 16 of the 18 of the poorest countries in the world are there. While we are reducing the amount of funds available, as I have indicated, it is going against what we should been doing in this new millennium. It is really not supporting new presidents who have been elected and are going through structural adjustments like in Mozambique where they have had a growth in their GDP of about 10 percent annually.

As a matter of fact, these countries, different from what people believe, that in the SADC countries, which are 14 countries in South Africa, each of these countries has had an increase in their GDP from 4 to 12 percent. Even the country of Botswana has had a balanced budget and has put more money in at the end of the day than it has spent.

So my appeal is that we increase the Development Fund for Africa to put it to the levels that it was 5, 6 and 7 years ago rather than to remove and have the money used for other parts of the world.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge that this amendment be accepted.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) wish to make his point of order?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Not at this point, Mr. Chairman. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) claim the time in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, the Development Fund for Africa, which is the prime fund, USAID, elections, funds for democracy, building, funds for IRI, International Republican Institute, NDI, the National Democratic Institute, organizations which promote the various types of democratic building programs in the world, in Africa, are the main part of the main ingredients of why this development fund is so important. It goes to stability.

We have gone in and said democracy is what we should be doing. Most of the countries have actually said we want to try democracy. There has been elections also in Tanzania and elections in Uganda and elections in Kenya. All of them improved over their previous elections. So they are striving to a more perfect election process.

At this time, for us to reduce the amount of funds that are available in the DFA I think is a step backwards.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

□ 0050

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, in this day and age, when we look at the global economy and we look at how this Nation has developed and other nations, and yet we look at the continent of Africa and see how underdeveloped they are; and also in this day and age, when we realize how much smaller the world has become, I think it becomes that much more urgent that we increase the Development Fund for Africa by the $220 million that is requested by the Payne amendment.

Once upon a time there was a line item initiative for the Africa development fund. That no longer exists. And when we look at how the cost of things are ever escalating, this request is actually very little. We talk about democracy and helping to democratize various countries in the continent of Africa. That is what this money is for, helping people have a form of government where they can grow and develop as we did.

We should be able to have others benefit from our history and understand the mistakes that we made in the past so that they will not have to go through some of the same growing pains that we did. In fact, in this great country, with the prosperity that we now have, I think it is just the very little that we could do, this $220 million. That is not a lot of money when I think about some of the individual wealth of some people in this country. Some CEOs in this country have $220 million to use at their disposal. We are talking about $220 million for an entire continent of people. That is just pennies. Pennies. Yet what good, what human good it will do for the people of the continent of Africa.

USAID is the money that is entitled here. Democratic initiatives. A lot of the things that I hear sometimes sound like excuses not to do something. When we were talking earlier in regards to debt relief, there was the excuse that was constantly being made that we cannot do it because this was wrong with this country or this was wrong with that country. And many of the things they talked about that was wrong with them, well, that is what we fix in this bill.

So it is about us being serious about making a difference. It is about our wanting to reach out a helping hand in a world that is ever shrinking. I do believe we are our brothers' keepers. We are our brothers' keepers. And I think if we want peace and prosperity, that by doing this we will not have to worry about spending $60 billion for a bubble sometime in the future because we are afraid of suffering some kind of attack. I think we need to begin to do the kinds of things that will make us accepted by others and others accepted by us because we are working collectively together for humanitarian concerns and reasons.

I think that we can do this. I think that it is a reasonable thing, and I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and wish to close by indicating that we feel that we have seen recent success with elections in Senegal; we have seen elections in Nigeria; we have seen current elections in Mozambique. We have seen successes.

As I indicated, we had $800 million in 1993, and 1994 $850 million, and now we have reduced the allocations of DFA down to $500 million. It is really a step backwards. It is unconscionable. It really does not keep up with what is going on. It is unbelievable to try to understand why this is.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to thank him for his great leadership when it comes to the continent of Africa. He is a tremendous resource to this Congress on this subject. He knows of what he speaks. And he is correct, we do not do enough in the African Development Fund. We must do more, and I am pleased to support his amendment.

We need more money in the bill, though, in order to do this so that we

do not damage other initiatives that we want for Africa as well. So in that spirit I am pleased to support the amendment and commend the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time and simply say that I would hope that that last statement from the gentlewoman from California, in a time when we have escalating profits, when we have people who are making billions and millions of dollars, the number of millionaires they do not even keep any more, I hope her statement would indicate for my colleagues that it is the wrong time for us to turn our backs when we take 100 million here and 200 million there. We can afford it. We can do better. God has blessed this Nation, we should not turn our back on him.

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

Mr. Chairman, I still reserve my point of order, and will insist on it in just a moment, but just in response to the gentleman, every year the President requests a separate fund for the development of Africa and every year this committee combines Africa into the development assistance and child survival accounts.

It is not that we are neglecting Africa. Indeed, if we total up overall everything that we have included this year, we recommend $1.6 billion for Africa. So this is not any omission of recognition of the needs of Africa. We do it. We do not, nor did my predecessor on this subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), earmark funds for countries or regions. We do not have a special regional account for Latin America or for Asia either.

I think that we have made it fairly clear to the administration that it is our intent that a minimum amount of $1.6 billion be spent.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point of order that this is an unauthorized earmark. I make that point of order against the amendment, and I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I understand what the gentleman has said, although it appears I was not asking for a line item.

I am just simply indicating that we are not asking to specifically earmark by line item, but in the allocation of the funds that were in the development assistance fund it was always understood that we would have a floor of $700 million to $800 million. It is my understanding that, with the way the funds are being allocated now, the floor has dropped.

So I have not asked for a specific line item for DFA. I am simply asking that in the development fund, that funds for Africa that will be allocated and that we attempt to stay at least where we were in the past. That is all I am requesting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The amendment proposes to earmark certain funds in the bill. Under clause 2(a) of rule XXI, such an earmarking must be specifically authorized by law. The burden of establishing the authorization in law rests with the proponent of the amendment.

Finding that this burden has not been carried, the Chair must sustain the point of order.

Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

□ 0100

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PAYNE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PAYNE:

Page 12, line 8, insert before the period the following: ": *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $500,000 shall be made available for a grant to the Office of the Facilitator of the National Dialogue for the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo".

