United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 15, 2004 No. 98

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend Jean Burch, Senior Pastor, Community Baptist Church, Pasadena, California, offered the following prayer:

This is the day that the Lord has made, let us be glad and rejoice in it. Dear Lord, as we begin this day, we can rejoice because You are our hope. And as we pray, may we be reminded that our hope is not based on optimism but a blessed assurance that this Nation under God will find her destiny in God's love.

I pray that the trust we have placed in the men and women of this House will prevail in the decisions that they make for this Nation. Speak to their hearts, Lord, through Your spirit that they may know Your will for Your people and our land. I pray that each man and woman in this room will not only know Your will, but that they may know You and the power of Your might.

For Lord, it is You who is the God of our hope, the rope we take hold of in times of turmoil, the anchor that holds us steady in the time of storm; and You are our refuge when all else has failed. Now, today, and in the days to come, may the God of hope fill each of you with all joy and peace as you put your trust in Him. In the name of our Lord, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCINTYRE 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.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4363. An Act to facilitate self-help housing homeownership opportunities.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2589. An act to clarify the status of certain retirement plans and the organizations which maintain the plans.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 99–498, the chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore appoints the following individual, to serve as a member of the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance.

Clara M. Cotton of Massachusetts.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain five 1-minutes on each side.

AMBASSADOR JOE WILSON

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

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Joe Wilson's cover has been blown. He has proclaimed to be a truth-teller, but he has been thoroughly discredited. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that Ambassador Wilson said President Bush was lying when in the State of the Union address he said the British Government learned that Saddam Hussein sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa. Last week's bipartisan Senate Select Intelligence Committee report concluded that it actually is Wilson who has been telling us lies.

We now know for certain that Wilson was wrong and that Bush's statement was entirely accurate. In September 2003, an independent British parliamentary committee looked into the matter and determined that the claim made by the British intelligence was in fact reasonable.

In recent days, the Financial Times has reported that illicit sales of uranium from Niger were indeed being negotiated with Iraq as well as four other states. According to the Financial Times, human and electronic intelligence sources from a number of countries picked up repeated discussions of an illicit trade in uranium from Niger. One of the customers discussed by the traders was Iraq.

There is more. The Senate report says fairly bluntly that Wilson lied to the media. The panel found that Wilson provided misleading information to The Washington Post last June, which has created more suspicion around him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring these developments to my colleagues in the House because they will not read this in the New York Times.

VICE PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE JOHN EDWARDS OF NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. Speaker, Vice Presidential candidate JOHN EDWARDS of North Carolina is a man who cares for people, who has a passion for a brighter America,

Printed on recycled paper.

and who will work in partnership with the U.S. Congress to improve our communities and to help lift all of our citizens up. Senator EDWARDS has always put people first. He understands the challenges that face our Nation in rural areas, suburban and urban America.

Second, he has a passion to make life better for all Americans. From education to energy, from factories to the farms, from health care to housing, Senator EDWARDS has a real desire to make improvements in these and so many other areas.

Third, JOHN has seen firsthand the challenges that citizens from all walks of life face, and he knows that we must work together in a bipartisan manner to move forward and to help our Nation. Senator EDWARDS has a vision for a better, stronger, and brighter America. With his focus on people, his passion for moving forward, and his commitment to partnership, he, indeed, will make an exceptional Vice President.

A STORY WE WILL NOT READ IN THE NEW YORK TIMES

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida talked about stories we will not read in the New York Times. Let me talk about another one.

Today, Mr. Speaker, 20, 25 women from the country of Iraq are here on the Hill talking with various Members of the House of Representatives, and their stories are so very poignant.

I just left a meeting with them, and I needed to share some of their words with my colleagues. To the question: What about the fact that America might have gone to war with Iraq under false pretenses? The first woman who raised her hand said, ''What took you so long?'' A woman who is a city leader in Karbala said 48 people in her family have been executed, and to this day they do not know where most of those family members are buried. She said to us, ''Why would you even ask this question?'' Another woman said, ''Chemical warfare has been used on my family. So many have been lost. We don't know where they have gone. You should have been here in 1991. Liberation was late. We were left to be tortured.''

On the subject of Fallujah, one woman stood up and very powerfully said, ''Please finish the job.'' I could not agree more.

SUPPORT FUNDING FOR UNFPA

(Mrs. MALONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, today we consider appropriating $25 million that would reassure the world about the U.S. commitment to saving women's lives.

The Bush administration has systematically undermined that commitment in its continued assault on UNFPA, the U.N. Population Fund. Our allies watch in horror as the world's enormous need for family planning goes unmet; and meanwhile our government allies itself with Iran, Syria, and Afghanistan in opposing voluntary international family planning programs.

Today, we can help to right that wrong by approving a measure that would direct $25 million to UNFPA programs to prevent and treat obstetric fistula, a devastating condition that afflicts 2 million women worldwide. No other agency works in this vital area.

Let us send a message to the Bush administration that this Congress listens to the American people even if it does not. The world is waiting for us to act. UNFPA saves women's and children's lives.

WE HAVE MADE PROGRESS IN THE WAR ON TERROR

(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, we have made great progress in the war on terror. Three years ago, in Afghanistan, al Qaeda was training and sending out thousands of terrorists. Pakistan had a significant al Qaeda presence. Saudi Arabia was a major area of support for al Qaeda. In Iraq, a sworn enemy of America was in power. Nuclear weapons technology was being sold to countries like Iran, North Korea, and Libya. For years, terrorists attacked the U.S. with relative impunity.

Three years later, because of the leadership of George Bush, in Afghanistan the terror camps are closed, Osama bin Laden is hiding in caves. Pakistani forces are rounding up terrorists on their border. Saudi Arabia is working closely with the U.S. to root out al Qaeda. In Iraq, our coalition removed a declared enemy of the United States. And we have ended one of the most dangerous sources of nuclear proliferation.

Today, because America has acted and we have led, the forces of terror and tyranny have suffered defeat after defeat, and America and the world are safer.

PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO MICHIGAN NOTHING MORE THAN A PEP RALLY

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, this week the President visited Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Too bad his visit was a pep rally. Instead, he owed the people of Northern Michigan some answers about his failed policies that have taken this Nation backwards in so many ways.

This is what the President should have talked about: how we would address the infinite list of problems and confusion with the sham Medicare prescription drug law; why we created new mandates for Northern Michigan schoolteachers and students through No Child Left Behind, but then failed to provide the needed financial resources to meet them; how he will restore the 397,000 jobs in Michigan we have lost, and more than 2 million nationwide. Many of these jobs have been shipped overseas.

The deficit: why the country has gone from record surpluses to a record $521 billion deficit. Why did the President choose tax cuts for the wealthy at the expense of putting the Nation's checkbook deep in the red?

Homeland security: Why has the President repeatedly cut needed funding for homeland security grants to local and State agencies. The Great Lakes: How will he restore the Great Lakes? His current proposal is a study of studies that will only keep us treading water.

Instead of real answers, all this President can give the American people is a pep rally. The American people deserve better.

PRAISING THE INDIAN AMERICAN REPUBLICAN COUNCIL

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the impressive gains made by the Indian American Republican Council since its founding 2 years ago. Under the outstanding leadership of Chairman Dr. Raghavendra Vijayanagar, there are 11 independent IARC state affiliates, eight Indian Americans are delegates at the Republican National Convention, and President George W. Bush has appointed 14 Indian Americans to his administration, more than any other President.

In particular, I commend the delegates attending the Republican National Convention: from Florida, Dr. Vijay, Dr. Zach Zachariah, Dr. George Thomas, and Dr. Akshay Desai; from Georgia, Mr. Narender Reddy; from Mississippi, Dr. Sampat Shivangi; from Maryland, Dr. Shambu Banik; and from Virginia, Shayam Menon, a prominent graduate of Washington and Lee University.

The IARC has become a nationally respected organization due to the energy, commitment, and dedication shown by its board of directors lead by Dr. Vijay. I look forward to working with the IARC to further the growing ties between Indian Americans and the Republican Party based on the shared values of promoting families and limited government.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

□ 1015

YUCCA MOUNTAIN COURT RULING

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the second highest court in the United States ruled that the proposed radiation standard for the Yucca Mountain project is inadequate to protect the health and safety of the American public and that the EPA knowingly ignored scientists' recommendations when formulating the standard. The Federal Court of Appeals found that the EPA blatantly disregarded the findings of the National Academy of Sciences that radiation levels will reach their peak in 300,000 years, and instead set a 10,000-year radiation standard. The gap between the science and the standard, a mere 290,000 years.

This ruling is the latest proof that the Yucca Mountain project is not based on sound science. When recommending the site to Congress, President Bush knew this radiation standard was not in keeping with scientific findings. Candidate Bush promised that he would not send nuclear waste to any proposed site unless it was based on sound science. President Bush reneged on his promise, ignored sound science, misled the people of the State of Nevada and approved the Yucca Mountain project. Thankfully, the court ruled in favor of science and the people of the great State of Nevada.

HONORING ROLLIE BOREHAM FOR HIS GRACIOUS CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rollie Boreham for his gracious contributions to the Third District of Arkansas. Rollie will be stepping down at the end of the year from his current role as chairman of the board of Baldor, a Fort Smith-based manufacturer. Rollie helped build Baldor into a leader in their field. In doing so, he also generously devoted his time and resources to countless projects in the community.

Before the year is over, the people of Arkansas will see yet another example of Rollie's generosity when the M&N Foundation dedicates their new office. The M&N Foundation is a Fayetteville charity that helps individuals in need. Merlin Augustine, the head of the Foundation, has needed to be very creative to accomplish what he has in their current facilities. Without Rollie's donation for a new building, they would still be working out of that old basement room.

Mr. Speaker, Merlin Augustine and the M&N Foundation can now do their wonderful work from brand-new facilities thanks to Rollie. Rollie's philanthropy has changed the lives of many Arkansans, and for that he deserves our praise.

SAME-SEX MARRIAGE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, after the debacle in the other body over the same-sex marriage amendment which would have been the first time in American history the Constitution would have been used to deny people's rights, there are rumors that the House Republican leadership would like to bring this doomed proposal to our Chamber in an effort to keep us away from issues that we could actually do something about.

One would hope that the Republican leadership would learn from watching the President and the leadership of the Republicans in the other body as they tied up the Senate for days, only to shoot themselves in the foot. Republicans in the other body could not agree amongst themselves, and the Vice President could not agree with his wife. In fact, the Vice President could not even agree with his own position on this issue from a few years ago.

For a President who claimed to come to Washington, DC, as a uniter, this represents another spectacular failure. Efforts to use sexual orientation as a political tool to divide this country for political advantage are shameful and will ultimately fail. One only hopes the voters will hold people who use this tool accountable sooner rather than later.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 10:45 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 19 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 10:45 a.m.

□ 1045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4818, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 715 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 715

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. 4818) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except: beginning with the semicolon in section 565(a)(2) through ''501)'' in section 565(a)(3). Where points of order are waived against part of a section, points of order against a provision in another part of such section may be made only against such provision and not against the entire 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. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 715 is an open rule that provides for the consideration of H.R. 4818, the Fiscal Year 2005 Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations bill. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule also provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

I would like to take a moment to reiterate that we bring this rule forward in totally open fashion. Historically, appropriations legislation has come to the House governed by an open rule, and we continue to do so in order to allow each and every Member of this House the opportunity to submit amendments for consideration, obviously as long as they are germane under the rules of the House.

This legislation before us appropriates over $19 billion for operations across the globe. This bill is fiscally sound, while at the same time compassionate and responsive to needs of millions of people plagued by disease, famine and disaster.

H.R. 4818 bolsters the President's Millennium Challenge Corporation to $1.25 billion, nearly a quarter of a billion dollars more than in fiscal year 2004. This expansion of foreign assistance is meant to help bring economic security, basic tenets of democracy and the rule of law to some of the world's poorest.

In May of this year, the Corporation began the first round of funding assistance by extending aid to 16 developing countries chosen from a total of 63 eligible nations. Each country that will receive this new funding is obligated to meet benchmarks for political, economic and social development, especially in transparency and anti-corruption efforts. Never before has the United States concentrated aid grants to countries that have the capability for reform in this fashion. This program is really, I think, the future of U.S. foreign assistance and a most effective means to responsibly disseminate U.S. taxpayer money in the foreign area.

The underlying legislation provides $2.2 billion to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. Combined with anticipated funding in the Labor-HHS bill, Congress will commit to fulfill President Bush's commitment to 14 countries on the African continent and the Caribbean by appropriating $2.8 billion. This continues the important mission to provide the training and technical assistance to private and voluntary organizations that work to eradicate that nightmarish disease.

The United States already has a proven record on HIV/AIDS assistance, but this year's funding will go far beyond previous obligations. In a speech given yesterday, U.S. AIDS Coordinator Randall Tobias remarked on the $2.4 billion that this Congress provided in fiscal year 2004. He said, ''This year, America is spending nearly twice as much to fight global AIDS as the rest of the world's donor governments combined.''

Our resolve to help all those across the globe who fight this disease is strong and serious. In addition to funding, the Federal Government enlists the expertise of various agencies, including the Food and Drug Administration, which assures that the medicines we send to Africa and the Caribbean are safe and effective to help those with HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, the underlying legislation also provides $2.2 billion for military and economic assistance to Israel. I think we have to continue to ensure that our friends and allies remain secure. A strong Israel is necessary, not only for the region, but obviously we are committed to do everything we can to see that Israel is safe and secure within its boundaries.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) for their leadership on this important issue. I urge all of my colleagues to support both this rule and the underlying legislation.

