Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, reappoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Coast Guard Academy—

the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) (from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation); and

the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) (At Large).

The message also announced that pursuant to section 1295(b) of title 46, United States Code, as amended by Public Law 101–595, and upon the recommendation of the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the United States Merchant Marine Academy—

the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) (from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation); and

the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) (At Large).

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan will be recognized for 1 minute. All other 1-minutes will be at the end of the day's business.

## WELCOME TO THE REVEREND IRA COMBS, JR.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join you in welcoming today's distinguished guest chaplain, Reverend Ira Combs, Jr., and thank him for leading the House in prayer. Reverend Combs is the founder and pastor of the Greater Bible Way Temple in Jackson, Michigan.

He started that church and now the congregation numbers over 1,000. Reverend Combs has built up his church to serve a growing congregation. He has received the Outstanding Young Men's Award from the National Jaycees and was named in the Marquis Who's Who in America and the Who's Who from the International Business Association, among some of his many awards.

Reverend Combs is distinguished by his love for people, desire to strengthen families and ability to motivate and cultivate those around him. His compassion for the less fortunate has led him to assist many needy families in and around Jackson while working tirelessly to serve his community and his State.

Reverend Combs continues to be a community leader in Jackson. I am proud to welcome him here today as our guest chaplain.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1646, FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 138 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 138

*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. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on International Relations now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Except as specified in section 2 of this resolution, each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments 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. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may recognize for consideration of any amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules out of the order printed, but not sooner than one hour after the Majority Leader or his designee announces from the floor a request to that effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). 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 138 is a structured rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1646, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal years 2002 and 2003. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill and the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. It provides that no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the Committee on Rules report.

The rule provides that each amendment printed in the report shall be offered only in the order printed in the report except as specified in section 2 of the resolution. These amendments shall be offered by a Member designated in the report, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against such amendments.

Section 2 of the resolution allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to permit amendments printed in the Committee on Rules report to be considered out of the order printed provided that the majority leader or his designee announces such a request from the floor no sooner than 1 hour before its consideration. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

The authority provided in section 2 of the resolution will provide flexibility for the House during the lengthy consideration of this bill and the 26 amendments which have been made in order by the Committee on Rules.

In considering amendments, the Committee on Rules was as fair and open as possible, Mr. Speaker. Of the 71 amendments filed, several of which were duplicative or overlapping, this rule makes in order three bipartisan amendments, 13 Democrat amendments, and 10 Republican amendments. I believe this is a generous composition. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and my colleagues on the Committee on Rules for reaching this balance.

I support this fair rule which brings forth very important bipartisan legislation authorizing appropriations for 2002 and 2003 for the Department of State, U.S. contributions to international organizations and commissions, international broadcasting activities, security assistance and for other purposes.

This bill authorizes appropriations for the State Department, thereby setting an upper limit on the amounts that may be appropriated in the Commerce-Justice-State and the Foreign

Operations appropriations bills. It also sets forth authorities and restrictions under which U.S. foreign policy operations may be conducted during the next 2 years.

It is a good bill, Mr. Speaker. Some of the amendments that have been made in order can make the bill even better by addressing important issues, such as the Mexico City policy and United Nations funding. I believe the rule provides ample opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of the Mexico City policy concerning funding for international family planning organizations that offer abortions by allowing an amendment to strike an amendment that was adopted during the committee consideration of the bill. Members will have a clean vote on this issue after a thorough debate. As a believer in the right to life, I intend to support the Hyde-Barcia-Smith-Oberstar amendment because I believe in preserving the President's legal authority to implement the Mexico City policy. The President should have the same authority as those before him. Preserving this policy will not take any funding away from the $425 million the administration has requested for use in population assistance around the world.

But my view is not what is important, Mr. Speaker. What is important is that this issue will be thoroughly available for debate. Last week, as Members know, the United Nations Economic and Social Council voted to remove the U.S. from the U.N. Commission on Human Rights for the first time since the commission's inception in 1947.

Unfortunately, the U.N. Commission on Human Rights has more and more become a club of dictatorships, with the inclusion of such regimes as Sudan, China, Libya, Vietnam. The Cuban dictatorship is automatically reelected as a member each time. The expulsion of the United States simply shows, in my opinion, the true nature of a significant portion of that commission. I am confident that the United States Congress through this legislation will make it clear that it takes note of what is unfortunately really happening to the United Nations.