Strike section 567 of the bill (page 109, strike line 7 and all that follows through line 11).

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) seek unanimous consent for that portion of the amendment which seeks to move ahead and strike section 567 of the bill?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may reserve a point of order. Is there objection to that portion of the amendment that reaches ahead to the point where the Clerk has not yet read?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) reserves a point of order on the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I have offered is an amendment that would provide assistance to the people of southern Sudan. At this time we have seen in Sudan a government from Khartoum that is a pariah government, the government of al-Bahsir and Mr. Tarrabi, a government that had wreaked havoc on the people to the south. And the group of the South Sudanese Liberation Movement have been struggling for years attempting to protect the people in the south.

The people in the south are taken into slavery and they are sold. It is unconscionable what is going on there. We have seen old Russian planes used to bomb stable communities in the south. And so we are asking that the administration give authority to provide non-lethal and non-food assistance to the National Democratic Alliance, which is a group of organizations in the south of Sudan in order to provide protection to the civilians who are targeted by government soldiers and by their militias, their allies, the persons who are doing aerial bombing and forcing displacement of people and taking people into slavery.

We are finally starting to see a groundswell in the country of people talking about the fact that we can no longer look the other way at what is happening in Sudan. It is disgraceful. It is something that we can no longer tolerate. We have to give assistance to folks in that particular area so that they can at least move forward in attempting to provide protection to the people.

As I have indicated, we are talking about non-lethal, non-food but ways that the folks in that area can be assisted by the National Democratic Alliance.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, point of inquiry.

The gentleman, as I understand it, read one amendment, and he is talking about another amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is absolutely right. The gentleman is correct.

We will ask the Chairman if we could, then, move to the one that is in this section. Mr. Chairman, if we could ask the Clerk to read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment which is pending.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment Offered by Mr. PAYNE:

Page 12, line 8, insert before the period the following: ": *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $500,000 shall be made available for a grant to the Office of the Facilitator of the National Dialogue for the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo".

Strike section 567 of the bill (page 109, strike line 7 and all that follows through line 11).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) continues to reserve a point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, this also is an amendment dealing with the problems on the Continent. This is asking for $500,000 to be allocated to the assistance for the national dialogue, which is the Lusaka Accords. The Lusaka Accords are the accords that will end the strife in the Congo.

As my colleagues know, in the Democratic Republic of Congo, under the leadership of President Kabila, there has been an armed conflict bringing in five foreign countries to the soil of the Congo: President Mugabi in Zimbabwe, President Sam Nujoma from Namibia. We have the country of Rwanda, the country of Uganda, Mr. Museveni, Mr. Mugambi from Rwanda and from Angola, Mr. De Santos, are all in a conflict in the Congo.

What this request is that the former president of the country of Botswana,

who has been designated by the OAU, the Organization of African Unity, to have a dialogue with the people of the Congo to come up with a mechanism for elections so that the people there could have elections and that it would facilitate the removal of foreign troops from the Congo, the troops from Rwanda and Uganda, Namibia, Zimbabwe and Angola.

And so this $500,000 is very key because it will give the funds that they need to do the dialogue with the Lasaca Accords.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order. This is an unauthorized earmark.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PAYNE. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Although the importance of this matter in this dialogue I believe sort of ought to be considered, the fact that we are making the request I assume would be considered an earmark. I think that the importance of it is so great I would hope that there would be some opportunity within the committee for some discussion on this matter. Because with six countries at war and we are talking $500,000 that could possibly have the withdraw of these countries because of the dialogue within the country I think would, hopefully, be able to work it in some way in some language so that it does not violate the question of being an earmark.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to speak on the point of order?

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, this will not take long. I think it has been said that this was an unauthorized expenditure. And I am not sure exactly what is meant by that except to say that the request that has been made by the gentleman is formally before this House without it having to be designated as authorized as such.

This is extremely important that he is given the opportunity to have this considered simply because he has spoken and others have spoken about what is going on on the Continent, the need to have more democracy, the need not to have dictatorships, the need to make sure that the dollars that we are trying to get in debt relief is spent in a wise fashion.

Well, this would help that process. We have countries that have so much potential, but they need to be assisted in their efforts to maintain the peace.

□ 0110

We have Angola that has been involved for many years and we have done nothing to assist them. We have supported Zabimbi who is up in the bush rather than giving support to someone who is trying to carry out democracy in Angola. We have new leadership in the Congo with no assistance to Kabila about how to resolve the differences between the Hutus and the Tutsis.

So I would ask that this be made in order and that the gentleman be allowed to offer this amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I might say once again, I support what the gentleman wants to do. His amendment earmarks funds within the development assistance account.

Earlier this year, USAID asked me to agree to provide $1 million to support the problem in the Congo. I agreed to support this program, which is also supported by the Catholic Church. So USAID has already indicated and pledged $1 million towards this anyway. What the gentleman's amendment would do is earmark $50 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The amendment proposes to earmark certain funds in the bill.

Under clause 2(a) of Rule XXI, such an earmarking must be specifically authorized by law. The burden of establishing the authorization in law rests with the proponent of the amendment. No provision of law has been cited.

Finding that this burden has not been carried, the Chair must sustain the point of order against the amendment.

Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEBANON

Of the funds appropriated under the headings ''Development Assistance'' and ''Economic Support Fund'', not less than $18,000,000 should be made available for Lebanon to be used, among other programs, for scholarships and direct support of the American educational institutions in Lebanon.

PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for development assistance may be made available to any United States private and voluntary organization, except any cooperative development organization, which obtains less than 20 percent of its total annual funding for international activities from sources other than the United States Government: *Provided*, That the Administrator of the Agency for International Development, after notification to the Committees on Appropriations, may, on a case-by-case basis, waive the restriction contained in this paragraph, after taking into account the effectiveness of the overseas development activities of the organization, its level of volunteer support, its financial viability and stability, and the degree of its dependence for its financial support on the agency.

Funds appropriated or otherwise made available under title II of this Act should be made available to private and voluntary organizations at a level which is at least equivalent to the level provided in fiscal year 1995.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses for international disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, $165,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT–INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

In title III of the bill under the heading ''MILITARY ASSISTANCE–FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT–PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) will be recognized for 5 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) reserves a point of order against the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my first order of business is to thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for their generosity and kindness in recognizing how vital these issues are to so many of us.