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

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

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has always fought for a peaceful, democratic and stable world, and now, more than ever, such a world is in our highest national interest. While the United States and her allies are making progress in the war on terror, Congress must remain committed to the ideals of peace and democracy and must do whatever it takes to maintain security here at home and elsewhere.

That is why today, Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor in support of H.R. 4818, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act. Along with defense and diplomacy, foreign assistance remains one of the strongest tools we have to ensure that the world is safe for peace and democracy.

The bill before us today helps ensure that the United States is successful in this mission by providing $19.4 billion for our foreign policy priorities. Among its major provisions, the bill contains significant funding for pressing needs in the war on terror, such as the reconstruction of Afghanistan, and significantly increases funding for HIV/AIDS programs in the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

The bill also provides significant aid to Israel. Specifically, the bill provides Israel with $360 million in economic assistance and $2.2 billion in military assistance. Israel has always been a good friend and strong ally of the United States. She shares our common values of peace and democracy, and she continues to struggle to win the war against terror for the protection of her own people, as we do. America's friendship with Israel has never been more important, and I am pleased we can provide our friend and ally with this aid as we continue the joint struggle to achieve peace and freedom in the Middle East.

Today we will consider the foreign operations bill under an open rule, which I support. However, four Members came to the Committee on Rules yesterday with important amendments that required waivers in order to be considered today and which I believe deserve serious consideration by this House. Unfortunately, not one of these four amendments was granted waivers. Each was defeated on a party line vote.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) brought important amendments dealing with women's health; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) brought an amendment designating an additional $800 million in emergency aid for the global fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria; and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) brought an amendment to help secure peace in the Middle East by transferring $325 million in aid for the Egyptian military into economic assistance that will improve the quality of life for the Egyptian people. The Lantos amendment, which we attempted to protect from a point of order, was not given an order.

In recent months, Egypt has embarked on a major military buildup that may disrupt our efforts to bring peace to the region. It is my understanding that the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) may offer a modified version of his amendment which will not need a waiver today during debate on the bill.

Although I am disappointed that four amendments were not protected, I am pleased that this bill is being considered under an open rule, and I plan on voting in its favor, as I do the bill. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I would first like to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for crafting a foreign aid bill that attempts to balance competing priorities for economic development and security funding. In particular, I would like to express my support for the $400 million provided for basic education.

Over the past 3 years, increased funding levels for basic education has made it possible for USAID to expand its education programs from 20 to 43 countries. These increases have also had positive effects on other U.S. development priorities, such as preventing HIV/AIDS and promoting agricultural development and maternal and child health. It is my hope that over the next couple of years Congress will increase funding for basic education to $1 billion annually. I believe this is the kind of leadership and funding America must demonstrate to achieve universal education by the year 2015. I look forward to working with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), in achieving this goal.

I would also like to touch upon one other priority in this bill that continues to trouble me deeply, U.S. policy and aid for Columbia. Yesterday, a

representative from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees described the dire situation of the internally displaced inside Colombia and the increasing number of Colombian refugees fleeing to neighboring Ecuador, Venezuela and Panama.

I have traveled to Colombia on three occasions over the past 4 years, and each time I have visited communities of the displaced. By most estimates, there are around 3 million internally displaced Colombians, mainly women, children and elderly. This bill makes $5 million available to help displaced Colombians, or approximately $1.66 for each displaced person. This hardly seems adequate to me.

Mr. Speaker, I have traveled to nearly every region in Colombia, and everywhere I go, Colombians of all political viewpoints, including mayors and governors, plead for funds to support community-based programs to generate income, provide basic healthcare, education and nutrition, and to bring some measure of economic stability and security to their towns and villages.

Now, I do not mean to imply that none of these funds in this bill will serve these purposes, but we all know that precious little of U.S. aid is allocated for these types of programs in Colombia, especially when weighed against the need. The simple fact remains that the majority of U.S. funding for Colombia is military and security assistance for counterinsurgency and counternarcotics programs.

Over the past 3 years, along with my distinguished colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), I have offered amendments to cut military aid for Colombia, but the Committee on Rules refuses to consider amendments on their merit and grant some waivers for amendments to appropriations bills so that key foreign policy issues can be more fully explored and debated.

For example, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) and I have never been able to offer an amendment to the foreign operations bill that reflects what many of my House colleagues believe would be a better set of priorities for the hundreds of millions of dollars we send down to Colombia each year; or an amendment that would condition U.S. funding for Colombia's agreement with the paramilitaries to an assurance that paramilitaries with outstanding U.S. extradition warrants will serve prison time in the U.S. or Colombia.

I cannot offer an amendment conditioning U.S. funding to ensure that the land paramilitaries took by violence be restored to the original inhabitants, who are now destitute and desperate displaced people or refugees.

So I sympathize with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), each of whom went before the Committee on Rules the other evening and were denied waivers to debate their important amendments.

□ 1100

We all know that foreign aid authorizing bills come out very rarely and, frankly, the aid for Colombia has never been authorized. It has always been presented to Congress in supplemental spending bills and the Foreign Operations and Defense appropriations bills and hardly ever has a designated line item in the bill. Over $3 billion has gone to Colombia since Plan Colombia was launched, all with very little debate and, in some instances, no debate.

Mr. Speaker, in the future, I hope that the leadership of this House will allow Members to have a more comprehensive debate on whether and how to shape our new and different priorities for the military, security, and economic assistance we are sending to Colombia. I, for one, look forward to that day.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that with regard to the issue of the displaced people in Colombia, it is an extraordinary human tragedy, and the reason that there are displaced people in Colombia is because of the terrorists. What this bill is trying to do, and it does in a very important way, is to help the democratically elected government of Colombia fight the terrorists.

Also, there is aid for refugees in this legislation. I know the people of Colombia are very grateful for it. I had the privilege of visiting them some months back. But obviously, it is not only in the interest of Colombia, but of the United States, to defeat the terrorists, the cause of the displacement of hundreds of thousands of innocent people in Colombia; and we do not lose sight of that. Neither does, obviously, the government of Colombia, because the people there are suffering at the hands of those brutal murderers that are being fought day in and day out by the Colombian people; and, obviously, the American people, through this Congress, are helping the Colombian people fight those terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that I think this is a good rule, it is an open rule, it is a fair rule. I think it is one in which we can carry on a good, healthy debate about foreign policy and our foreign assistance programs, and I hope this body will support it and we can do it quickly and hopefully get on to consideration of the bill very soon.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the rule, but I rise to express my disappointment with this rule.

On a party-line vote, the Committee on Rules refused to make my amendment in order to provide funding on a limited basis to the United Nations Population Fund. I requested that it be made in order so that the full House would have the opportunity to discuss this matter of grave importance, not only to the poorest women and their families, but also to United States national security. Unfortunately, we are being denied the opportunity to debate this issue.

Many of my colleagues think they have voted on this issue before. However, the debate we could have had today would have been different from those of the last 3 years.

To begin with, this amendment would have maintained the Kemp-Kasten restrictions in the bill in their original form. As many of my colleagues know, these restrictions prohibit funding to any organization that supports coercive abortion and sterilization.

The amendment would have provided funding for UNFPA in only six countries, all of which are strategically important to United States national security: Iraq, Afghanistan, Jordan, Pakistan, Kenya, and Tanzania. If UNFPA is found to be supporting coercive practices in any of these countries, the amendment would have prohibited funding for the UNFPA program in that country.

The amendment would have maintained prohibitions on funding for the UNFPA in China and would have restored a prohibition included in previous Foreign Operations bills that requires a reduction in U.S. funds to UNFPA programs for every dollar spent by UNFPA in a country which is alleged to support coercive practices. Currently, China is the only such country.

Essentially, my amendment would have asked a very simple question: Should we let concerns about UNFPA's programs in one country, China, stop the United States from investing in a proven, multilateral program that could, in fact, reap benefits for United States national security?

By improving the health of women and their children, reducing the rate of maternal deaths, and preventing the transmission of HIV/AIDS, UNFPA chips away at the demographic trends and public health disasters that threaten the stability of the world's poorest nations. As we all know, achieving global stability is a primary United States foreign policy goal. I am really disappointed that we will not have the opportunity to debate it today.

I am also displeased that the rule did not grant waivers to other Democratic amendments. One such amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) would have provided an additional $800 million in emergency funding to the Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB, and malaria. While we have provided $400 million in the bill for the Global Fund, an amendment equal to last year's bill and $300

million above the President's request, the Global Fund will require much more in order to meet current and future commitments. It is unfortunate, I say to my colleagues, that we will not be able to vote on this sound policy initiative today.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the 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 rise in strong support of this rule. It is, as the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations stated, an open rule, which allows for any germane amendment to be considered.

I see my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) here, and I would like to say that he knows very well that we tried very much to work with him to accommodate his desire to have an amendment as it relates to our policy towards Egypt; and I know that under this open amendment process, he is going to be able to offer an amendment that is different than the one he had intended to offer. But, as has traditionally been the case, we have provided protection for the bill as it has been reported out of the Committee on Appropriations, and then provided for an open amendment process not moving into this extra area of providing waivers for the amendments that the distinguished ranking minority member of the subcommittee mentioned.

So I believe that the opportunity for a very fair and open and rigorous, and I know it will be a somewhat lengthy, debate, to the consternation of a few of my colleagues here, it will take place; and I think it is very important.

Mr. Speaker, I remember very vividly when the President of the United States stood in his State of the Union message and talked about the need for us to ensure very important support for a number of initiatives. HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis, malaria, all very important programs that are funded in this appropriations bill.

I had the privilege of going last year to Africa and I met with leaders in west and north Africa; and the Millennium Challenge Account is a very important thing, providing an incentive for those nations as they move and take bolder steps towards political pluralism and the rule of law and free and fair elections, and all of the structures that follow that. And the Millennium Challenge Account, I believe, is a very important tool as we continue to encourage that kind of development and growth on the very important continent of Africa.

I also want to say that as we focus on HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria and the issue of the Millennium Challenge Account, to me, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more important in this bill than the important items that focus on the global war on terror.

There are many people who are often hypercritical of the foreign assistance packages that come out of the United States Congress. We all know that it is a fraction of the overall Federal expenditures. But now it is, in many ways, even more important for us to focus on important foreign assistance. Why? Because since September 11 of 2001, we all know that our world here as Americans changed. The rest of the world dealt with terrorist attacks on a regular basis, but we know that September 11 clearly changed our world here. And that is why I believe it very important that we do everything that we possibly can to continue to provide strong assistance to our allies and those who are standing up to the global war on terror. And we know that there are many people who are part of that, many nations are part of that, the coalition is strong and growing; and I believe that this legislation that we are going to consider will go a long way towards building that very important support.

So I congratulate both the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for the hard work that they have put into this important legislation; and I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) who, as a Cuban American, understands how important it is for us as a Nation to do what we can to encourage political pluralism, democratization, free and fair elections, the rule of law, and all of those institutions which we all hope one day the people of Cuba will be able to enjoy.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Texas, for yielding me this time.

First, I want to pay tribute to the bipartisan leadership of this very important subcommittee of the Congress. They have done a great job, and I want to commend them. I also want to thank the scores of my colleagues on the Republican and Democratic sides who have seen the wisdom of an amendment I will propose which will represent a fundamental change in U.S. foreign policy with respect to the Middle East. It is an amendment, the prime beneficiaries of which are the Egyptian people. I will explain.

I am proposing to shift one-quarter of the military aid we are providing on automatic pilot to Egypt and shift that dollar-for-dollar for economic aid, for education, health programs, democracy-building, free media.

Egypt is fortunate enough to have no military threat aimed at it. There are three neighbors Egypt has: the Sudan, which certainly is no military threat to Egypt; Israel, which has peace with Egypt; and Libya, which has just surrendered to the United States all of its weapons of mass destruction. Egypt is one of the most fortunate nations on the face of this planet in terms of its security situation. It has no threat against it.

Yet, year after year, as if we were on automatic pilot, we are providing the Egyptian military with high-tech equipment amounting to $1.3 billion. It is one of the worst expenditures of our foreign aid program.

My measure will shift one-quarter of that military aid to economic and social aid. Egypt will lose not one thin dime, but the Egyptian people will gain an enormous amount in their effort to enter the 21st century.

I would like to suggest that this amendment, $325 million in military aid, traded for $325 million in economic aid, may be subject to a point of order. It is the absurdity of our system that if that point of order is sustained, I will be forced to offer an amendment shifting a larger amount, which will not be subject to a point of order.

So I want all of my colleagues to clearly understand that my initial intent is to propose a shift of $325 million. That is all I wish to achieve. However, if I am blocked by parliamentary maneuvers from accomplishing this, I will be compelled to shift a larger amount, which I am sure the vast majority of my colleagues on the Republican and the Democratic side will support.

Egypt desperately needs economic assistance. Per capita income in Egypt is less than $1,000. The majority of Egyptian women over the age of 15 are illiterate. The last thing this society needs is the ultimate in high-tech weapons in a security situation which is safe, which is unassailable. There is no threat to Egypt.

□ 1115

It would be the ultimate of irresponsibility for us to continue following the path of recent years and automatically appropriate $1.3 billion in military assistance to Egypt.

I will urge at the appropriate time all of my colleagues to support my amendment. This amendment has the support of civil society in Egypt. High-ranking members of the Egyptian parliament have advised me that they are hoping and praying that this amendment will pass because it will provide a major boost to economic and social development by the Egyptian people.

I want to thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time.

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his leadership on so many issues.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the Committee on Rules did not accept an extremely important amendment that I had hoped to offer today. I went to the committee because the issue of funding the United Nations Population

Fund is essential to the health and well-being of millions of women around the world. Women are dying, and the U.S. has turned its back on them.