In response to the U.N. actions, we will be debating the Hyde-Lantos-Sweeney amendment, which would send a clear signal to the governments which did not stand with the U.S. on the U.N. vote that expelled the United States from the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. Hyde-Lantos-Sweeney, which I intend to support, ties United States return to the U.N. Human Rights Commission to the release of $244 million in previously appropriated funds to pay U.S. arrearages to the United Nations. If the amendment is adopted, money will still be available to be released for fiscal year 2001; but it would condition the spending of money for 2002 on the readmission of the United States to the U.N. Human Rights Commission, giving the U.N. ample opportunity to meet this condition.

I am also supportive of an amendment sponsored by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) which will keep the U.S. from wasting valuable time and funds joining and participating in the U.N. so-called Educational and Scientific Cultural Organization, which in my view is an organization truly in search of a mission. Currently, the U.S. gives approximately $3 million each year on a voluntary basis to support educational, scientific, and cultural projects which we feel are worthwhile, whereas if we were to become a member, we would be funding good and bad projects alike.

This structured rule is not without precedent, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1015

In the 103rd Congress, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the State Department authorization bill was considered under a structured rule.

We also considered last year's American Embassy security bill under a structured rule.

The rule is allowing for 26 amendments, which will obviously take up a significant amount of time of the House, and which are as wide-ranging in subject as they are in sponsorship.

I look forward to a vigorous debate on this bill. I commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for their commitment to human rights, their hard work in crafting this bipartisan bill and, as always, for making us all in this House proud.

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 a restrictive rule. It will allow for consideration of H.R. 1646. It is a bill that would authorize the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003. As my colleague from Florida has described, the rule provides for 1 hour of debate. It will be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on International Relations. The rule permits floor consideration of only those amendments selected by the Committee on Rules.

I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for their leadership on this bill. It is refreshing to see a State Department authorization bill which increases funding for vital foreign policy programs instead of making major cuts as we have done in the past.

Our Nation's diplomats are the ounce of prevention towards avoiding international conflict, and a good diplomatic corps with sufficient resources can prevent much more costly and disruptive military actions.

I am also pleased that the bill funds our Nation's commitment to international organizations, especially the United Nations.

Last year, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Richard Holbrooke, negotiated an agreement to lower our U.N. dues, saving America millions of dollars. This legislation will honor that agreement by making the technical changes to current U.S. law. We must now uphold our part of this bargain by paying our back dues to the United Nations. Great nations honor their commitments, and we must pay our bills.

This measure increases the authorization for UNICEF and for refugee assistance. Both of these accounts save lives and they deserve our support. Since 1995, funding for the refugee account has been so low it has not even kept up with inflation. This bill increases the account by more than $100 million above the President's request and will help make up for the shortfall. This funding is especially critical, now since a funding shortfall is anticipated from other donor nations.

Though I am pleased with the bill that was reported out of committee, I must express my disappointment with the rule to accompany the bill that we are now considering. In the 104th and the 105th Congresses, we took up the State Department authorization bill under an open rule. In the 107th Congress, the rule was restrictive but the Committee on Rules made in order most requested amendments. Now this restrictive rule makes in order less than half of the amendments requested.

Moreover, the amendments that are made in order do not fully address the breadth of issues of concern to House Members.

I am especially concerned about one amendment made in order to be offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) to withhold some U.N. dues unless the United States is returned to its seat on the U.N. Human Rights Commission. I must state that I hold these gentlemen in the highest personal regard and I fully support the ultimate goal of their amendment. Like most Americans, I am outraged that the United States was removed from both the United Nations Human Rights Commission and the International Narcotics Control Board. Like the sponsors of this amendment, I want the United States to get back on these commissions in 2002. However, I strongly oppose the approach of the Hyde-Lantos amendment that hold our U.N. back dues hostage to the United States returning to these commissions.

This is the money we owe the U.N. and we have already agreed to pay it. As the gentlemen know, I am opposed to linking back payment of U.N. dues to any cause. With great reluctance, I broke from my pro-life colleagues who wanted to link payment of our dues to funding some international family

planning organizations. Then, as now, I fully supported the end result but then, as now, I do not think that threatening to withhold our U.N. dues, our U.N. back dues, was the proper tactic.

Mr. Speaker, this is President Bush's view as well. Yesterday, the President's spokesman stated while the United States is disappointed with the results of the Human Rights Commission election, the President feels strongly that this issue should not be linked to the payment of our arrears to the U.N. and other international organizations.