Just about a couple of weeks ago on the Commerce, State, Justice Appropriations bill, I tried there to reconcile, if you will, what I thought was a terrible direction in limiting the President's opportunity to join in peacekeeping efforts and to fund peacekeeping efforts around the world by way of the restriction on the funding requiring congressional intervention.

This amendment would restore monies that have been taken from the peacekeeping efforts. The bill appropriates $118 million for voluntary contributions for international peacekeeping operations, including those in the Sinai and Cyprus, $16 million, 12 percent less than the request; and $35 million, 12 percent less than the current level.

What my amendment does is add $10 million to this very vital effort.

Mr. Chairman, let me speak to this whole idea of peacekeeping. As we stand here in the early morning hours of July 13, 2000, all of us are prayerful and grateful that there are peace negotiations going on regarding the Middle East. Well, then, I would say, Mr. Chairman, that our responsibilities on peace, as I have indicated on coming to the floor of the House, is a burden that America accepts as one of the most powerful or the most powerful democratic Nation in the world; in fact, the most powerful Nation in the world.

As we look to the continent of Africa with such promise, having passed the African Growth and Opportunity Act,

fighting for survival for those who are infected with HIV/AIDS, we cannot avoid looking at the need for peace. In fact, we find in the passage of the legislation, and the foreign policy has specifically limited the funding for peacekeeping missions in Ethiopia, Eritrea, Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Angola and the Western Saharan region.

Mr. Chairman, this is a tragedy. Just coming back from the United Nations last week, and we joined with several Members of this body, along with a number of ambassadors, many of them from the continent of Africa, where we joined together that we would stop the abuse and use of children in war, stop using children in prostitution and pornography. That was a great step of collaboration, but yet, America cannot join its allies in fighting for peace. In Sierra Leone as a very prime example, Mr. Chairman, let me cite for my colleagues, ''the line of youth swelled with other abductees as the rebels took the boys, told the boys their hands would be cut off and sent back to the democratic president of Sierra Leone.''

Another story, Mr. Chairman, talking about the Jordanian soldiers who arrived in Sierra Leone fresh in this beleaguered peacekeeping effort, and I realize that we have not had good things to say about those peacekeeping efforts, but yet that president is trying. As he paid homage to 19 people killed during the recent demonstration, he was still trying to encourage the 10,000 people who, without fear, gathered to rally around to support him that we can have peace in Sierra Leone.

The only way we are going to have peace is if we have the kind of resources in America to be able to give our fair share to the United Nations peacekeeping efforts. We did it in Kosovo, and many people came on this floor and laughed about Kosovo. They believed we could not have peace there, and yes, it is a shaky peace. But with the United Nations and our air war effort, we have a stabilized peace in Kosovo and in the Bosnian area.

Can we do less on the continent of Africa? Can we do less for the Congo? Can we do less for Angola? Can we do less in Eritrea and Ethiopia? The chairman knows that he worked with me just a few years ago to challenge Ethiopia to improve its human rights situation, and yet, here we are today causing the effort to be diminished by not providing them with peacekeeping funds.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 4811, the Foreign Appropriations bill. We must re-establish our nation's unwavering commitment to the world's International Peacekeeping efforts, which are designed to bring peace and order in times of strife and chaos.

This amendment that would increase funding an amount of $10 million for peacekeeping activities in H.R. 4811, the Foreign Operations appropriation measure.

The bill appropriates $118 million for voluntary contributions for international peacekeeping operations, including those in the Sinai and Cyprus, $16 million (12%) less than requested and $35 million (12%) less than the current level.

As the world's sole super power we must not concede that any part of it is outside of our interest as a nation. What happens in other countries does affect our nation. If only one lesson can be gained by our nation's experience during World War II, it is that ignoring an international problem does not make it go away.

Prior to the Congressional recess for the Fourth of July Break this body made an attempt to negate our nations full range of options in implementing foreign policy by specifically limiting the provision of funding for peacekeeping missions in Ethiopia, Eritrea, Sierra Leone, The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Angola, and the Western Saharan region.

Should that kind of thinking become standard foreign policy for our nation the foes of the United States can just wait until we declare some territory off limits and then relocate their operation to that location and then they could freely use that territory to project their terror to our shoes at will.

It has been said often enough by those who are more versed in national security than most of this body because of their positions on National Security related committees that the one thing no nation should do is say what they will not do. It is better to keep opponents guessing about what we will or will not do regarding the protection of our people and national interest abroad.

Specifically, the amendment increases the President-Peacekeeping Operations funding amount currently in this bill by $10 million. This represents critical funding for United Nations peacekeepers that we must take seriously.

As we all know, a serious issue facing the United Nations, the United States, and Congress concerning United Nations peacekeeping is the extent to which the United Nations has the capacity to restore or keep the peace in the changing world environment. We need a reliable source of funding and other resources for peacekeeping and improved efficiencies of operation.

We need peacekeeping funds in order to promote our own best interest globally. These are not peripheral concerns for countries trying to establish the rule of law. The instability and fragile peace in countries like Bosnia, Ethiopia, Eritrea, the Sudan, and Haiti cannot be ignored. United Nations peacekeeping operations carry out vital functions. They are historically known for their impartiality, integrity, and courageousness.

We need to support democratic institutions in a consistent and meaningful manner. Proposals for strengthening U.N. peacekeeping and other aspects of U.N. peace and security capacities have been adopted in the United Nations, by the Clinton Administration, and by the Congress. Moreover, most authorities have agreed that if the United Nations is to be responsive to post-Cold War challenges, both U.N. members and the appropriate U.N. organs will have to continue to improve U.N. structures and procedures in the peace and security area.

Peacekeeping forces are also critical to ensure that ports remain easily assessable for relief operations, that peaceful operations of civil authority is allowed to re-establish rule by law, and provide order and stability during times of crisis. Some say that there may not be a famine in the Horn of Africa. But we really do not know. We do know that the situation of food insecurity is so bad that conditions are approaching the desperate situation that occurred in 1984, when the people of that nation did experience a famine.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that we can restore peace and security in Africa. These problems are intertwined and the peacekeeping missions in Africa deserve our strong support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Relations on Africa.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentlewoman from Texas for this amendment.