I offered an amendment that would have ensured that the money in this bill will go to UNFPA and go to help young women and girls who are suffering from obstetric fistula, a terrible condition that occurs during prolonged labor and leaves the women leaking urine for life.

Unfortunately, on a party line vote, the Committee on Rules voted not to protect my amendment.

I assure my colleagues that I have made every effort to compromise on this issue and to break this logjam.

In April of this year, I wrote a letter to the President, signed by many of my colleagues, asking him to put aside our differences and reach a compromise that would help millions of women and girls around the world by funding UNFPA's work on obstetric fistula. Sadly, I received a response ignoring the facts.

Mr. Speaker, women are dying around the world, and this body can do something about it. It is time that we did.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I first want to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), my chairman, and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), our ranking member, for the fine job they have done on this bill. It is not a perfect bill, but it is a bill that we can live with and work for. There is much distress around the world, and this bill begins to address some of that.

I, too, am a little upset about a part of the rule that did not allow for some very serious debate, as well as some help, for the children and the women who live around this world who need attention that this bill, unfortunately, because of our limited means, is unable to address.

I do commend the rule for continuing the process and that we fund Haiti and begin to help that Western hemisphere's poorest country to begin to get back to normal.

Also, the Sudan, as my colleagues know now, in the Darfur region of the Sudan, genocide is taking place, and this bill begins to address that, but I wish and hope that we will withhold our money to Sudan until they, the leadership in Khartoum, addresses the Darfur problem. It is unfortunate, and I hope that we move forward in that regard.

HIV/AIDS is a pandemic in the world. In just completing the World Conference in Thailand, we heard many, many stories about it and what is happening in the world. Africa, Asia, the former Soviet Union, India, it is a pandemic that must be addressed. This bill offers $2.5 billion for that, the largest we have ever appropriated. We wish we could do more. It is unfortunate that one of the amendments offering $800 million more is not going to be able to be offered today, but overall, it is a good bill, not a perfect bill. We must do more to help our neighbors around the world.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman, and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member for their support and leadership in ensuring funding for Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. I want to particularly thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), my co-chair of the Armenia Caucus, for all that he did in the subcommittee.

Through their support, $65 million was allocated to Armenia in economic assistance, and an additional $5 million was allocated in military assistance and $5 million was secured for assistance to Nagorno-Karabakh. I am pleased with these levels of aid, and I would like to reiterate my steadfast support for maintaining these levels as we go to conference.

I am particularly pleased with the fact that parity was restored in the levels of military aid given to Azerbaijan and Armenia. When the Bush administration's budget was released, I was quite troubled that the FMF request for Azerbaijan was four times as high as the request for Armenia. This imbalance simply could not be allowed. When the President waived section 907 of the Freedom Support Act in the aftermath of 9/11, a commitment was made by the Bush administration of parity in any military aid to Armenia and Azerbaijan. Because Azerbaijan continues to blockade Armenia and also has threatened Armenia militarily, it is more important than ever to maintain parity in military aid between the two Nations.

Additionally, it is essential that the people of Nagorno-Karabakh receive the aid and assistance that they need.

I support the language directing the USAID to spend $5 million in fiscal year 2005 for programs in Nagorno-Karabakh. This support is in our country's interests and will help alleviate the conditions of the people there.

Lastly, I would like to thank again the subcommittee for maintaining a high level of economic assistance to Armenia in order for the country to overcome the dual blockade by Azerbaijan and Turkey, which continues to impede Armenia's economic well-being. Despite the dual blockades by Azerbaijan and Turkey, Armenia continues to implement economic and democratic reforms, which have met with considerable success. While Armenia continues to make important reforms, as long as Armenia suffers from blockades on its east and west borders, continued and robust U.S. assistance is necessary to help minimize their impact.

I want to thank the subcommittee again.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would advise the gentleman from Florida that we have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of our time and urge adoption of the rule.

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

I thank all of our colleagues who have come to the floor to debate this important rule. This measure before us that we bring to the floor is extraordinarily important and should be supported by the overwhelming majority of our colleagues today.

I particularly am proud of the leadership that the President has provided and really the congressional leadership has also joined in to create an unprecedented assistance program to fight HIV/AIDS in the world. I think we all have to be very proud of that, and it is a very significant part of the legislation that we bring forward with this rule today.

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 resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on three motions to suspend the rules postponed yesterday in the following order:

H. Res. 615, by the yeas and nays;

H. Res. 713, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Con. Res. 462, by the yeas and nays.

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

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN SUPPORT OF FULL MEMBERSHIP OF ISRAEL IN THE WEOG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 615, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 615, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 377]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Aderholt	Alexander
Ackerman	Akin	Allen

Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Becerra

NOT VOTING—14

Carson (IN)
Collins
Conyers
Deutsch
Franks (AZ)
Greenwood
Hoeffel
Holden
Isakson
Kilpatrick
Majette
Reyes
Thompson (MS)
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1147

Mr. BECERRA changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''present.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in support of full membership of Israel in the Western European and Others Group at the United Nations.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 377, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

DEPLORING MISUSE OF INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE BY UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY FOR POLITICAL PURPOSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 713, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 713, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 361, nays 45, answered ''present'' 13, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 378]

YEAS—361

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Israel
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Young (AK)

NAYS—45

Abercrombie
Baird
Becerra
Capps
Clay
Conyers
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Dingell
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Grijalva
Hinchey
Inslee
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaHood
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
McDermott
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Obey
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rohrabacher
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanders
Solis
Stark
Waters
Watt
Wynn

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—13

Bereuter
Blumenauer
Capuano
Case
Cunningham
DeFazio
Doggett
Holt
Jefferson
Leach
Petri
Sabo
Velázquez

NOT VOTING—14

Carson (IN)
Collins
Delahunt
Deutsch
Franks (AZ)
Greenwood
Hoeffel
Holden
Isakson
Majette
Pomeroy
Thompson (MS)
Watson
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1156

Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. RYAN of Ohio changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: ''Deploring the misuse of the International Court of Justice by a plurality of the United Nations General Assembly for a narrow political purpose.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 378, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FRANKS. Mr. Speaker, I deeply and sincerely regret that I was not able to be present for Rolled Suspension on H. Res. 615, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in support of full membership of Israel in the Western European and Others Group (WEOG) at the United Nations, and Rolled Suspension on H. Res. 713, deploring the misuse of the International Court of Justice by a majority of the United Nations General Assembly for a narrow political purpose. I hereby submit for the record my statement that had I been present for H. Res. 615 and H. Res. 713, I would have voted "aye" to both measures.

REAFFIRMING UNWAVERING COMMITMENT TO TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 462.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 462, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 18, answered ''present'' 4, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 379]

YEAS—400

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Turner (OH)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)

Wilson (SC)	Woolsey	Wynn
Wolf	Wu	Young (AK)

NAYS—18

Abercrombie	McCollum	Otter
Filner	McDermott	Paul
Grijalva	Miller, George	Rahall
Kucinich	Moran (VA)	Stark
Lee	Oberstar	Turner (TX)
Lofgren	Obey	Waters

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—4

Becerra	Sabo
Israel	Watt

NOT VOTING—11

Carson (IN)	Hoeffel	Majette
Collins	Holden	Thompson (MS)
Deutsch	Isakson	Young (FL)
Greenwood	Jones (NC)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1203

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

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H.R. 4837, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108–607) on the bill (H.R. 4837) making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to clause 1, rule XXI, all points of order are reserved on the bill.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4818 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 715 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. 4818.

The Chair designates the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) as chairman of the Committee of the Whole, and requests the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) to assume the chair temporarily.

□ 1203

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. 4818) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, with Mr. TERRY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

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

I am pleased to present to the House today the funding recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs. The bill provides important funding for programs designed to support the global war on terrorism, the battle against HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases, and to support the national interests of the United States. In the wake of September 11, 2001, such funding for our critical friends and allies is more important than ever.

The committee recommends a total of $19,385,645,000 in new discretionary budget authority for fiscal year 2005. This represents a reduction of $1.932 billion from the President's budget request. On the other hand, the bill before us is $1.905 billion above the fiscal year 2004 enacted level when we exclude the supplemental appropriations. If supplemental appropriations are included, the recommendation represents a decrease of $19.287 billion over the 2004 level.

Having gotten those numbers out of the way, let me just say it is important that we know that this bill was developed in a bipartisan way, and I want to pay special tribute and give credit to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my ranking minority member, for the fine work that she has done on this bill and for engaging in a process that resulted in basic agreement on the components of this package, even if funding compromises happen to be found on both sides. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the way the House of Representatives ought to work, and I think the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and I have worked in a bipartisan fashion.

In preparing this legislation, we have three overriding priorities: first, supporting our allies on the war on terrorism; second, responding to the global HIV/AIDS pandemic; and, third, supporting innovative approaches to foreign assistance through the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

Let me summarize how this recommendation responds to those challenges. First, the President's budget request included important military assistance and counternarcotics increases for our allies in the global war on terrorism. That includes an increase of $350 million to equip the new Afghan National Army; an increase of $90 million for law enforcement and counternarcotics programs in Afghanistan; a new base program of $300 million for military assistance for Pakistan as they assist us in hunting terrorists along the Afghan border; an increase of $46 million for a total of $66 million for Poland, a major ally in Operation Iraqi Freedom; and an increase of $73 million, for a total of $2.22 billion for the State of Israel, which is our closest ally in the Middle East.

The committee recommendation includes full funding for these increases both through new budget authority and, in the case of Pakistan, use of $150 million of transfer authority.

The second priority in the President's budget request is one that we also met with an increase of $593 million to combat HIV/AIDS and related diseases, for a total of $2.2 billion. The committee recommendation fully meets that funding level. It includes a grant of $400 million for the Global Fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, subject to conditions that improve the fund's accountability and efficiency. Together with the money that we expect that the House Labor Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies Subcommittee will include, that will mean over $2.8 billion will be available for HIV/AIDS programs around the world in fiscal year 2005.

The Global AIDS Initiative is making treatment and care available to a record number of people affected by the disease. In 2003, only 50,000 people in the developing world had access to the drugs that dramatically reduced the impact of AIDS and extend life for years. By next summer, 200,000 people will have access to these drugs; and over the next several years, millions of infected people will be treated through the use of the Nevirapine for pregnant women.

The third priority, of course, in the President's budget was a request for a $1.5 billion increase for the Millennium Challenge Corporation, for a total of $2.5 billion. Mr. Chairman, given our allocation, we could not recommend full funding for this initiative, important though it is and though I am very personally committed to it. However, to demonstrate our commitment to this important foreign assistance reform effort and to respond positively to

the President's proposal, the recommendation does include $1.250 billion for the Millennium Challenge Corporation. That is an increase of $256 million over last year.

As chairman, I have made the MCC a priority in this bill. I believe in the President's vision of a new form of development assistance where a country's commitment to fighting corruption, its commitment to reform, and its commitment to investing in its people is complemented by an assistance package from the United States, negotiated by the country in the form of a signed compact. We included the authorization that created the MCC in last year's appropriation bill, and the President can continue to count on me as a strong supporter.

In preparing this bill, we were also faced with decreases in some areas of the budget, including some key non-HIV/AIDS health programs, and in the development assistance account. We have restored those reductions and, in the case of development assistance, added funds for basic education. I believe our development assistance program is a key component of our national security strategy, and it is critical to a positive U.S. image in foreign countries.

Including funding for HIV/AIDS, this bill makes available $3.079 billion for health programs overall, and that is an increase of $600 million over last year's House-passed bill. Of this total, over $332 million will be made available to fight TB and malaria. These funds help to continue the global fight against malaria, which kills one person every 30 seconds, most of them African children. USAID implements a comprehensive approach against this disease supporting the purchase and distribution of malaria medicines, a search for a vaccine, and strong prevention efforts.

Basic education has become a signature issue for the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY); so I will let her describe the details of our recommendation in that regard. Suffice it to say that I fully support her efforts to provide more educational opportunities to the impoverished youth of the world, especially women and children. This bill recommends $400 million for basic education activities. That is an increase from $326 million in fiscal year 2004. Report language accompanying the bill requires the Secretary of State to articulate an interagency strategy on the use of those funds so that we have a coherent, coordinated effort that can produce meaningful results in reducing illiteracy.

The bill also supports USAID's work to support microenterprise lending. Report language accompanying the bill references the fiscal year 2004 authorization ceiling of $200 million as the program level the committee expects in fiscal year 2005. It is also important that USAID continue to use the traditional providers of microenterprise lending and not rely excessively on contractors for implementing this program.

We continue an emphasis in our bill on helping developing countries build their capacity to participate in the international trading system. We have $517 million in the bill for trade capacity building, and that is the same amount as the House passed version last year.

Fiscal year 2005 is the final year of the President's Water for the Poor Initiative, announced in August, 2002, in Johannesburg, South Africa. In all likelihood, we will exceed the 3-year goal of spending $970 million on water projects. Report language urges the President to direct $50 million to water programs in Africa with $9 million targeted to programs in East Africa.

The committee continues its strong support for women's programs, provides that not less than $15 million in development assistance shall be made available to improve women's leadership capacity in recipient countries. This is an increase from the $11 million that we provided last year. In addition, from our Afghanistan assistance program, we set a goal of $60 million in fiscal year 2005 for programs for women and girls.

The committee recommendation also responds to emerging needs, such as the provision of an additional $50 million for assistance for Haiti. Following up on my amendment to the Defense appropriation bill that included $95 million in supplemental assistance for the victims of the violence in the Darfur region of Sudan, we recommend $311 million in this bill for humanitarian assistance for Sudan and for the refugees affected by that conflict.