The United States has been and continues to be a beacon of hope for defending the human rights and freedoms of all people, and this is the promise of the United Nations. I am afraid that the Hyde-Lantos amendment would only further undermine the operations of the U.N. and our ability to provide leadership. Despite my support for the bill, I reluctantly oppose the rule, and ask my colleagues to vote no on this unnecessarily restrictive rule. Should the rule pass, I ask my colleagues to vote no on the Hyde-Lantos amendment.

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the Committee on International Relations but I would like to express my disappointment that of my amendments that were offered to the Committee on Rules, none of them were approved. That was a great disappointment to me.

I will vote for the rule, recognizing the fact that it is hard to accommodate everyone, but nevertheless it is very clear that I have been an outspoken opponent of the United Nations, and the amendments that we will be discussing will really not deal with the essence of whether or not we should be involved as we are in foreign interventionism. I think we are tinkering on the edges and will not do much to improve the bill even if some of the amendments are passed, some of which I will support.

I do think there are some serious things that we must consider. One is the issue of national sovereignty. To support H.R. 1646, one has to vote to give up some of our national sovereignty to the United Nations. There is $844 million for peacekeeping missions. We know now that we live in an age when we go to war not by declaration of the U.S. Congress but we go to war under U.N. resolutions. When we vote for this bill, and if this bill is supported, that concept of giving up our sovereignty and going to war under U.N. resolutions is supported.

I would like to have struck from the bill all the money for population control. I will support the Mexican City language, but it really does not do that much. All funds are fungible, and if we provide hundreds of millions of dollars for population control and say please do not use it for abortion, it is just shifting some funds around. So there is no real prohibition on the use of American taxpayers' money for abortion if we do not strike all of these funds.

The United Nations have already laid plans for an international tax. This January it was proposed that the U.N. would like to put a tax on all currency transactions to raise $1.5 billion. This is abhorrent. This should be abhorrent to all of us. It should be abhorrent to all Americans that we would have an international tax imposed by the United Nations.

Already the United Nations is involved in tax collecting. In Bosnia right now, in Serbia, the U.N. has as one of their functions collecting taxes on goods coming into the country. There was a demonstration not too long ago by the Serbs objecting to this. The idea that U.N. soldiers, paid by the American taxpayers, are now tax collectors in Bosnia should arouse our concern.

The only way, since we do not have the amendments to reject outright some of this wasteful and harmful funding, the only way we who believe that our sovereignty is being challenged is to reject 1646. I see no other way to address this subject, because it is not in our best interest to go along with this.

The way the bill is written right now, we will support the Kyoto Treaty, and the International Criminal Court is also something that we should be contending with.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule. I am disappointed that the Hastings-Allen amendment was not made in order. Our amendment would establish a special coordinator for Korea to negotiate the end of the North Korean missile program. We can negotiate away the North Korean missile threat, but only if we sit down at the table to discuss the subject. President Bush has refused to do so.

In denying the House a vote on our amendment, Republicans show they have no interest in getting rid of North Korean missiles. Why? Apparently because those missiles are needed to justify the President's extravagant, unworkable missile defense scheme.

It is far easier to defend against a missile that is never built than against a missile that has been launched. There is a new, improved climate on the Korean Peninsula. The North Koreans have voluntarily continued their moratorium on testing. It is a shame on this bill we cannot even vote for a special coordinator to negotiate an end to the North Korean missile threat.

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

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) for yielding me this time. I appreciate his great leadership in this body on so many issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this restrictive rule. The rule should be open and allow for debate of all the issues that could be brought to this floor, because it is extremely important.

Later today I will be speaking about an issue that does not reflect the best of our decisions in the deals that we have made. I am referring to the Hyde-Lantos-Sweeney amendment. This amendment will hold hostage United States payments to the United Nations.

In 1999, under the Helms-Biden agreement, we negotiated a deal with the United Nations. They have held up their end of the bargain. We have not. Because the U.N. has voted the U.S. off the Human Rights Commission, we are deciding that we can break our agreement, that we can break our contract.

This is wrong, and I think we would be ashamed if our children acted in this manner.

Today I am supporting the Bush administration, because they support the funding of the United Nations. If we pass the Hyde-Lantos-Sweeney amendment, it will be the first loss of the Bush administration on Capitol Hill.