Peacekeeping is where it is. We have seen that by delaying the number of peacekeepers that go into a country because of the lack of funds, we find that they go in unprepared. I think in Sierra Leone we saw that happen. We cannot send people in that are not prepared.

Mr. Chairman, I support the gentlewoman's amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it would increase the level of outlays in the bill in violation of clause 2(f) of Rule XXI. This rule states that ''it shall be in order to consider en bloc amendments proposing only to transfer appropriations among objects in the bill without increasing the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. The amendment would increase the level of outlays in the bill.''

It increases the outlays by $4 million.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Texas wish to be heard briefly on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I certainly do. I appreciate the procedural reference that has been made by the distinguished chairperson of this committee. But as was indicated in earlier discussions, might I say that the context of this appropriations bill deals with our foreign policy.

My understanding is that my amendment is germane to the point that it deals with increasing funding levels for peacekeeping that is denoted in this appropriations bill. I am understanding of the reference that the chairman is making, but I believe that because it deals with what this appropriations bill deals with, which is foreign policy and peacekeeping, that I am germane and within the context of such.

Mr. Chairman, I would care to, if I am able to yield to the chairman, who I understand is coming back to the floor, but let me just say this, that we are suffering in our standing as a world power, being able to carry the kind of leverage to encourage others to promote peace.

□ 0120

We cannot do it if we diminish the funding and if we hold these various amendments nongermane or out of order when we are suffering all over this world. I would ask that the amendment be considered as in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) seek to be heard briefly on the point of order?

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, let me just say that when we say this is nongermane, it makes it appear as though the question of peacekeeping has never been raised. We have been talking about peacekeeping. We even had $2.7 billion removed from the bill about peacekeeping, so we are simply saying that it seems to me that the ruling of the Chair that this is not germane when peacekeeping has actually been part of the appropriations process, it is to a large degree what we have been talking about.

We have been talking about it for Ethiopia and Eritrea, for the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We are talking about peacekeepers possibly in Angola. We are talking about peacekeepers now, after the diplomats have made the Lome accord that says this is the outline for peace in the region, when we had the Lusaka accord that says, this is what the diplomats have done for the Congo, now we need to bring the peacekeepers in to preserve the peace; the Lome accords for the peace in Sierra Leone.

So for them to be called nongermane when this has been the center of much of the discussion here, especially in Africa for the past 3 or 4 weeks, I just would urge that the Speaker reconsider the narrow interpretation, the strict construction that he has done in the interpretation, and look at it not in the specificity but in the fundamental of the general position of peacekeeping, which has been something that has been germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

To be considered pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the level of budget authority or outlays in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read.

Therefore, the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama is sustained against the amendment.

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

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CALLAHAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TODAY

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns this legislative day, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. today.

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

There was no objection.

ORDER OF PROCEEDINGS

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, a point of inquiry. Mr. Speaker, when will the votes be taken tomorrow that had been rolled? Since we only have a few, is it possible we can begin with debate to give Members more time to get in here tomorrow morning, since we went so late tonight?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unable to answer that at this time, but would yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), who possibly could shed some light.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that votes will be rolled in the morning until there are sufficient number of votes to make sense to bring Members over to cast a series of votes on amendments.

Ms. PELOSI. Although we have to be here obviously at 9 o'clock to begin the debate, as far as the other Members are concerned, it is not likely that our first vote will occur at 9 o'clock, but after we have a few more votes.

Mr. THORNBERRY. The gentlewoman is correct.

Ms. PELOSI. I would encourage that. I think that, again, since we have been here so late tonight, it would be great if Members could not have to be here at 9. They have other appointments, et cetera, in the morning, some funerals and things like that.

So while we debate, if they could have that time, it would be great. I thank the chairman.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of official business.

Mr. FORBES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for July 10 through July 12 on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, July 13, 2000, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8493. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Office's report on comparability of pay and benefits, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 18336; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8494. A letter from the Chairperson, National Council on Disability, transmitting a report entitled, ''Federal Policy Barriers to Assistive Technology,'' as required by the Assistive Technology Act of 1998; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8495. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Procurement and Assistance Management, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Greening the Government Requirements in Contracting—received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8496. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Procurement and Assistance Management, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—DOE Authorized Subcontract for Use by DOE Management and Operating (M&O) Contractors with New Independent States' Scientific Institutes through the Science and Technology Center in the Ukraine—received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8497. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Procurement and Assistance Management, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—DOE Administrative Class Deviation, 952.247–70, Foreign Travel, and 970.5204–52, Foreign Travel—received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8498. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Security and Emergency Operations, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standardization of Firearms—received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8499. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Security and Emergency Operations, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Chapter 9, Public Key Cryptography and Key Management—received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8500. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' rule—Revision of Fee Schedules; 100% Fee Recovery, FY 2000 (RIN: 3150–AG50) received June 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8501. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's ''Major'' rule—Revision of Part 50, Appendix K, ''ECCS Evaluation Models'' (RIN: 3150–

AG26) received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8502. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the 1999 management reports of the 12 Federal Home Loan Banks and the Financing Corporation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8503. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, ''Auditor's Review of Unauthorized Disbursements From ANC 8B's Checking Account''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8504. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia, transmitting the report entitled, ''Review of the Financial and Administrative Activities of the Taxicab Assessment Fund for Fiscal Years 1997, 1998, and 1999''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8505. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, ''Status of the Washington Convention Center Authority's Implementation of D.C. Auditor Recommendations''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8506. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report entitled, ''Review of Quantum Meruit Payments Made By District of Columbia Government Agencies''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

8507. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 1999, through March 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

8508. A letter from the Director, Financial Services, Library of Congress, transmitting activities of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission Fund for the six-month period which ended on March 31, 2000, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 188a—3; to the Committee on House Administration.

8509. A letter from the Public Printer, Government Printing Office, transmitting the Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on House Administration.