Although there are no funds for Iraq in this bill, we continue our oversight responsibilities by mandating the continuation of an independent inspector general to audit the Iraq Reconstruction program. Without new authority, the inspector general will go out of business on December 28 of this year, 6 months after the Coalition Provisional Authority was disbanded. Section 573 of the bill provides for continued operations of the CPA Inspector General's Office operating under the supervision of the Secretary of State and providing that the $75 million previously appropriated for the IG is to be made available only to the IG for his continued audit and investigative work in Iraq.

We also provide the administration the authority they need to reduce Iraq's debt to our government so that the United States can negotiate an international debt reduction for Iraq. The sooner Iraq has financial stability, the sooner the government of Iraq can fund its own security and reconstruction needs. No new funds are provided for this purpose. Any funding for debt relief will come from previously appropriated funds.

The bill fully funds the President's request for export finance agencies to promote U.S. investment overseas and create jobs in United States export sectors. The bill provides $317 million for those agencies, which include the Export-Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and the Trade and Development Agency. About $311 million of that $317 million is offset by collections.

Mr. Chairman, the United States leads the international fight against coca and poppy cultivation overseas. The narcotics industry has become a source of funding for terrorists, as well as, of course, a source of drugs worldwide. As part of the war on terror, the committee fully funds the President's request for the Andean Counterdrug Initiative at a level of $731 million for antinarcotics, interdiction, for development programs, and rule-of-law and institution-building programs in Colombia, Bolivia, Peru, and Ecuador.

□ 1215

Under the general anti-narcotics account, the bill fully funds anti-narcotics and law enforcement programs in Afghanistan at a level of $90 million, in Mexico at $40 million, and supports an existing program in Pakistan at $32 million.

To support continuing United States leadership in the world for humanitarian responses to refugee crises, we include $776 million for refugee programs, and that is $26 million more than the President requested.

We have $19 million, $1.5 million more than the request, for the Department of Treasury, to provide technical advisors to developing countries throughout the world.

The committee includes full funding of $20 million for the President's request for debt relief for countries who qualify under the Tropical Forestry Conservation Act and $75 million for multilateral debt relief for the poorest nations that receive assistance from the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries, or the HIPC, trust fund.

The committee supports contributions to the Multilateral Development Bank and includes $1.3 billion for such contributions. While the committee was not able to fund the World Bank incentive fund or all the arrears requested by the budget because of the budgetary restraints I mentioned earlier, we have provided full funding of the regularly scheduled contributions to these banks.

Finally, the committee has provided $323 million for voluntary contributions to international organizations and programs, a level $19 million more than the request. It includes $125 million to the United Nations Childrens Fund, or UNICEF, an increase of $5 million for this important organization.

We also have $107 million for the United Nations Development Program, or UNDP, and $7 million for the Fund for Victims of Torture. A total of $25 million is available through the United Nations Population Fund, or UNFPA, under the same ''Kemp-Kasten'' restrictions as exist in current law.

We have had to reduce this bill by $1.9 billion from the President's request, as I mentioned, Mr. Chairman.

Therefore, we did not or could not provide funding for a number of new and expanded initiatives requested by the President or brought to the committee's attention by committee members, other Members of Congress and outside groups.

The major reductions to the President's budget include, as I have already mentioned, a cut of $1.25 billion to the request for the Millennium Challenge Corporation; a reduction of $224 million for the World Bank Group, including the International Development Association; and a cut of $95 million in debt relief. There are other reductions to the President's request, but we tried to retain the base funding for most of the programs.

I believe this balanced bill provides important support for our most critical national security needs, while substantially increasing funding to respond to the global HIV/AIDS pandemic. It enhances our support for overseas development assistance and humanitarian assistance. It meets the high priorities of the President in these areas and accommodates congressional concerns as well.

As I have said, this bill was developed in a very bipartisan manner and should have broad support in the House. I urge a yes vote on this bill.

Before I yield the floor, I want to call the attention of the House to two matters that were inadvertently left out of the committee report. One matter involves the Surgical Implant Generation Network, based in Richland, Washington, which is the only organization in the world that provides, free of charge, an ongoing supply of training and orthopedic materials to surgeons in developing countries who repair fractures of the very poor.

The second matter involves the Vishnevskaya Rostropovich Foundation, a charitable organization based in Washington, D.C., that conducts a mass children's vaccination initiative in the Russian Federation.

I would urge the United States Agency for International Development to give strong consideration to funding proposals for these funding organizations.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following charts for the RECORD.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS- 2005 (H.R. 4818)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE					
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES					
Subsidy appropriation	---	125,700	125,700	+125,700	---
Administrative expenses	72,465	73,200	73,200	+735	---
Inspector General	---	1,140	---	---	-1,140
Negative subsidy	-34,000	-33,000	-33,000	+1,000	---
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States	38,465	167,040	165,900	+127,435	-1,140
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION					
Noncredit account:					
Administrative expenses	41,141	42,885	42,885	+1,744	---
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections	-272,000	-278,000	-278,000	-6,000	---
Subsidy appropriation	23,858	24,000	24,000	+142	---
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation	-207,001	-211,115	-211,115	-4,114	---
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Trade and development agency	49,705	50,000	51,500	+1,795	+1,500
Total, title I, Export and investment assistance	-118,831	5,925	6,285	+125,116	+360
TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
United States Agency for International Development					
Child survival and health programs fund	1,824,174	1,420,000	1,648,500	-175,674	+228,500
(Transfer out)	(-6,000)	---	(-6,000)	---	(-6,000)
Development assistance	1,376,829	1,329,000	1,429,000	+52,171	+100,000
(Transfer out)	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	---	---
International disaster assistance	253,993	385,500	355,500	+101,507	-30,000
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)	110,000	---	---	-110,000	---
(By transfer) (P.L. 108-106)	(110,000)	---	---	(-110,000)	---
Subtotal, Disaster assistance	363,993	385,500	355,500	-8,493	-30,000
Transition Initiatives	54,676	62,800	47,500	-7,176	-15,300
Development Credit Authority:					
(By transfer)	(21,000)	(21,000)	(21,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses	7,953	8,000	8,000	+47	---
Subtotal, Development assistance	3,627,625	3,205,300	3,488,500	-139,125	+283,200
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	43,859	42,500	42,500	-1,359	---
Operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for International Development	600,536	623,400	618,000	+17,464	-5,400
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)	40,000	---	---	-40,000	---
(By transfer)	(6,000)	---	(6,000)	---	(+6,000)
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106) (Transfer to U.S. AID Office of Inspector General)	(-1,900)	---	---	(+1,900)	---
Subtotal, USAID	640,536	623,400	618,000	-22,536	-5,400

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS- 2005 (H.R. 4818)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Capital Investment Fund	81,715	64,800	64,800	-16,915	---
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)	16,600	---	---	-16,600	---
Subtotal, Capital investment fund	98,315	64,800	64,800	-33,515	---
Operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General	34,794	35,000	35,000	+206	---
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)(By transfer)	(1,900)	---	---	(-1,900)	---
Subtotal, Operating expenses	34,794	35,000	35,000	+206	---
Total, USAID	4,445,129	3,971,000	4,248,800	-196,329	+277,800
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance					
Economic support fund:					
Israel	477,168	360,000	360,000	-117,168	---
Egypt	571,608	535,000	535,000	-36,608	---
Other	1,071,143	1,616,500	1,555,000	+483,857	-61,500
Economic support fund (P.L. 108-106)	872,000	---	---	-872,000	---
(By transfer emergency)	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)	---
(By transfer)	---	---	(-150,000)	(-150,000)	(-150,000)
Subtotal, Economic support fund	2,991,919	2,511,500	2,450,000	-541,919	-61,500
International Fund for Ireland	18,391	8,500	18,500	+109	+10,000
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States	442,375	410,000	375,000	-67,375	-35,000
Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union	584,531	550,000	550,000	-34,531	---
US emergency fund for complex international crises	---	100,000	---	---	-100,000
Iraq relief and reconstruction fund (P.L. 108-106)	18,649,000	---	---	-18,649,000	---
(Transfer out) (P.L. 108-106)	(-210,000)	---	---	(+210,000)	---
Debt relief (P.L. 108-106)	---	---	---	---	---
CPA operating expenses (P.L. 108-106)	983,000	---	---	-983,000	---
Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance	23,669,216	3,580,000	3,393,500	-20,275,716	-186,500
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Inter-American Foundation					
Appropriation	16,238	15,185	16,238	---	+1,053
African Development Foundation					
Appropriation	18,579	17,000	18,579	---	+1,579
Peace Corps					
Appropriation	308,171	401,000	330,000	+21,829	-71,000
(By transfer)	(15,000)	---	---	(-15,000)	---
Millenium Challenge Corporation					
Appropriation	994,100	2,500,000	1,250,000	+255,900	-1,250,000
Department of State					
Global HIV/AIDS initiative	488,103	1,450,000	1,260,000	+771,897	-190,000
(Transfer out)	(-15,000)	---	---	(+15,000)	---
International narcotics control and law enforcement	240,274	358,820	328,820	+88,546	-30,000
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)	170,000	---	---	-170,000	---
Subtotal, Narcotics control	410,274	358,820	328,820	-81,454	-30,000

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS- 2005 (H.R. 4818)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Andean Counterdrug Initiative	726,687	731,000	731,000	+4,313	---
(By transfer)	(17,000)	---	---	(-17,000)	---
Migration and refugee assistance	755,712	729,789	756,000	+288	+26,211
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund	29,823	20,000	20,000	-9,823	---
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs	351,414	415,200	382,000	+30,586	-33,200
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)	35,000	---	---	-35,000	---
Subtotal, Nonproliferation	386,414	415,200	382,000	-4,414	-33,200
Subtotal, Department of State	2,797,013	3,704,809	3,477,820	+680,807	-226,989
Department of the Treasury					
International Affairs Technical Assistance	18,888	17,500	19,000	+112	+1,500
Debt restructuring	94,440	200,000	105,000	+10,560	-95,000
Subtotal, Department of the Treasury	113,328	217,500	124,000	+10,672	-93,500
Total, title II, Bilateral economic assistance	32,361,774	14,406,494	12,858,937	-19,502,837	-1,547,557
Appropriations	(11,486,174)	(14,406,494)	(12,858,937)	(+1,372,763)	(-1,547,557)
Emergency appropriations	(20,875,600)	---	---	(-20,875,600)	---
(By transfer)	(59,000)	(21,000)	(-123,000)	(-182,000)	(-144,000)
(Transfer out)	(-42,000)	(-21,000)	(-27,000)	(+15,000)	(-6,000)

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS- 2005 (H.R. 4818)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Military Education and Training	91,159	89,730	89,730	-1,429	---
Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Grants:					
Israel	2,147,256	2,220,000	2,220,000	+72,744	---
Egypt	1,292,330	1,300,000	1,300,000	+7,670	---
Other	829,079	1,437,500	1,257,500	+428,421	-180,000
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)	287,000	---	---	-287,000	---
(By transfer)	---	---	(150,000)	(+150,000)	(+150,000)
(Transfer out)	(-17,000)	---	---	(+17,000)	---
Subtotal, Grants	4,555,665	4,957,500	4,777,500	+221,835	-180,000
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(40,500)	(40,500)	(40,500)	---	---
Total, Foreign Military Financing	4,555,665	4,957,500	4,777,500	+221,835	-180,000
Peacekeeping operations	74,458	104,000	104,000	+29,542	---
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Subtotal, Peacekeeping operations	124,458	104,000	104,000	-20,458	---
Total, title III, Military assistance	4,771,282	5,151,230	4,971,230	+199,948	-180,000
Appropriations	(4,434,282)	(5,151,230)	(4,971,230)	(+536,948)	(-180,000)
Emergency appropriations	(337,000)	---	---	(-337,000)	---
(Transfer out)	(-17,000)	---	---	(+17,000)	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(40,500)	(40,500)	(40,500)	---	---

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS- 2005 (H.R. 4818)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
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	138,418	120,678	107,500	-30,918	-13,178
Contribution to the International Development Association	907,812	1,061,310	850,000	-57,812	-211,310
Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency	1,117	---	---	-1,117	---
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(4,475)	---	---	(-4,475)	---
Total, World Bank Group	1,047,347	1,181,988	957,500	-89,847	-224,488
Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:					
Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund	24,853	25,000	25,000	+147	---
Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:					
Contribution to the Asian Development Fund	143,569	112,212	112,212	-31,357	---
Contribution to the African Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital	5,075	5,100	5,100	+25	---
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(79,610)	(79,533)	(79,533)	(-77)	---
Contribution to the African Development Fund	112,060	118,000	118,000	+5,940	---
Total, African Development Bank	117,135	123,100	123,100	+5,965	---
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Paid-in capital	35,222	35,431	35,431	+209	---
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)	(122,085)	(121,997)	(121,997)	(-88)	---
Contribution to the International Fund for Agricultural Development	14,915	15,000	15,000	+85	---
Total, International Financial Institutions	1,383,041	1,492,731	1,268,243	-114,798	-224,488
International Organizations and Programs					
Appropriation	319,752	304,450	323,450	+3,698	+19,000
Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance	1,702,793	1,797,181	1,591,693	-111,100	-205,488
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(206,170)	(201,530)	(201,530)	(-4,640)	---
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	38,717,018	21,360,830	19,428,145	-19,288,873	-1,932,685
(By transfer)	(59,000)	(21,000)	(27,000)	(-32,000)	(+6,000)
(Transfer out)	(-59,000)	(-21,000)	(-27,000)	(+32,000)	(-6,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses)	(40,500)	(40,500)	(40,500)	---	---
(Limitation on callable capital subscript)	(206,170)	(201,530)	(201,530)	(-4,640)	---
(Emergency Supplemental (P.L. 108-106))	(21,212,600)	---	---	(-21,212,600)	---