I would like to quote from Ari Fleisher, representing the Bush administration. ''While the United States is disappointed with the results of the Human Rights Commission election, the President feels strongly that this issue should not be linked to the payment of our arrears to the United Nations and other international interests.''

If we pass this amendment, we will be sending a message to the world that our word cannot be trusted and that if we do not get what we want, we can break our deal. As I am sure my colleagues will agree, this is not the message we want to send to the world community.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, with great disappointment that the Committee on Rules did not make in order a very important amendment that I had offered. While I understand the restrictions that face the Committee on Rules in selecting a workable number of amendments under tight time constraints, I regret that the committee did not see fit to report my amendment which addresses a very critical and legitimate issue.

The amendment that I had hoped to offer would better coordinate the Federal Government's response to international terrorism. In crafting this bill, my staff and I worked closely with experts in the field of international terrorism, including officials from the Congressional Research Service, the Rand Corporation, the State Department and Department of Justice. In short, I believe this is a very legitimate and growing problem.

Under the measure which I offered also as a bill, H.R. 1338, the Secretary of State would be required to designate an existing Assistant Secretary of State to monitor efforts to bring justice to U.S. victims of terrorism abroad.

□ 1030

Each year, hundreds of thousands of U.S. citizens work and travel overseas, including a growing number of U.S. employees who work for the energy industry based in my district. Because of the confusing blend of multijurisdictional concerns, U.S. victims of terrorism and their families are often unable to obtain justice, even when the perpetrators' whereabouts are known by Federal authorities.

Under this measure, the Assistant Secretary of State would be required to work directly with the Justice Department and other applicable Federal agencies to identify and track terrorists living abroad who have killed Americans or who are engaged in acts of terrorism that have directly affected American citizens. In addition, the Assistant Secretary would provide an annual report to Congress on the number of Americans kidnapped, killed, or otherwise directly affected by the actions of international terrorists. Also included in the annual report to Congress would be a thorough detailing of what actions State and Justice are undertaking to obtain justice for U.S. victims of international terrorism and a current list of terrorists living abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Committee on Rules did not see fit to allow this amendment to be debated on the floor of the House today. As Members of Congress, we have a profound duty to provide an effective response when our constituents have been victims of international terrorists while traveling or working abroad. I am hopeful that I can count on the support of the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations in the weeks ahead to address this very important problem.

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

Mr. Speaker, we oppose the rule. The bill is a pretty good bill. I am very satisfied with the bill, but the rule is very restrictive.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we have crafted a fair rule, with 26 amendments made in order, over half from our friends from the other side of the aisle. The key issues have all been made in order for debate. We look forward to a vigorous debate on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. The Rules Committee has blocked an amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN and myself. This amendment, ''Accountability to Congress for Nuclear Transfers to North Korea Act'', would have provided for thoughtful consideration as the United States and its allies march forward ponderously towards providing nuclear power to North Korea.

North Korea is a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and, as such, is required to submit to inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Since the early 1990s, however, North Korea has blocked the IAEA from performing inspections of certain nuclear facilities. This non-compliance was tacitly accepted by the U.S.-North Korean Agreed Framework of 1994, which arranged for the provision of 2,000 megawatts of light water nuclear reactors to the North Koreans in exchange for them to stop operation and construction of their graphite-moderated reactors. IAEA inspections, however, must occur before ''key nuclear components'' can be delivered.

With a country that is unwilling to fulfill its international obligations, it is important that we scrutinize carefully any transfers of nuclear equipment or technology. At the same time, we must recognize the precarious power predicament in which North Korea finds itself. The nuclear reactors won't be completed for years. And when—and if—they are, North Korea's electric grid is not capable of handling and transmitting the power that will be produced. The people of North Korea will still want for that fundamental building block of an industrialized society—sufficient, reliable electricity.

So we have to balance the various issues; we have to be tough but fair-minded. We have to consider carefully any attempt to transfer nuclear technology or material to North Korea per the Agreed Framework, but we also have to preserve the Agreed Framework, which helped to avoid potential military confrontation on the Korean Peninsula. And as part of ensuring stability there, we have to recognize the legitimate needs of the North Korean people.

The amendment offered by Mr. GILMAN and myself would have accomplished this task. First, it required that before any material or technology was transferred to North Korea under a nuclear cooperation agreement, Congress would have to approve by joint resolution any certification made by the President as specified by the North Korea Threat Reduction Act of 1999. This portion of the amendment passed the House of Representatives in the last Congress by a margin of 374 to 6 on May 15, 2000. Second, the amendment would have prohibited the assumption of liability by the United States government for accidents involving nuclear reactors in North Korea. This portion of the amendment passed the House of Representatives last May by a margin of 334 to 85 as an amendment to the Defense Authorization bill.