8510. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule To Remove the Umpqua River Cutthroat Trout From the List of Endangered Wildlife (RIN: 1018–AF45) received June 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8511. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' rule— Distribution of Fiscal Year 2000 Indian Reservation Roads Funds (RIN: 1076–AD99) received June 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8512. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—SAFETY ZONE: OpSail Miami 2000, Port of Miami [COTP MIAMI 00–015] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8513. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Transit of S/V Amerigo Vespucci, Chesapeake Bay, Baltimore, MD [CGD 05–00–004] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8514. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—SAFETY ZONE: Maine Yankee Steam Generator and Pressurizer Removal Wiscasset, ME [CGD1–00–129] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8515. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Outer Continental Shelf Platforms in the Gulf of Mexico (RIN: 2115–AF93) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8516. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Termination of Regulated Navigation Area: Monongahela River, Mile 81.0 to 83.0 [CGD08–00–010] (RIN: 2115–AE84) received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8517. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30029; Amdt. No. 422] received May 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8518. A letter from the General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's ''Major'' rule—Small Business Size Standards; General Building Contractors, Heavy Construction, Except Building, Dredging and Surface Cleanup Activities, Special Trade Contractors, Garbage and Refuse Collection, Without Disposal, and Refuse Systems—received July 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

8519. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Employment and Training Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' rule—Birth and Adoption Unemployment Compensation (RIN: 1205–AB21) received June 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of July 11, 2000]

Mr. LEACH: Committee on Banking and Financial Services. H.R. 3886. A bill to combat international money laundering, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted July 12, 2000]

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3906. A bill to ensure that the Department of Energy has appropriate mechanisms to independently assess the effectiveness of its policy and site performance in the areas of safeguards and security and cyber security; with amendments (Rept. 106–696 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. Report on the Revised Suballocation of Budget Allocations for Fiscal Year 2001 (Rept. 106–729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 534. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the recent nuclear weapons security failures at Los Alamos National Laboratory demonstrate that security policy and security procedures within the National Nuclear Security Administration remain inadequate, that the individuals responsible for such policy and procedures must be held accountable for their performance, and that immediate action must be taken to correct security deficiencies (Rept. 106–730). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DREIER, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. TAUZIN):

H.R. 4825. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families of disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the Medicaid Program for such children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 4826. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to lobbying with appropriated funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORN (for himself, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BARCIA, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. COOK, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. VISCLOSKY):

H.R. 4827. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prevent the entry by false pretenses to any real property, vessel, or aircraft of the United States or secure area of any airport, to prevent the misuse of genuine and counterfeit police badges by those seeking to commit a crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (for himself and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4828. A bill to designate wilderness areas and a cooperative management and protection area in the vicinity of Steens Mountain in Harney County, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

H.R. 4829. A bill to provide for the application of certain measures to the People's Republic of China in response to the illegal sale, transfer, or misuse of certain controlled goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 4830. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located

at 1859 South Ashland Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Cesar Chavez Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 4831. A bill to redesignate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2339 North California Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Roberto Clemente Post Office''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 4832. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to revise the eligibility criteria for the Department of Defense special compensation benefit for certain severely disabled military retirees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCOLLUM:

H.R. 4833. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the definition of the term ''Vietnam era'' to provide eligibility for certain veterans benefits that are based on service during the Vietnam era, without regard to whether such service was in the Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCINTOSH:

H.R. 4834. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend all motor fuel taxes until January 1, 2001; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia:

H.R. 4835. A bill to authorize the exchange of land between the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of Central Intelligence at the George Washington Memorial Parkway in McLean, Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and in addition to the Committee on Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 4836. A bill to provide for the application of certain measures to the People's Republic of China in response to the illegal sale, transfer, or misuse of certain controlled goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POMEROY:

H.R. 4837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow distributions to be made from certain pension plans before the participant is separated from employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 4838. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a waiver of the oath of renunciation and allegiance for naturalization of aliens having certain disabilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BRYANt, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COX, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. METCALF, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. TOOMEY):

H.R. 4839. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide prospectively for personalized retirement security through personal retirement accounts to allow for more control by individuals over their Social Security retirement income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 4840. A bill to reauthorize the Atlantic Coastal Fisheries Cooperative Management Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. POMEROY, and Mrs. CLAYTON):

H.R. 4841. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 to provide increased access to health care for Medicare beneficiaries through telehealth services; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4842. A bill to provide for Federal recognition of the King Salmon Traditional Village and the Shoonaq' Tribe of Kodiak; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi):

H. Res. 549. A resolution recognizing the historical significance of the 10th anniversary of the initial activation of National Guard and Reserve personnel for Operation Desert Shield and Operation Desert Storm and expressing support for ensuring the readiness of the National Guard and Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

402. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to Senate Resolution No. 45 memorializing that the President and Congress to recognize an official political relationship between the United States Government and the Native Hawaiian People; to the Committee on Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 141: Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. DANNER, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 207: Mr. COLLINS.

H.R. 303: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. REGULA, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 363: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 407: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 488: Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 802: Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 827: Mr. RANGEL and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 860: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 890: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 941: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 997: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1055: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 1068: Mr. COX.

H.R. 1102: Mr. ISAKSON and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1216: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1290: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1422: Mr. HALL of Texas and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1574 Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 1890: Ms. VELAZQUEZ and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1899: Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1960: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2200: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2335: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 2451: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2457: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2562: Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 2588: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 2631: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 2660: Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 2686: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2710: Mr. WYNN and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2736: Mr. MOORE.

H.R. 2790: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2870: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KUYKENDALL, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 2888: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 3083: Mr. SANDLINE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. WATERS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 3091: Mr. STARK, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 3102: Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 3142: Mr. QUINN and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 3193: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 3235: Mr. BORSKI and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 3328: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3514: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 3672: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 3676: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3688: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 3698: Mr. MOORE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MINGE, and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 3710: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 3816: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 3842: Mr. FORBES, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. BONO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HULSHOF, and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 3861: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3896: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 3915: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 3996: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. RILEY, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 4046: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 4050: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 4066: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 4142: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 4139: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 4165: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 4211: Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 4259: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4274: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 4277: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 4282: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 4292: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 4328: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HILLEARY, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 4340: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 4349: Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 4393: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 4410: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 4441: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 4480: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 4495: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. KING.

H.R. 4497: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. RILEY, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 4498: Mr. COOKSEY.