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS- 2005 (H.R. 4818)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Czech loans	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
Emergency supplemental (P.L. 108-106)	-21,212,600	---	---	+21,212,600	---
Emergency appropriations	---	---	---	---	---
Total, adjustments	-21,192,600	---	---	+21,192,600	---
Total (including adjustments)	17,524,418	21,360,830	19,428,145	+1,903,727	-1,932,685
Amounts in this bill	(38,717,018)	(21,360,830)	(19,428,145)	(-19,288,873)	(-1,932,685)
Scorekeeping adjustments	(-21,192,600)	---	---	(+21,192,600)	---
Prior year outlays	---	---	---	---	---
Total mandatory and discretionary	17,524,418	21,360,830	19,428,145	+1,903,727	-1,932,685
Mandatory	(43,859)	(42,500)	(42,500)	(-1,359)	---
Discretionary	(17,463,959)	(21,318,330)	(19,385,645)	(+1,921,686)	(-1,932,685)

FOREIGN OPERATIONS- EXPORT FINANCING- AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS- 2005 (H.R. 4818)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2004 Enacted	FY 2005 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RECAP BY FUNCTION					
Mandatory	43,859	42,500	42,500	-1,359	---
Prior year outlays	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Mandatory	43,859	42,500	42,500	-1,359	---
Discretionary	17,480,559	21,318,330	19,385,645	+1,905,086	-1,932,685
Prior year outlays	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Discretionary	17,480,559	21,318,330	19,385,645	+1,905,086	-1,932,685
Grand total, Mandatory and Discretionary	17,524,418	21,360,830	19,428,145	+1,903,727	-1,932,685
DISCRETIONARY 302(b) ALLOCATION					
302(b) allocation	---	---	19,386,000	+19,386,000	+19,386,000
Over/under allocation	17,480,559	21,318,330	-355	-17,480,914	-21,318,685

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. I want to begin by thanking the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) for the close working relationship we enjoy. The bill we consider today is the result of our close collaboration and represents the bipartisan commitment of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations to bring a bill to the House floor that accurately reflects United States foreign policy priorities.

As in the past, the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) has been a gracious colleague, and I am proud of the product of our cooperation. I believe this bill successfully maintains our commitment to ensure that foreign aid remains one of the three pillars of the United States national security policy, along with defense and diplomacy.

The bill provides nearly $19.4 billion in new discretionary budget authority, which is over $1.9 billion below the President's request. It contains substantial funding for pressing needs in support of the war on terror, such as the reconstruction of Afghanistan, and significantly increases funding for HIV/AIDS programs and the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

The bill fully funds and even slightly increases the President's request for the Emergency HIV/AIDS Initiative. Since the very beginning of our effort to fight HIV, the subcommittee has led the charge to increase funding for this key priority. While I would have preferred to have included even more funding, our limited 302(b) allocation precluded us from doing so. However, within the context of our allocation, the bill does provide $400 million for the Global AIDS Fund, the same as last year's bill, and $300 million above the President's request. It also provides $30 million for microbicides research and development and a similar amount for HIV vaccine research and will allow for substantial program increases for all countries where the United States now conducts HIV programs, even those not among the 15 ''focus'' countries of the President's Emergency AIDS Initiative.

I am particularly pleased that we were able to preserve funding for other vital child survival programs, instead of cutting these as the President requested.

As we continue to ramp up funding for HIV programs and respond to the many administration initiatives requested, most notably the Millennium Challenge Account, we cannot retreat from our child and maternal health commitments in the developing world. The progress we have made on the prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS will be lost if the United States does not maintain its leadership role in meeting the basic health needs of women and children in poor countries.

The bill provides $400 million for basic education, which is an increase of $75 million over last year. Increasing this commitment to basic education has been one of my top priorities as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, and I am proud that funding for basic education has increased from $98 million in fiscal year 2000 to a total of $400 million for fiscal year 2005. For the first time, we have included funding specifically to address the issue of school fees in a comprehensive manner in the form of a pilot project to be undertaken by USAID.

As we are all aware, crises in Haiti and Sudan have required us to reevaluate our funding priorities to ensure that the United States is leading the way to alleviate the horrible situation in these two countries. The bill earmarks an additional $50 million above the President's request for Haiti and provides a total of $311 million, $25 million above the request, for urgent humanitarian needs in Sudan.

Congress has already responded to the evolving humanitarian crisis in the Darfur region of Sudan by adding $95 million in emergency funding to the DOD bill. There may be additional funds needed, as we intend to simultaneously fund the rebuilding of southern Sudan if and when a peace treaty is completed. The bill does prohibit assistance to the government of Sudan until it has disarmed and disbanded government-supported militia groups and allows full and unconditional access to the Darfur region to the UN and other humanitarian organizations. The government of Sudan should get the clear and unambiguous message from this bill that we will not tolerate continued brutality and cover-ups.

I am particularly pleased that the bill provides funding to combat terrorist financing in three different accounts, along with report language requiring the administration to analyze the total level and distribution of funding for this priority across all government agencies. This analysis will be a critical tool in ensuring that our efforts are coordinated and efficient.

I am very pleased that this aid bill once again demonstrates our strong commitment to maintaining Israel's economic health and its qualitative edge in the region. The bill also provides increased funding for conflict resolution programs in the Middle East and elsewhere and increased funding for UNICEF, UNDP and UNIFEM's program to prevent violence against women.

While the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and I are in agreement on the vast majority of issues, and, as I did say, we worked so well together, there are a few areas where we may disagree.

Once again, the bill fails to include language that will restore funding for the life-saving activities of the United Nations Population Fund. I had hoped to offer an amendment today to restore funding to UNFPA on a limited basis to countries of clear strategic importance to the United States foreign policy.

Because I discussed this amendment in depth during debate on the rule, I will not repeat the discussion again during the general debate, but I want to make it clear that I think it was a grave error not to include this funding for UNFPA for the six countries strategically placed who have clear laws against abortion and the other provisions of that bill which I believe make a great deal of sense and are very important to the entire world.

I also want to say a few words about our overall allocation, to ensure that the funding levels in this bill are put into context. As my colleagues are surely aware, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations was asked this year to make room for new administration initiatives alongside the core development, export financing and military assistance accounts usually included in the bill. The largest of these initiatives, the Millennium Challenge Account, was initially conceived of by the President 2 years ago, at which time he assured the American people that any funds devoted to it would be in addition to, rather than in place of, existing development funds.

With an allocation nearly $2 billion below the President's request, however, we were hard-pressed to provide significant increases for priorities such as non-AIDS child survival and health, development assistance and refugees and migration assistance.

While we significantly cut MCA funding from the requested level, it is clear that, unless the President increases his request and the committee decides to grant us an adequate allocation, we will continue to have to scrape together the money to level fund or slightly increase our core development priorities. This is a real concern to me. I am sure many of my colleagues share it. I am sure my committee chairman shares it as well.

However, in conclusion, the bill we are recommending to the committee today represents a true bipartisan effort and funds accounts as equitably as possible in the context of the deep cut from the President's request. I support the bill enthusiastically. I hope my colleagues will do the same.

In closing, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) again, as well as all the members of the subcommittee and the associate staff. The majority staff, John, Alice, Rodney, Rob, Lori and Sean, and the minority staff, Mark and Beth, have been extraordinarily helpful in working with the chairman and me in crafting the bill, and I do thank them for their efforts.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), one of the very distinguished members of the subcommittee who has

made some very significant contributions to this bill and has been one of our most valuable members through the years.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill and encourage all of my colleagues to vote in favor of it today.

I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for their working together to produce a very, very good bill. Let me also commend the staff for the work that they have contributed. They have addressed the chairman's, ranking member's and as many of the other Members' problems and interests as possible and done a very good job in producing an effective bill. I hope and expect it will receive broad bipartisan support today.

Mr. Chairman, the foreign operations bill is arguably the most important contribution to America's foreign policy that the House of Representatives makes. Let me briefly highlight a few areas.

Assistance to the Middle East is always a central part of this bill.

□ 1230

For fiscal year 2005, Israel will receive $2.2 billion in military assistance, $360 million in economic assistance, and $50 billion to resettle Jewish refugees in Israel. I strongly support all of that funding.

The U.S.-Israel relationship is a cornerstone of our overall foreign policy, and Israel is our critical ally in the Middle East. We do disagree from time to time, but the U.S.-Israel relationship is incredibly strong.

I also support the military and economic assistance to Egypt in this bill. Because of the level of cooperation we are receiving from Egypt in the war on terrorism and the peace process, I believe the bill contains the right balance of military and economic assistance for each at this time.

I understand that an amendment will likely be offered today to change the balance of assistance to Egypt. I will strongly oppose that amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it as well.

I am also very pleased this bill contains $35 million in economic support funds for Lebanon, including $4 million for the American educational institutions that are there. Lebanon has great potential, and USAID's Village Cluster Program has played an important role in the development of villages throughout Lebanon. I know many Members agree with me on that and that the continuation of this program of $35 million is critical.

Let me just highlight what this bill provides for Armenia. Unfortunately, Armenia is a landlocked country surrounded by nations on both sides that are hostile to it. Because transportation routes into Armenia are sealed, the Armenian economy is being strangled. Therefore, it is appropriate for the U.S. to provide substantial economic assistance. This bill provides $65 million in economic assistance to Armenia, which is an increase above the administration's request.

We also must be very careful with the military assistance we provide in the Caucasus, in the South Caucasus. I believe it is absolutely critical to maintain complete parity in military assistance to Armenia and Azerbaijan. I am pleased that this bill does exactly that.

The State Department's Middle East Partnership Initiative is becoming one of the most progressive reform programs in the Middle East. I am pleased that this bill continues to provide funding for this important initiative.

There are many more valuable programs in this bill, including the Millennium Challenge Corporation, IMET to Greece, microcredit, and, of course, funding to fight the scourge of HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me once again urge everybody on this floor, all Members on both sides, to support this bill, a good bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), an outstanding, effective member of the committee.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, to my ranking member, I thank her for yielding me this time.

I first want to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) for running and steering the committee in such a way that we all have input and are able to offer our deals and suggestions, and that he incorporates them in this bill.

I rise to support the Foreign Operations bill that is before us this afternoon. It is a good bill. If we had more money, of course we could do better and do more things; but the bill before us is a good bill, and I would urge all of our colleagues to support it.

The funding that is included for Haiti is to be commended, $50 million more than was asked for; and, as my colleagues know, they have been under floods and other kinds of problems, and people are dying daily. Children are dying daily. In the Sudan as well. I call upon the United Nations to get involved, Security Council. We have $311 million in this bill, and I as one Member would ask that we not move forward until the Sudanese government works for all of its people to protect all of the women and children and the people of the Sudan.

I want to thank the chairman for accepting the amendment that we offered for our small businesses here in America. Already, small businesses can contract with our government and get contracts after they go through a procurement process. This Foreign Operations bill under my leadership also now allows our American businesses to contract and do business abroad under the same provisions that we have for our domestic businesses. So it is another opportunity for businesses to grow their bottom line and to employ more people.

I too rise against the amendment that will be offered later that will take money out of Egypt's foreign military assistance and put it in another part of the Egypt budget. I am told from my staff and others and the Egypt embassy that they do not want that money moved at this time, and they work well with Israel to keep that money in their foreign military assistance account.

UNICEF, United Nations Children's Education Fund, we have upped the number in this bill, so there are many good provisions in this bill. I urge my colleagues to support it. I commend the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE), and our ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and all our committee for working together in a bipartisan way to bring a good Foreign Ops bill to the floor. I urge the acceptance of my colleagues.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the very distinguished vice chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), who has also been a great member of this committee. I have had the opportunity to travel with him on a number of occasions and he has contributed greatly to the drafting of this bill.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. KOLBE for those words. I want to begin by agreeing with the gentlewoman from Michigan who just spoke about the bipartisan nature of this subcommittee and the product that we have come up with. Sometimes we are accused of partisan bickering on the House floor, and from time to time it is necessary to air our differences and raise our voices to bring attention to those differences in philosophy. But I just wish that the American people had an opportunity to watch my distinguished chairman and my distinguished ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and the way they work together on this very important aspect of our national security program. I want to commend them both and the full committee for the bipartisan nature of the bill.

A couple of things that I would mention about it. This bill addresses the AIDS pandemic by providing a total of $2.2 billion in global assistance to combat HIV/AIDS, as well as other very serious diseases. I think President Bush deserves to be commended for his world leadership in fighting HIV and AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, in the year 2000, Mr. Bush ran as a compassionate conservative, and some people smiled about that and doubted that. I think President Bush has shown his leadership and strength in the things that he has done with regard to Afghanistan and Iraq. But when it comes to HIV and AIDS, President George W. Bush has shown the world the level of his compassion in bringing people from the conservative side of the spectrum to support his worldwide effort to combat HIV and AIDS. This is the highest level of AIDS

funding in the history of our Republic, and so I want to commend the subcommittee, but also the President of the United States for his compassionate leadership in this matter.

The bill provides an increase in foreign assistance for Israel. As we move toward a peaceful resolution to the Middle East issue, it is important for us in America to remember that Israel is our steadfast friend and ally, that they are one of the few democracies in the region, and that they are surrounded by sworn enemies. So as we try to bring the Palestinians in and we try to make everyone a little more friendly in that area, we do not need to forget the fact that Israel is our faithful ally.