Finally, the amendment expressed the sense of Congress that the provision of non-nuclear power generation to North Korea should be considered. This proposal postulated that non-nuclear power was the best way to fulfill the energy needs of North Korea. It encouraged the modernization of the electricity grid. It required that the President report to Congress on the current and projected electricity needs of North Korea and on the cost and time-frame for providing non-nuclear versus nuclear power generation. It was an information-gathering tool. It was a call to think about what we are doing with North Korea. Let us not go blindly along, business-as-usual, and hope that somehow, someday, the nuclear power plants will be built according to the satisfaction of everyone. North Korea will not be satisfied with their lack of electricity, and we in the House of Representatives will not be satisfied with being shut out of the decisionmaking process regarding nuclear transfers to North Korea.

The rule hides from these realities. It should be rejected.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The question is on the resolution.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 226, nays 192, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—226

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aderholt | Collins | Goode |
| Akin | Combest | Goodlatte |
| Armey | Cooksey | Gordon |
| Bachus | Cox | Goss |
| Baker | Crane | Graham |
| Ballenger | Crenshaw | Granger |
| Barcia | Culberson | Graves |
| Barr | Cunningham | Green (WI) |
| Bartlett | Davis, Jo Ann | Greenwood |
| Barton | Davis, Tom | Grucci |
| Bass | Deal | Gutknecht |
| Bereuter | DeLay | Hall (TX) |
| Biggert | DeMint | Hansen |
| Bilirakis | Diaz-Balart | Hart |
| Blunt | Doolittle | Hastings (WA) |
| Boehlert | Dreier | Hayes |
| Boehner | Duncan | Hayworth |
| Bonilla | Dunn | Hefley |
| Bono | Ehlers | Herger |
| Boyd | Ehrlich | Hilleary |
| Brady (TX) | Emerson | Hobson |
| Brown (SC) | English | Hoekstra |
| Bryant | Everett | Horn |
| Burr | Ferguson | Hostettler |
| Burton | Flake | Houghton |
| Buyer | Fletcher | Hulshof |
| Callahan | Foley | Hutchinson |
| Calvert | Fossella | Hyde |
| Camp | Frelinghuysen | Isakson |
| Cannon | Gallegly | Issa |
| Cantor | Ganske | Istook |
| Capito | Gekas | Jenkins |
| Castle | Gibbons | Johnson (CT) |
| Chabot | Gilchrest | Johnson (IL) |
| Chambliss | Gillmor | Johnson, Sam |
| Coble | Gilman | Jones (NC) |

Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schiff
Schrock
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (FL)

NAYS—192

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—13

Abercrombie
Clement
Cubin
Delahunt
Engel
Hunter
Menendez
Moakley
Rivers
Ros-Lehtinen
Sensenbrenner
Stump
Young (AK)

□ 1058

Messrs. BARRETT of Wisconsin, CLYBURN, and ROSS, and Mrs. McCARTHY of New York changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. PAUL 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.

Stated against:

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 105, I was unavoidably detained on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I was unavoidably absent and I was unable to cast my vote on rollcall No. 105, the rule for H.R. 1646, the State Department Authorization bill.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay.''

## AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 1, NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001

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

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, today a ''Dear Colleague'' letter will be sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet the week of May 14 to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process on H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. The bill was ordered reported yesterday by the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H312 in the Capitol no later than noon on Tuesday, May 15.

Amendments should be drafted to the text of H.R. 1 as ordered reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce. That text will be available at the Committee on Education and the Workforce and will be posted on its Web site tomorrow.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1271

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1271.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1100

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on H.R. 1646.

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

There was no objection.

## FOREIGN RELATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 2002 AND 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 138 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. 1646.

□ 1100

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. 1646) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State for fiscal years 2002 and 2003, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD 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 Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1646, the Department of State's authorization for fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

The distinguished gentleman from California, (Mr. LANTOS), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, and I introduced the bill, which was favorably reported to the House by voice vote.

I want to emphasize this is not a foreign aid bill. That subject will be discussed at a later time.

Standing at the edge of a new century, it is appropriate to pause and wonder what lies ahead for us, our descendents, and our country. For the United States, the century just past was one of unprecedented American