H.R. 4538: Mr. NADLER and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 4543: Mr. CRANE and Mr. GILMOR.
H.R. 4546: Mr. WELDON of Florida.
H.R. 4593: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 4644: Ms. LEE, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 4653: Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4659: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 4677: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 4706: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. Visclosky.
H.R. 4710: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 4727: Ms. DANNER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FROST, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. COOK, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HILLIARD, and Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 4740: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 4744: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.
H.R. 4745: Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.
H.R. 4750: Mr. KING, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HOLT, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. KLINK, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEINER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 4759: Mr. BUYER.
H.R. 4760: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FROST, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 4770: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 4793: Mr. BONILLA.
H.R. 4807: Mr. UPTON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BACA, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
H.R. 4817: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 4820: Mr. SCOTT.
H. Con. Res. 58: Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. LARGENT, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H. Con. Res. 249: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 308: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WOLF, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. STABENOW.
H. Con. Res. 340: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 356: Ms. DEGETTE and Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Con. Res. 364: Mr. DELAY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EWING, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. DEMINT, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. RILEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. WICKER, Ms. GRANGER, Mrs. NORTHUP, Ms. DUNN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LATHAM, Mrs. BONO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SKEEN, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. CANNON, Mr. COX, and Mr. BILBRAY.
H. Con. Res. 368: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H. Res. 109: Mr. HOLT.
H. Res. 347: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
H. Res. 398: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. COOK, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. POMBO.
H. Res. 439: Mr. BENTSEN.
H. Res. 458: Ms. DANNER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H. Res. 517: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. FROST.
H. Res. 531: Mr. DEUTSCH.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4632: Mr. SOUDER.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. BAKER

AMENDMENT NO. 29: At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), add the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in title II of this Act under the heading ''DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE'' or under the heading ''ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'' may be made available for the Government of the Republic of Panama unless the United States Government and the Government of the Republic of Panama have entered into good-faith negotiations for the conclusion of an agreement which provides for use by units of the United States Armed Forces of an appropriate military installation in the Republic of Panama for counternarcotics activities and the defense of the Panama Canal.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. BEREUTER

AMENDMENT NO. 30: At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), add the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

PROHIBITION ON ASSUMPTION BY UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT OF LIABILITY FOR NUCLEAR ACCIDENTS IN NORTH KOREA

SEC. 701. (a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to enter into any international agreement, contract, or other arrangement, the purpose or effect of which is to impose liability on the United States Government, or otherwise require financial indemnity by the United States Government, for nuclear accidents that may occur at nuclear reactors in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any treaty subject to approval by the Senate pursuant to article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. BROWN OF OHIO

AMENDMENT NO. 31: In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT–AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CHILD SURVIVAL AND DISEASE PROGRAM FUND'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $40,000,000)'' and in the fifth proviso after the fourth dollar amount (relating to other infectious diseases) insert ''(increased by $40,000,000)''.

In title IV of the bill under the heading ''MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT–CONTRIBUTION TO THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND'', after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $40,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. BROWN OF OHIO

AMENDMENT NO. 32: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new title:

TITLE VII—LIMITATION PROVISIONS

SEC.____. No funds in this bill may be used in contravention of section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307).

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. CAPUANO

AMENDMENT NO. 33: Page 22, line 25, before the period insert the following: ''*: Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $5,000,000 shall be made available to promote peace between Armenia and Azerbaijan and to promote democracy within those two countries through the establishment of an International Fund for the Armenia–Azerbaijan Peace and Democracy Initiative''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. CAPUANO

AMENDMENT NO. 34:

Page 132, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

REPORTS RELATING TO TERMINATION OF UNILATERAL AGRICULTURAL OR MEDICAL SANCTIONS

SEC. 701. (a) REPORTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the President terminates a unilateral agricultural sanction or unilateral medical sanction, the President shall prepare and transmit to Congress a report that contains a description of any occurrence of food or medicine that has been prevented from reaching intended populations by the foreign country or foreign entity involved, any occurrence of stockpiling of food or medicine by the country or entity involved, and any effort by the country or entity involved to foster distribution of food and medicine to the population.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY.—The term ''agricultural commodity'' has the meaning given the term in section 102 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5602).

(2) AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM.—The term ''agricultural program'' means—

(A) any program administered under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691 et seq.);

(B) any program administered under section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1431);

(C) any program administered under the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.);

(D) the dairy export incentive program administered under section 153 of the Food Security Act of 1985 (15 U.S.C. 713a–14);

(E) any commercial export sale of agricultural commodities; or

(F) any export financing (including credits or credit guarantees) provided by the United States Government for agricultural commodities.

(3) MEDICAL DEVICE.—The term ''medical device'' has the meaning given the term ''device'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(4) MEDICINE.—The term ''medicine'' has the meaning given the term ''drug'' in section 201 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321).

(5) UNILATERAL AGRICULTURAL SANCTION.—The term ''unilateral agricultural sanction'' means any prohibition, restriction, or condition on carrying out an agricultural program with respect to a foreign country or foreign entity that is imposed by the United States for reasons of foreign policy or national security, except in a case in which the United States imposes the measure pursuant to—

(A) a multilateral regime and the other member countries of that regime have agreed to impose substantially equivalent measures; or

(B) a mandatory decision of the United Nations Security Council.

(6) UNILATERAL MEDICAL SANCTION.—The term ''unilateral medical sanction'' means any prohibition, restriction, or condition on exports of, or the provision of assistance consisting of, medicine or a medical device with respect to a foreign country or foreign entity that is imposed by the United States for reasons of foreign policy or national security, except in a case in which the United States imposes the measure pursuant to—

(A) a multilateral regime and the other member countries of that regime have agreed to impose substantially equivalent measures; or

(B) a mandatory decision of the United Nations Security Council.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. COBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 35: Page 16, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 19, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. COBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 36: Page 16, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $9,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $9,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. COBURN

AMENDMENT NO. 37: Page 19, line 22, insert before the period the following: '', except that such limitation shall not apply to reconstruction of the electrical power and water systems in Kosovo''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. CONYERS

AMENDMENT NO. 38: Strike section 558 of the bill (page 94, strike line 10 and all that follows through line 3 on page 95).