The chairman mentioned that he and I have traveled together, and sometimes we do not like to talk about travel when we go back to our constituents. But I have had an opportunity as vice chairman of this committee to visit in Asia and Iraq and in Afghanistan, and, with the ranking member, in some of the poorest areas of Africa; and it is heartening, Mr. Chairman, to see the level of involvement of so many Americans. Certainly we are proud of our troops. It just takes your breath away to see the young men and women of America who volunteer to support our country in uniform. But also, when you go to Africa and you see the Peace Corps volunteers, highly educated graduates of universities who are willing to serve for very, very little pay; when you see the personnel of the USAID agency and realize the fact that they are willing to go in harm's way, though not in a military capacity, but to risk their lives in very, very hostile environments to advance the cause of the United States, and also to do some good in an altruistic way, it is absolutely astonishing. It renews my faith in the American people and in our spirit of volunteerism.

This is a balanced bill. I commend both the ranking member and the subcommittee chairman.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), our distinguished colleague who happens to have his daughter in the audience with her really distinguished road show for the show ''Oliver.'' So we are very happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my very gracious friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the story of boys and girls living on the street and starving to death in our culture is a matter of fiction. It is the story of Oliver Twist. But for huge numbers of people in the world today, it is not a matter of fiction; it is a matter of fact. Seventy percent of the world's population lives in countries where the per capita income in 1 year is equal to what Americans make in a month. Seventy percent of the people live in desperate poverty, and many of those people live in countries where the debt owed by those countries to Western lending institutions is huge.

I commend the chairman and the ranking member for their initiative in the Millennium Challenge Account. By putting $1.25 billion into debt relief for these struggling countries, this is not only an act of human mercy; it is an act of economic intelligence that will benefit our own country as well as the people living in these very troubled and destitute countries.

So I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) in the majority. I thank my dear friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), in the minority. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the bill.

The Chairman pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The Chair would announce that the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) has 7 minutes remaining; the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), a distinguished New Yorker who happens to represent my former district in Queens.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their fine work on this bill. This is an extraordinarily important bill each year. It is very easy to demagogue that we should provide the funding that we do; but, in fact, for relative pennies on the dollar, we get an enormous amount of benefit for our country.

I rise to engage the chairman of the subcommittee in a colloquy to discuss the continuing humanitarian crisis in the Dominican Republic.

This last May, as many as 2,000 Dominicans and Haitians were killed during flooding in the region surrounding the Haitian-Dominican border. In what was perhaps the worst natural disaster ever to hit the Caribbean, there are over 660 dead in the Dominican Republic alone, and tens of thousands lost their homes as entire towns were washed away.

The flooding was a result of a confluence of two unfortunate circumstances. The first is obvious. It was hurricane season in the Caribbean and there were heavy rains. But the second, as the chairman knows, was that poverty in the Dominican Republic and Haiti has forced Haitians and Dominicans to raze entire forests. The wood they harvest allows them to just barely scrape by. Without trees to hold the soil firm, the beautiful hills of the Dominican Republic and Haiti were laid bare, and those living in the valleys below were made susceptible to the mudslides which have wreaked so much devastation.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), and the ranking member have worked hard to provide assistance for both the Dominican Republic and Haiti in this bill, and they deserve to be commended for their efforts. Haiti, torn apart recently by a political crisis, has been provided an additional $50 million in an effort to jump-start their economy and stabilize the new government.

The Dominicans are suffering as well. In the late 1990s, the Dominican economy was growing by 8 percent a year, a remarkable achievement. Last year, the economy shrunk and is expected to shrink another 1 percent this year. Inflation is near 30 percent, and unemployment is at 16 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his continuing interest in helping the people of the Dominican Republic. I hope he will work in conference to provide additional aid to them.

Before the chairman has an opportunity to respond, I will yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) to add her words.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York, and I also thank the ranking member on this committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and I also want to congratulate the chairman of this subcommittee as well.

□ 1245

I rise today to speak about the Dominican Republic as well. I have some deep concerns regarding the lack of emphasis to provide sufficient funding to allow for people there to gather their lives again. We lost 414 people there, 274 missing, 1,600 families displaced, 3,000 homes destroyed.

We need infrastructure funding. We need homes. We need to bring some social awareness and hopefully infrastructure dollars there to put back the lives of the people that live in the Dominican Republic. Many of their family members live in the States. They do send remittances, not nearly enough as what I think should be required or given and would ask that in your discussions that we can include them further in detail.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to the previous speakers on behalf of the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE). Between now and conference the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) will work with USAID to determine the needs of the government of the Dominican Republic with regard to this issue and to ensure the U.S. is being as responsive as possible.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a valuable member of our subcommittee.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this bill and the work of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), our chair and ranking minority member.

Mr. Chairman, many have said that the United States in this current campaign should build allies, that we should strengthen our ties with other governments, that we should back peace treaties and agreements that make war much less likely. This bill does that.

In 1917, the U.S. went to war in Europe and lost hundreds of thousands of young men. In the following years, our government took the easy way out. We demobilized. We saddled allies with debt. We focused resources at home. It was a very popular set of decisions but also laid the foundation for World War II.

One man who understood this well as a mistake was Harry Truman, a veteran of World War I. He saw the waste of a Second World War and knew that he had to do everything to prevent another conflict.

We had to keep an army overseas. We had to lead international organizations. We had to help allies. These were not popular decisions, and Truman made these tough decisions that started this appropriations bill when he stood at 32 percent in the polls.

The lessons he learned were well applied to the world after September 11. This bill backs our allies, especially in the Middle East. It also provides debt relief and reduces the growth of population in countries that can barely create jobs for the people they already have. We have learned that we must be engaged and aggressive with aid and provide leadership in conflict regions.

One institution Truman created was the World Bank, officially titled the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The bank moved quickly into occupied Japan and Germany to rebuild those countries. We fulfilled our obligations and built not just security relationships but allies.

Years after the Bank moved in, we finally created new governments in Germany and Japan. The Bank has a proud tradition of moving quickly and keenly in new states emerging from civil war. I am the only Member of Congress that is an alumni of the Bank, and during my time we opened offices in zones of conflict in quasi states and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

The Bank also provided aid to Croatia and Bosnia and Haiti. It had a proud staff that knew their work was dangerous but important. Given this, it is surprising the World Bank is now so slow to help the people of Iraq. Iraq is a founding member of the World Bank. After the coalition moved into Baghdad, the Bank launched a timely study of Iraq's needs, but then most action stopped.

After the U.N. Baghdad bombing, the Bank lost a staff member and withdrew all of its international staff from Iraq. No one has returned, and the Bank has no plans to put international staff in Iraq.

Worse, the Bank staff spent from May, 2003, until 2004 debating whether to recognize a new government. I think this is a call to action to Secretary Snow to rectify the situation and hope that we can act.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), a good friend and distinguished, effective member of the committee.

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me the time.

Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to first thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. WICKER) for all of his cooperation and that of his staff in taking into consideration all of our concerns, including those in the minority. It is greatly appreciated, and the spirit of bipartisan that you bring to the committee is very welcome and I believe has produced a very fine bill overall.

Of course, my ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), has done a magnificent job in leading us in so many ways to improve the condition of peoples around the world.

A lot of Americans wonder why we spend any money on foreign aid at all. Well, it is really very simple. Of course, we have a humanitarian interest in making sure that people do not suffer, and we help our neighbors, not just those next door but across the border.

But if one were to look at it purely selfishly, in America's national interest, we do not want people to go hungry. We do not want them to be brutalized by dictatorships. We do not want them to become resentful and frustrated and angry, and we do not want them to lash out at all of the powers in the world who live in a democracy and live in freedom, which is what we are facing now, people who have been deprived or who feel deprived, who have nothing to lose by giving up their lives, so they think, to destroy a world order that has ignored them.

Mr. Chairman, I am so delighted that this bill provides money, for example, for microloan projects, where $100 literally given to a small village in Africa or in Latin America or even in Eastern Europe can change the whole town's economy. Buy a sewing machine and create garments, sell those garments and buy another sewing machine.

Along with our aid to our allies such as the state of Israel, to Jordan in the Middle East, our assistance to Egypt, which hopefully will continue to help the situation in Gaza, number one, by preventing smuggling of arms from Egypt to the Palestinians that are being used against Israeli civilians but also to help train a security force in Gaza so that when Israel pulls out of Gaza, as they have announced their intention to do, there will be a civil order in Gaza and the Palestinians can control Gaza themselves and hopefully develop a moderate leadership that is interested in living in peace next to its neighbor, our number one ally and friend for 55 years, the state of Israel.

I am also delighted that we have provided sufficient money for Armenia and Azerbaijan, money for Cyprus for bicommunal activities, because these are ways that areas, countries where there was traditionally tension between the two countries or the two entities within one country can find common ground, get over their historical differences and work together. Hopefully, that is an example for the whole world.

Of course, in Haiti and the Sudan there is much to do. There is so much suffering in Haiti, and that is why I am proud that $75 million in humanitarian aid for Haiti's recovery is in the bill, and that $310 million is in the bill for the Sudan, where there have been and are presently ongoing horrors, murders and rapes and slavery, literally slavery of men, women and children in that region. So that $310 million will be very well spent.

Again, this foreign aid bill not only is in our humanitarian interest to do to make the world a better place and to help our neighbors live a better life, we want to make sure that the people of the world are well fed, have a job, have a chance to be free, have a chance to take care of their families.

This is so important and especially now when, regardless of the cause, and we can debate the cause, I think it is fair to say, and most Americans believe, that many people in the world wonder about America's character. They wonder about that great Nation, shining Nation on a Hill, if we still have the kind of values that they thought we had.

Well, this foreign aid bill should let them know that the people of the United States of America are as generous as always and interested in their well-being.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the support of this bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes and 10 seconds 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, there is no doubt that this must be the most popular appropriations subcommittee, because so many of us have come to the chairman and the ranking member on many of our issues. Really, it deals with world harmony and world peace and the United States largesse or generosity to the world.

It also has its criticisms; and I might say that, along with my appreciation for the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE), I do want to acknowledge some concerns as I give applause.

First of all, I want to acknowledge the strong statement that was made as it regards to Sudan. So many of us have lent our voices to this issue. I

know many have traveled, and many will travel, to Sudan to look at the heinous and horrific acts occurring in Darfur, where Muslim is killing Muslim, where Arab Muslim is killing black Muslim, where women are being pillaged and killed. And we know for sure that there needs to be definitive peacekeeping.

We also know that the governor of Khartoum needs to act, and I would hope when we finish this bill we will have strong, pointed language that the killing must stop and that we will not allow this to be another Rwanda.

I also hope that we will strengthen the peace effort in Haiti, recognize that some of us are still concerned about the deposing of a democratically elected leader, but we want most of all for Haiti to be able to rebuild itself, and we look for those resources in this legislation.

I add my voice to the concern of the Dominican Republic and Haiti in terms of dollars to help reconstruct.

I also support amendments that are adding to the HIV/AIDS killer. As we know, the efforts in Thailand suggest that HIV/AIDS is still killing around the world, but I offer an amendment as well to recognize that it is important to provide U.S. aid to the starving countries around the world.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to add, if you will, something to sustainable development, to provide resources so that farmers can be shown how to work in droughts in Arab communities so that they can provide for themselves around the world. This is an important step.

And lastly, Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will not underfund Pakistan when they are helping us in the war on terror. We should not vote against any amendment that cuts the resources for Pakistan.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), another distinguished member of our subcommittee.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Chairman, there are a lot of good reasons to support this legislation, but let me just touch on one, the Millennium Challenge Account. It is a new way to deal with foreign aid and foreign assistance.

The old way has run its course. We would appropriate money, hold our breath and hope the countries might reallow some of the things that we wanted to happen. And, yet, now we have a results-oriented approach. Because built in to these Millennium Challenge Accounts are incentives for countries to adopt new policies, to provide for economic and personal freedom, and that is a giant step forward.

If you stop and think about it, our threats to this country in terms of terrorism are not going to come from rival global powers. They are going to come from the smaller emerging countries, smaller failing countries. Those are countries where they lack education, they lack the rule of law, they lack personal freedom; and those are countries where terrorism can flourish, where terrorism can fester, where terrorists can find sanctuary. If we want to deal with those kinds of threats, it seems to me we can prevent that from happening through this new approach where we encourage policies like the rule of law, encourage human rights, civil liberties, and we can build the kind of countries through our foreign aid that will prevent this from happening in the future.

□ 1300

Mr. Chairman, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation for these and other good reasons.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. LOWEY) for her ongoing strong leadership. She has been upfront on this issue since I have been in Congress and even before that.

I would like to take this opportunity to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), regarding pediatric HIV/AIDS treatment and care. I would also like to thank him for his strong leadership on this issue and his ongoing commitment to this cause.

As the chairman knows, I have worked consistently for global HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs, particularly for children and orphans in Africa. Currently, over 14 million children have been orphaned by HIV/AIDS, 95 percent of them in sub-Saharan Africa. And while Africa is the epicenter of the pandemic, the next wave is projected to include China and India with between 1 to 15 million and 20 to 25 million infected people, respectively, by 2010.

Mr. Chairman, there is a shortage of trained health care providers who understand and are knowledgeable of the special needs that children with HIV/AIDS have.

I have introduced H.R. 4191 that calls for establishing pediatric HIV/AIDS centers in 10 countries, seven in Africa and the rest in India and China and Guyana. These are countries with epidemic rates of HIV/AIDS resulting in children and orphans with no social support system. These centers would not only provide treatment but also critical training and research, and they are essential.