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. FILNER

AMENDMENT NO. 39: In title II of the bill under the heading ''OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTNACE ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'', add at the end before the period the following: '': *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $3,500,000 shall be made available for programs carried out by the Kurdish Human Rights Watch for the Kurdistan region of Iraq''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 40: Page 6, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $39,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $39,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 41: Page 13, line 14, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. HASTINGS OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 42: Page 26, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 41, line 3, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. JACKSON OF ILLINOIS

AMENDMENT NO. 43: Under the heading ''CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK,'' on page 41, line 3, strike ''$3,100,000'' and insert ''$6,100,000.''

On page 41, line 11, strike ''$49,574,000'' and insert ''$95,983.000.''

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 44: In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $15,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 45: In title II of the bill under the heading ''BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

In title III of the bill under the heading ''MILITARY ASSISTANCE—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT—PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS'', after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 46: Page 132, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR COUNTRIES THAT USE CHILDREN AS SOLDIERS

SEC. 701. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to the government of a country that—

(1) conscripts children under the age of 18 into the military forces of the country; or

(2) provides for the direct participation of children under the age of 18 in armed conflict.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 47: Strike section 587 (page 124, strike line 4 and all that follows through line 15 on page 127).

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MS. KAPTUR

AMENDMENT NO. 48: Page 132, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF UKRAINE

SEC. 701. The amount otherwise provided by this Act for assistance to the Government of Ukraine under the heading ''ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION'', is hereby reduced by an amount equal to the amount of any claim outstanding on the date of the enactment of this Act by the United States Government, a United States business enterprise, or a United States private and voluntary organization against the Government of Ukraine or any Ukrainian business enterprise.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. LATHAM

AMENDMENT NO. 49: Page 132, after line 12, insert the following new title:

TITLE VII—OPPOSITION TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION LOANS THAT WOULD HURT UNITED STATES AGRICULTURE

OPPOSITION TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTION LOANS THAT WOULD REDUCE THE COMPETITIVENESS OF UNITED STATES AGRICULTURE

SEC. 701. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Director at each international financial institution (as defined in section 1701(c)(2) of the International Financial Institutions Act) to use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any proposed loan by the institution that would reduce the competitiveness of United States agriculture.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. MENENDEZ

AMENDMENT NO. 50: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new title:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. **PERU.**

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Organization of American States (OAS) Electoral Observer Mission, led by Eduardo Stein, deserves the recognition and gratitude of the United States for having performed an extarodinary service in promoting representative democracy in the Americas by working to ensure free and fair elections in Peru and exposing efforts of the Government of Peru to manipulate the national elections in April and May of 2000 to benefit the president in power;

(2) the Government of Peru failed to establish the conditions for free and fair elections—both for the April 9, 2000, election as well as the May 28 run-off--by not taking effective steps to correct the 'insufficiencies, irregularities, inconsistencies, and inequities' documented by the OAS Electoral Observation Mission;

(3) the United States Government should support the work of the OAS high-level mission, and that such mission should base its specific recommendations on the views of civil society in Peru regarding commitments by their government to respect human rights, the rule of law, the independence and constitutional role of the judiciary and national congress, and freedom of expression and journalism; and

(4) in accordance with Public Law 106–186, the United States must review and modify as appropriate its political, economic, and military relations with Peru and work with other democracies in this hemisphere and elsewhere toward a restoration of democracy in Peru.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report evaluating United States political, economic, and military relations with Peru, in accordance with Public Law 106–186.

(2) Such report should review, but not be limited to, the following:

(A) The effectiveness of providing United States assistance to Peru only through independent non-governmental organizations or international organizations.

(B) Scrutiny of all United States anti-narcotics assistance to Peru and the effectiveness of providing such assistance through legitimate civilian agencies and the appropriateness of providing this assistance to any military or intelligence units that are known to have violated human rights, suppressed freedom of expression or undermined free and fair elections.

(C) The need to increase support to Peru through independent non-governmental organizations and international organizations to promote the rule of law, separation of powers, political pluralism, and respect for human rights, and to evaluate termination of support for entities that have cooperated with the undemocratic maneuvers of the executive branch.

(D) The effectiveness of United States policy of supporting loans or other assistance for Peru through international financial institutions (such as the World Bank and Inter-American Development Bank), and an evaluation of terminating support to entities of the Government of Peru that have willfully violated human rights, suppressed freedom of expression, or undermined free and fair elections.

(E) The extent to which Peru benefits from the Andean Trade Preferences Act and the ramifications of conditioning participation in that program on respect for the rule of law and representative democracy.

(c) DETERMINATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall determine and report to the appropriate committees of Congress whether the Government of Peru has made substantial progress in improving its respect for human rights, the rule of law (including fair trials of civilians), the independence and constitutional role of the judiciary and national congress, and freedom of expression and independent journalism.

(d) PROHIBITION.—Subject to subsections (e) and (f), if the President determines and reports pursuant to subsection (c) that the Government of Peru has not made substantial progress, no funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the Government of Peru, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors to the international financial institutions to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose loans to the Government of Peru.

(e) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (d) shall not apply to loans to support basic human needs, humanitarian assistance, democracy assistance, anti-narcotics assistance, assistance to support binational peace activities involving Peru and Ecuador, assistance provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, or assistance provided by the Trade and Development Agency.

(f) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (d) for periods not to exceed 90 days if the President certifies to the appropriate committees of Congress that doing so is important to the national security interests of the United States and will promote the respect for human rights and the rule of law in Peru.

(g) DEFINITION.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ''humanitarian assistance'' includes, but is not limited to, assistance to support health and basic education.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. NADLER

AMENDMENT NO. 51: Page 130, after line 16, insert the following new section:

SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING SO-CALLED ''HONOR CRIMES''

SEC. 592. (a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) Thousands of women around the world are killed and maimed each year in the name of family ''honor''.

(2) The United Nations Commission on Human Rights, 56th Session, January 2000, working with the Special Rapporteurs on violence against women and extrajudicial, summary, or arbitrary executions, received reports of so-called ''honor killings'' from numerous countries, including Bangladesh, Jordan, India, and Pakistan, and noted that such killings take many forms, such as flogging, forced suicide, stoning, beheading, acid throwing, and burning.

(3) According to the Department of State's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1999, ''crimes of honor'' in Bangladesh include acid-throwing and whipping of women accused of moral indiscretion.

(4) Authorities in Bangladesh estimate there will be up to 200 ''honor killings'' in that country this year.

(5) Thousands of Pakistani women and girls are stabbed, burned, or maimed every year by husbands, fathers, and brothers who accuse them of dishonoring their family by being unfaithful, seeking a divorce, or refusing an arranged marriage.

(6) Jordan, which had 20 reported ''honor killings'' in 1998, still has laws reducing the penalty for, or exempting perpetrators of ''honor crimes'', and the Jordanian Parliament has twice failed to repeal these laws.

(7) His Majesty King Abdullah of Jordan should be commended for the recent formation of Jordan's Royal Commission on Human Rights, chaired by Her Majesty Queen Rania, which will primarily address obstacles that prevent women and children from exercising their basic human rights, including the persistence of ''honor crimes''.

(8) Although India has made efforts to address the issue of ''honor crimes'', more than 5,000 ''dowry deaths'' occur every year in India, according to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), which reported in 1997 that a dozen women die each day in ''kitchen fires'' designed to be passed off as accidents because the woman's husband's family is dissatisfied over the size of the woman's dowry.

(9) Women accused of adultery in countries such as Afghanistan, the United Arab Emirates, Pakistan, and a host of other countries are subject to a maximum penalty of death by stoning.

(10) Even though ''honor killings'' may be outlawed, law enforcement and judicial systems often fail to properly investigate, arrest, and prosecute offenders and laws frequently permit reduction in sentences or exemptions from prosecution for those who ''kill in the name of honor'' typically resulting in a token punishment, impunity, and continued violence against women.

(11) The right to exist is the most fundamental of all rights and must be guaranteed to every individual without discrimination, and the perpetuation of ''honor killings'' and dowry deaths is a deliberate violation of women's human rights that should be universally condemned.

(b) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING SO-CALLED ''HONOR CRIMES''.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States, through the United States Agency for International Development, should—

(A) work with foreign law enforcement and judicial agencies to enact legal system reforms to more effectively address the investigation and prosecution of so-called ''honor crimes''. and

(B) make resources available to local organizations to provide refuge and rehabilitation for women who are victims of ''honor crimes'' and the children of such women;

(2) the Department of State, when preparing yearly Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, should include—

(A) information relating to the incidence of ''honor violence'' in foreign countries;

(B) the steps taken by foreign governments to address the problem of ''honor violence''; and

(C) all relevant actions taken by the United States, whether through diplomacy or foreign assistance programs, to reduce the incidence of ''honor violence'' and to increase investigations and prosecutions of such crimes;

(3) the United States should communicate to the United Nations its concern over the high rate of honor-related violence toward women worldwide and request that the appropriate United Nations bodies, in consultation with relevant nongovernmental organizations, propose actions to be taken to encourage these countries to demonstrate strong efforts to end such violence; and

(4) the President and the Secretary of State should communicate directly with leaders of countries where ''honor killings'', dowry deaths, and related practices are endemic, in order to convey the Nation's most serious concerns over these gross violations of human rights and urge these leaders to investigate and prosecute all such acts as murder, with the appropriate penalties.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. PAYNE

AMENDMENT NO. 52: Page 8, line 15, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $28,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. PAYNE

AMENDMENT NO. 53: Page 12, line 8, insert before the period the following: ''*: Provided further,* That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not less than $500,000,000 shall be made available to carry out chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. PAYNE

AMENDMENT NO. 54: Page 12, line 8, insert before the period the following: ''*: Provided further,* That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, $500,000 shall be made available for a grant to the Office of the Facilitator of the National Dialogue for the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo''.

Strike section 567 of the bill (page 109, strike line 7 and all that follows through line 11).

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. PAYNE

AMENDMENT NO. 55: Page 26, line 5, after ''$305,000,000,'' insert ''(decreased by $16,000,000)''.

Page 38, line 6, after ''$117,900,000'' insert ''(increased by $16,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. PAYNE

AMENDMENT NO. 56: Page 119, line 24, after ''SIERRA LEONE'' insert ''OR ANGOLA''.

Page 120, line 6, after ''(RUF)'' insert '', or to National Union for the Total Independence of Angolo (UNITA)''.

Page 120, line 8, before the period insert ''or the democratically elected government of Angola, as the case may be''.

Page 120, line 15, before the period insert ''or in Angola''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. PAYNE

AMENDMENT NO. 57: Page 132, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

ASSISTANCE FOR NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC ALLIANCE OF SUDAN

SEC. 701. (a) IN GENERAL.—Of the funds appropriated under the heading ''TITLE II—BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE–ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'' for non-sub-Saharan African countries, not more than $15,000,000 shall be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to provide assistance to the National Democratic Alliance of Sudan to strengthen its ability to protect civilians from attacks, slave raids, and aerial bombardment by the Sudanese government forces and its militia allies.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''assistance'' includes non-lethal, non-food aid such as blankets, medicine, fuel, mobile clinics, water drilling equipment, communications equipment to notify civilians of aerial bombardment, non-military vehicles, tents, and shoes.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT NO. 58: Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $1,000)''.

Page 30, line 8, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $179,600,000).

Page 30, line 9, strike '': *Provided*'' and insert the following '', of which $179,600,000 is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided*, That the $179,600,000 designated by this paragraph shall be available only to the extent an official budget request that includes designation of this amount as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*''.

Page 132, after line 12, insert the following:

TITLE VII—ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS FOR DEBT RESTRUCTURING

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

For an additional amount for ''Debt Restructuring'', $210,000,000 for a contribution to the ''Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund'' of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (HIPC Trust Fund): *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress. For payment to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, there is authorized to be appropriated to the President $210,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MS. PELOSI

AMENDMENT NO. 59: Page 6, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $42,000,000).

Page 7, line 21, after the first dollar amount insert ''(increased by $42,000,000)''.

Page 34, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(decreased by $42,000,000)''.

H.R. 4811

OFFERED BY: MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

AMENDMENT NO. 60: Page 12, line 8, before the period insert the following: '': *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, $30,000,000 shall be made available for plant biotechnology research and development''.