I hope that the chairman and the ranking member would bring forth their leadership in providing some assistance here.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentlewoman for her attention to this important issue. Children that are affected by HIV/AIDS are a group that tugs at the heart strings of all people. I have worked closely with USAID and the Global AIDS coordinator to develop an integrated, comprehensive approach to fighting this disease, and pediatric AIDS is a core component of that approach.

While I applaud the gentlewoman's intentions, I believe that in some circumstances, integrated treatment and care centers where both adults and children can receive attention would be more appropriate. However, I will be happy to work with the gentlewoman, the Global AIDS coordinator, USAID, and other concerned parties to ensure that orphans and vulnerable children receive proper treatment, care and support, as part of a comprehensive approach to fighting this disease.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I thank the distinguished chairman and the gentlewoman.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

I would join in the praise that I think is well deserved, commending the committee for what it has accomplished within a 302(b) allocation that is far too small, given the immense task that they have been assigned.

There is truly no money that is more important for humanitarian and national security purposes than the money that is spent under this bill. For example, 10,000 people per day needlessly die from waterborne diseases. That is why I am pleased that the chairman mentioned the funding for Water For the Poor, the $970 million 3-year program to finish our commitment that was launched at the United Nations Environmental Summit in Johannesburg.

I note the report language on Urban Programs that is to be found on page 21 where it is pointed out that massive urbanization occurring throughout the developing world is a significant problem. It has been identified by the CIA as one of the seven top threats to American security. The committee is suggesting the USAID focus on urban issues appears to be diminishing as the urban-specific problems are accelerating and seeks to have a report on this issue.

This is critically important, and very necessary at this point.

I would also urge continued oversight on the part of this subcommittee about the balance of aid between Iraq and Afghanistan. We have already spent 10 times as much on development assistance for Iraq, a smaller, richer and less seriously damaged country than Afghanistan, where, after all, the 9/11 attacks were launched and where we are now seeing over two-thirds of the global illicit heroine production.

I am hopeful that the subcommittee can use its oversight power to deal with the correction of that imbalance toward this needy country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 2¼

minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Providence, Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the chairman for their work on this legislation.

I too want to join any colleagues in saying how important a bill like this is, and I only hope this Congress recognizes how critical the kind of aid that is provided through legislation like this is in a time where we are trying to combat international terrorism.

Terrorism feeds on instability. Terrorism feeds on poverty. Terrorism feeds on the loss of hope. And unless we build these economies, unless we provide stability to these countries, such as Sudan, which is obviously such a great tragedy, and I am pleased to see this committee work to try to address the needs of the Sudanese who are starving and dying every day. But in addition to that, Liberia; and I wanted to make a special note. Liberia has been racked with a civil war for over 10 years or more. A third of their population has been driven from their country.

We need to continue to support the effort to connect and build Liberia so that the refugees that have been scattered all around the world can come home and help make that country a country that can move into the future.

The United States has a very close relationship with Liberia. Liberia was founded for former American slaves, hence the name Liberia. Its capital city was named after the President who did that, President Monroe, Monrovia. And I know that within the bill also there are funds for the John F. Kennedy Hospital which is the primary health care facility in Monrovia. And I am pleased to see that the committee has acknowledged that in the efforts to help rebuild Liberia and make it so that those people can move forward in their country.

I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 15 seconds remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) is recognized for 1¾ minutes.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. Lowey), for their hard work on this bill.

This is a tough appropriations year. The chairman, the ranking member and the entire subcommittee staff worked very diligently to create a good bill. It addresses some of the pressing issues: education, narcotics abuse, and worldwide terrorism.

Earlier this week I had the opportunity to meet with some of the most well-educated Iraqi women, many with Ph.D.s and layered graduate degrees. Now that Saddam Hussein's oppressive regime has been removed, these women are socially active and involved in Iraqi politics. This bill recognizes that education increases awareness and activism in developing countries.

The bill supports the war on terrorism by training international forces in hunting down al Qaeda. It increases funding to train and equip the new Afghan National Army. It provides money for Pakistan's military efforts.

I want to thank the chairman for helping to look into the issue of pay for Afghanistan police recruits and instructors, a concern that I had and that I learned primarily of from my district. I look forward to working with the chairman to find a solution.

The bill also funds programs that alleviate the international narcotics program. I am a member of the Speaker's Drug Task Force and know that narcotics control is a pressing international issue, especially for Afghanistan. This bill provides $329 billion to international narcotics control. In doing this we are showing our commitment to root out the main source of terrorism funds.

I thank the chairman, the ranking member, and the subcommittee staff for their help on this bill.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak out against H.R. 4818, this year's Foreign Operations Appropriation Bill. I want to state my apprehension about what has been this Nation's philosophy toward international aid. Perhaps I should say, I rise today to restate my concerns, as much of what troubles me about our foreign aid philosophy is unchanged from year to year. In fact, Mr. Speaker, none of my worries have been reconciled. In some cases, my fear has grown.

A year ago I found myself in exactly the same position. I expressed grave reservations regarding the way the American taxpayers' money was squandered abroad. I had reservations about sending so much of our money away when we have dire needs and deficits here at home. I had serious reluctance about giving money to the UN, an institution that is grossly inefficient, fosters anti-American sentiment, attacks our values and, I believe, furthers anti-Semitism. I had grave reservations that our money was spent to prop up regimes that oppose the war on terror and, in some cases, even help terrorists.

It is often said that the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again, expecting a different result. After voicing my concerns, I waited and have yet to see a significant change. I am someone who is accustomed to results. Because I haven't seen any, I am going to change my vote. Last year, I voted for the Foreign Operations Appropriation Bill. This year I am voting against.

I am voting against the Foreign Operations Appropriation because I do not believe America should be sending money to nations that have turned their backs on our efforts in fighting the War on Terror when our young men and women are sacrificing on foreign soil. I do not believe we should be sending money to the UN until we can be sure that it was not propping up Saddam's regime through the oil for food program. We should not send money to the World Bank when so many of its loans have been failures; and I do not believe we should be sending money to fight AIDS in Africa when we have Americans who need healthcare here at home.

While I am voting against the Foreign Operations Appropriation Bill, I know there are worthwhile causes in the bill. I am torn about my vote. I have always been such a strong and staunch supporter of Israel. As the only established democracy in the Middle East, I have always wholeheartedly supported aid for Israel. As one of our strongest and unflagging allies in the region, Israel indeed deserves our support. Israel has been on the frontlines in the war on terror. The Israeli people understand America's need to take the battle to our enemies, unless we want to be fighting it on the streets of New York. Our support for this nation is fully justified and I just wish there was more we could do.

I would like to point out that there is hope. We have learned some of the lessons of our foreign aid insanity. I have much admiration for the President's Millennium Challenge Accounts. The Millennium Challenge Corporation changes the direction of our foreign aid. This assistance is based on criteria that reflects our values. In order to receive aid through Millennium Challenge Accounts countries must sign compacts that they pledge to govern justly, invest in their people, promote economic freedom and fight corruption. In addition to acknowledging to these principles in advance, these countries also agree to be monitored and will forfeit future aid if they don't make regular progress towards meeting these goals. There are 16 criteria by which countries agree to be judged and I am hopeful this results based approach will promote greater responsibility in our foreign aid programs.

Mr. Chairman, I am voting against the foreign aid bill because too much of our taxpayer's dollars are wasted on misguided and misdirected programs. It is my hope that in the future we will hold international institutions to higher standards of accountability and promoting freedom.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment that was to be offered by Congressman RON PAUL, which seeks to strip Pakistan of necessary resources.

H.R. 4818, without the Paul amendment, allocates up to $200,000,000 to Pakistan in the form of direct loans and guarantees; enables unused funds (up to $150,000,000) appropriated under the "Economic Support Fund" and "Foreign Military Financing Program" to provide assistance for Pakistan; makes funds appropriated in title I and II of this bill available to Pakistan, as well as victims of war, displaced children and victims of trafficking; and finally, it allows funds allocated to Department of Defense to be expanded for crafting, packing, handling and transportation of excess defense articles to various countries, including Pakistan.

The funding provided in the bill, without the Paul amendment, will act as a tool in the global war against terrorism, as Pakistan has been

our partner in this effort. This assistance will create programs combating the spread of disease such as HIV/AIDS, and will continue to foster a much needed trusted relationship in that region of the world. Finally, our assistance will help educate the children of Pakistan, who will be the leaders of tomorrow. As chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I have witnessed how often we forget to provide for our children, who lose international attention and priority during times of active military engagement.

With our assistance, we have been able to witness Pakistan's economic trade and investment improvements, health care improvement, the promotion of democracy and human rights, increased education provision, and the further development of science and technology in Pakistan. By continuing to assist this nation, we will continue a true partnership that promotes world peace and security, and uncaps Pakistan's vast untapped economic potential to the benefit of both Pakistan and the United States.

The United States has enjoyed a strong relationship with the government and people of Pakistan since the founding of the modern state in 1947, and Pakistan has proven to be an indispensable ally during both the Cold War and the War on Terror.

Pakistan's strategically important location and unwavering support have played a decisive role helping to remove the Taliban regime from Afghanistan and the capture of hundreds of wanted al-Qaeda terrorists. Pakistan has suffered thousands of casualties and has been a victim of numerous terrorist acts on their own soil because of their steadfastness with our nation in the War on Terror.

Stripping assistance from Pakistan sends out the wrong message; such an act is disrespectful and most importantly it is dangerous. By choosing to single out and exclude Pakistan from access to our financial assistance, we show them how unappreciative we are for their efforts to aid us in the War against terrorism. Pakistan has been committed to assisting us in the effort to stomp out terrorism, and has proven this commitment by capturing hundreds of terrorists found in Afghanistan and all over the world.

Congressman PAUL asserts that, ample evidence exists proving that Osama bin Laden is a current free resident of Pakistan, and highlights the ineffectiveness of their aid thus far. I ask you to question the validity of this intelligence. Is this the same intelligence used, which caused our nation to believe that Sadam Hussein was harboring weapons of mass destruction? I ask that you also reflect upon our own nation as to how effective we have been in capturing Osama bin Laden ourselves. Playing the blame game has no place here, and only acts to alienate and ostracize a valued ally in the War on Terrorism. Congressman PAUL's amendment suggests that because Osama bin Laden may be currently at-large in Pakistan, we should strip our funding from a nation that has provided us with enormous amounts of aid in our effort to stomp out terrorism.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge my colleagues to remember the fact that we called upon the help of Pakistan during both the Cold War and the War on Terrorism, and in both instances they helped us. Without the knowledge of the future, it would be very unwise to cut off a country that we may need yet another time in the future. There is absolutely no reason to strain our ties with Pakistan by denying them the assistance needed.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend Chairman JIM KOLBE, Ranking Member NITA LOWEY, the other members of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee and the majority and minority staffs for the bipartisan, collegial spirit during our oversight hearings and the subcommittee and full committee markups.

I feel privileged to have worked with such a fine group of people. We all know this is a difficult appropriations year, and I am grateful to Chairman KOLBE and the subcommittee staff for their even-handed approach to drafting the FY 2005 Foreign Operations bill.

I support this bill, despite the lack of resources. The Chairman and the subcommittee staff incorporated most of my requests that significantly improve funding for health and development programs for those suffering in the developing world—especially in Africa. I thank them for that.

During my tenure on this subcommittee, I have always fought for more funds for sub-Saharan Africa. When the President submitted his budget for the Foreign Operations bill earlier this year, he proposed several cuts in Development Assistance and Child Survival funds to scores of specific African countries. Development Assistance funds are crucial to the long-term, sustainable development of these countries because they fund agriculture, education, environment, democracy, and governance programs. Child Survival funds are important because they combat infectious diseases such as HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis.

Moreover, during our oversight hearings, administration witnesses did not put forward a coherent or credible plan when it came to solving the long-term health and development problems of sub-Saharan Africa.

After working with the Chairman and the Ranking Member, we restored these cuts and improved the bill.

Let me be the first to say that this bill is not perfect. Overall, it is almost $2 billion below the President's request. Our commitment to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria is severely underfunded by possibly hundreds of millions of dollars, and although funding for the Peace Corps has been increased from last year relative to FY 2004, it is $70 million below the President's FY 2005 request.

Moreover, this bill is $95 million below the President's request for Debt Restructuring and $13 million below our commitment for the Global Environment Facility.

One of the more troubling aspects of this bill is that the Rules Committee did not make in order a very thoughtful amendment by my Ranking Member, Representative LOWEY.

Representative LOWEY's amendment would have provided much needed health care resources through UNFPA programs in only 6 countries of strategic and national security importance to the U.S.: Iraq, Afghanistan, Jordan, Pakistan, Kenya and Tazania and would continue to prohibit funding for any individual UNFPA country that has been cited for violating Kemp-Kasten.

Despite these omissions, I plan to support this bill. The House should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

Although I think this bill underfunds the Global Fund, it is $300 million above the President's request. This bill is $228 million above the President's request for Child Survival and Health Programs. It is $100 million above the President's request for Development Assistance, and $27 million above the President's request for Migration and Refugee Assistance.

Also, this bill includes $12 million for conflict resolution and a $17 million increase for International Organizations and Programs.

All of the cuts requested in the Child Survival and Health Programs were restored, and $6 million has been included for obstetric fistula prevention and repair. All of the cuts requested for sub-Saharan African countries in Child Survival and Development Assistance accounts have been restored and there is a $15 million African school fee reduction incentive fund.

The Chairman and the Ranking Member have produced a solid piece of legislation despite the lack of resources they were provided. I cannot stress enough how much I have enjoyed my work this year on the Foreign Operations Subcommittee as we addressed the problems and concerns of the developing world. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of this bipartisan legislation crafted by Mr. KOLBE and my good friend from New York, Ms. LOWEY.

Representing one of the most diverse Congressional districts, I know how important U.S. foreign assistance is to nations around the world and I have seen the success of our assistance firsthand.

I am pleased to see the committee increased international development assistance—this is a positive step by the U.S.

We cannot afford to offer only military assistance to front line states in the war on terrorism. Our Nation must address some of the root causes that attract young men and women to the extremists like poverty, lack of education, and the lack of freedom in their countries.

I thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for supporting priorities of mine, including the Asian University for Women that is located in Bangladesh and increased funding for the Peace and Reconciliation programs in this legislation. I believe these types of programs are a step in the right direction to help solve some of the problems that we face around the world.

This bill also includes $25 million for the United Nations Population Fund. But we all know that money will not be released by this administration, because the administration seems determined to hinder the health of women around the world. And this bill continues to mandate the onerous Global Gag Rule, which keeps funding away from groups such as the Bangladeshi Rural Advancement Committee and their work to improve child and maternal health.

While I am saddened to see these horrible policies continued there is much good in this bill particularly when you look at the Middle East. I strongly support the $2.2 billion in foreign military funding and economic aid in this bill for Israel. At this critical point of the peace process we must make sure that our friend and close ally receives all the support they need to protect themselves from terrorists and the states that support them.

While I am pleased about the support for Israel as well as Jordan, a steadfast ally and

proponent of stability, I believe the United States must do more to combat the anti Israeli and Western stances taken by our supposed allies like Saudi Arabia. The anti-Semitic statements made by Crown Prince Abdullah show the true feelings of this so called ally—my colleagues and I have raised our outrage and it is time for the Administration to speak out against these types of slanderous statements.

Egypt will all receive full funding under this bill and I am pleased to see that the Egyptians are starting to take a more active role in the peace process and working to close terrorist smuggling rings in Gaza.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on H.R. 4818, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act of Fiscal Year 2005. This is the [seventh] bill we are considering pursuant to the 302(b) allocations adopted by the Appropriations Committee on June 9th. I am pleased to report that it is consistent with the levels established by the conference report to S. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2005, which the House adopted as its fiscal blueprint on May 19th.

H.R. 4818 provides $19.429 billion in new budget authority, which is within the 302(b) allocation to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and outlays of $26.742 billion. The bill contains no emergency-designated new budget authority, nor does it include rescissions of previously-enacted appropriations.

Accordingly, the bill complies with section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of bills in excess of an appropriations subcommittee's 302(b) allocation of budget authority and outlays established in the budget resolution.

I commend Chairman KOLBE's efforts to prioritize our foreign operations funding to respond to the global HIV/AIDS pandemic, to support our allies in the global war on terrorism, and to support innovative approaches to foreign assistance.

In addition, I strongly support the record level of $2.2 billion in funding provided in the bill to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria; of which almost $1.26 billion is funded under the Global HIV/AIDS account, $885 million under the Child Survival and Health Programs Fund, and $54 million through other accounts.

I am pleased the Appropriations Committee was able to prioritize our critical funding needs for foreign operations within the fiscally responsible manner outlined in the budget resolution and, therefore, urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4818.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for H.R. 4818, the FY 2005 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill, and I want to commend Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Member LOWEY for including $20 million for the Tropical Forest Conservation Act. This is the amount requested by President Bush in his FY 2005 Budget submission.

The TFCA is based on the previous Bush administration's Enterprise for Americas Initiative, and authorizes the President to restructure debt in exchange for conservation of threatened tropical forests worldwide.

Tropical forests are important. They absorb carbon dioxide from the atmosphere to help reduce greenhouse gases. They help regulate rainfall on which agriculture and coastal resources depend, and their plants are a vital source of new medicines, including treatments for cancer.

Regrettably, about 30 million acres of tropical forests (an area larger than the State of Pennsylvania) are lost each year because many countries are forced to exploit timber and other natural resources to generate revenue to pay their external debt.

Seven TFCA agreements have been concluded to date: Bangladesh, El Salvador, Belize, Peru, the Philippines, Panama and Colombia. These agreements have generated more than $70 million in long-term income tropical forest conservation and will contribute to the conservation of 40 million acres of tropical forests. Private donors have contributed more than $5 million to TFCA swaps, leveraging the U.S. government funds. Active deals are currently being negotiated with Jamaica and Sri Lanka. Several other countries that have expressed interest or are eligible for TFCA.

On June 24th, The International Relations Committee unanimous approved H.R. 4654, a bipartisan bill I introduced with our colleague, TOM LANTOS, and 32 other cosponsors to reauthorize TFCA through FY 2007. That bill was developed with the Bush administration, the Nature Conservancy, the World Wildlife Fund, Conservation International and the Wildlife Conservation Society. We expect H.R. 4654 to come to the floor in the near future.

TFCA is a worthy program that is working well. The Bush Administration is a strong proponent of the Tropical Forest Conservation Act, and it has bipartisan support in the Congress. I again thank the leadership for providing the funding in H.R. 4818 so TFCA can continue to protect some of the world's most threatened natural resources.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, today, as the House considers the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act of 2005, I respectfully submit the following statement into the record in order to raise awareness of an issue that I have found most distressing. For over three years, I have been working on behalf of a company in my district, Pennsylvania Ship Supply Inc. (PA Ship) to resolve a financial dispute with a Ukrainian entity, the Black Sea Shipping Company (BLASCO).

PA Ship is a company that provides ancillary services to ships at ports around the world. My office has been working on behalf of this company since June of 2001, although PA Ship's problems with BLASCO began much earlier. In 1996, PA Ship provided services to the BLASCO ship m/v Sosnogorsk in the amount of $17,242.44. Shortly thereafter, BLASCO filed for bankruptcy. To this date, PA Ship has yet to receive payment for the services it provided BLASCO.

This matter is made all the more alarming by the fact that BLASCO is a state owned company. My office has made numerous attempts, through the Department of State, to resolve this issue. Unfortunately, the government of the Ukraine has been either unwilling or unable to provide much more than contact information for the Director and Deputy Head of the Ukrainian State Department of Sea and River Transport. Further inquiries from the U.S. Embassy to these agencies in the Ukrainian government have been ignored.

I find this lack of concern on behalf of the Ukrainian government unacceptable. Ukrainian officials have indicated to my office that BLASCO's bankruptcy had been a major scandal in the Ukraine when it first surfaced in the mid-1990s. It is also my understanding that PA Ship was not the only company that has yet to receive payment for services rendered prior to BLASCO filing for bankruptcy.

The government of the Ukraine has a well-established history of ignoring the concerns of its international partners. Since 1993, Ukraine has been seeking to gain accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO). Negotiations between the government of the Ukraine and the WTO working party assigned to examine its application have yielded very little progress. Concerns about Ukraine's persistent failure to take effective action against significant levels of optical media piracy and to implement intellectual property laws that provide adequate and effective protection have prompted the United States Trade Representative to place Ukraine on its "Priority Foreign Country" list in its 2004 special 301 report, an action which could ultimately lead to an investigation. This dubious distinction is highlighted by the fact that the Ukraine is the only country to be placed on this list for this year.

I urge the office of the United States Trade Representative to advocate for the suspension of the WTO working party's negotiations with the Ukrainian government until these and other outstanding issues have been resolved.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2005.

There are many important initiatives in this bill, specifically: the extra funding for economic assistance to some of the poorest countries in the world, the additional funding for the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, and the sizable funding allocation for the implementation of development programs to support women in Afghanistan. This will help improve the lives of poor people in every corner of the globe.

As the AIDS epidemic continues to wipe out enormous segments of the world's population, funding to improve and implement effective medical programs and infrastructure is vital. America has a responsibility to stem this horrific epidemic that claims hundreds if not thousands of lives every day. This bill provides significant funds toward that effort and thus deserves our support.

Even as I vote for this bill today, however, I have serious concerns about this Congress' proclivity for taxpayer subsidization of foreign militaries and U.S. defense contractors. The bill continues this wrongheaded policy when Congress ought to be working to reduce the number of weapons in the world.

I am also strongly concerned about the restrictions placed on the $25 million provided to the U.N. Population Fund or UNFPA. Throughout the last three decades, UNFPA has provided over $6 billion in assistance to more than 150 countries for maternal and child health care and voluntary family planning. My Republican colleagues have successfully sought, year after year, to hobble this international health program under the dictates of their extreme ideological agenda, despite its success in lifting the yoke of poverty and disease from people around the world. Simple compassion tells us to provide funding for this effort without unfounded restrictions preventing UNFPA from fully addressing the interconnected issues of health, family planning and poverty.

Although I am frustrated by the lack of commitment to disarmament and family planning programs in our annual foreign operations bills, I cannot deny the significance of so many other initiatives included in this bill, most notably the commitment to fighting global AIDS. I look forward to working with like-minded colleagues and advocates to improve this bill before it returns to the House as a conference report.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the current bill and to applaud Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Member LOWEY for their hard work and leadership in crafting an effective piece of legislation. However, in making appropriations for the entire nation, it is virtually impossible to have a complete assessment or to profess a complete breadth of knowledge of the regions that need the most assistance—because this is an ever-changing issue.

Thus, I have offered an amendment. I support H.R. 4818, but I also urge that not less than $5 million be appropriated for agricultural development in sub-Saharan Africa. This money would not only provide assistance to needy farmers and villages, but it would also strengthen infrastructure and encourage sustainable agriculture growth.

Providing small farmers and villages within the assistance and the resources necessary to plant, harvest, and distribute food crops is an essential component of development in Africa. In my amendment I propose doing much more than just giving small farmers money to buy farming products such as shovels, seeds, and livestock. I propose that we also improve infrastructure such as roads, irrigation canals, wells, and storage facilities. From this small investment, rural farmers will be able to reap profits for seasons and years to come. This is essence of sustainable development.

Mr. Chairman, without such measures toward systemic change, populations all over the world will continue to be faced food shortages. It is estimated that there are already 842 million undernourished people in the world, 798 million of which lived in developing countries and 34 million of which live in developing countries. It is clear that this is an issue that affects both poor and rich countries.

The African continent, however, is undeniably the hardest hit. The continent claims 24 of the 34 countries experiencing food emergencies. The sub-Saharan African region is feeling the brunt of this crisis with some 207 million people in 1999–2001 facing and experiencing food shortages. That amounts to nearly 26 percent of the sub-Saharan population facing inadequate access to nutritious food supplies.

Such widespread hunger plays a crucial role in sub-Saharan African societies. There are implications for education. When a child does not have the proper nourishment in his breakfast, it is impossible to expect him to perform well in school. There are implications for public health. When a mother's body is ravaged by the effects of HIV/AIDS, it is impossible to expect that anti-retroviral drugs will ameliorate her situation when food is a requirement for taking such powerful drugs. There are implications for peace and security. When a young man's meager wages are not enough to help provide for his family, it is implausible to expect that he will not go to whatever lengths necessary to secure some sort of food for his family. Mr. Chairman, the United States is invested in improving the state of education, health, and peace in sub-Saharan countries. This will not be possible without providing for improvements in rural agriculture by providing assistance to small farmers.

Those living in poor, rural areas are the most vulnerable. They comprise 70 percent of the continent's population and are the most in need of agricultural development because their livelihoods are dependent on agriculture.

Small farmers produce the food that feeds the men, women, babies, and the elders living in the small villages scattered across the arid landscape of Africa. If we neglect Africa's rural population, we neglect Africa's backbone. If we provide these farmers with the necessary resources to shore up inefficient and antiquated infrastructure we open the door to alleviating a host of other problems that plague almost 70 percent of Africa's rural population that depend on agriculture.

My proposal would allow for the development of small-scale irrigation, water and drainage, post-harvest storage, crop intensification, crop and livestock diversification, and rural infrastructure. Such improvements to infrastructure would encourage sustainable development and lead to a decrease in food shortage in the short and long run.

The Special Programme for Food Security of the Food and Agriculture organization of the United Nations (FAO) along with other international NGOs is already making headway in Africa and other continents to reduce the food shortage crisis. We must acknowledge the benefits of agricultural improvement and its subsequent benefits for other areas of life for those living in rural communities and villages.

Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated above, I support H.R. 4818 with the principles set forth in the amendment that I offer.

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.

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 Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4818

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, 2005, 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: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding section 1(c) of Public Law 103–428, as amended, sections 1(a) and (b) of Public Law 103–428 shall remain in effect through October 1, 2005.

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, $125,700,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *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, 2023, for the disbursement of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance and tied-aid grants obligated in fiscal years 2005, 2006, 2007, and 2008: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior Act appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, and 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.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan and insurance programs, 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, $73,200,000: *Provided,* That the Export-Import Bank may accept, and use, payment or services provided by transaction participants for legal, financial, or technical services in connection with any transaction for which an application for a loan, guarantee or insurance commitment has been made: *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, 2005.

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 $42,885,000: *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 Non-Credit 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 2005 and 2006: *Provided further,* That such sums shall remain available through fiscal year 2013 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 2005, and through fiscal year 2014 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 2006.

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.

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, $51,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006.

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, 2005, unless otherwise specified herein, as follows:

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

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, health, and family planning/reproductive health activities, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, $1,648,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That this amount shall be made available for such activities as: (1) immunization programs; (2) oral rehydration programs; (3) health, nutrition, water and sanitation programs which directly address the needs of mothers and children, and related education programs; (4) assistance for children displaced or orphaned by causes other than AIDS; (5) programs for the prevention, treatment, control of, and research on HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, polio, malaria, and other infectious diseases, and for assistance to communities severely affected by HIV/AIDS, including children displaced or orphaned by AIDS; and (6) family planning/reproductive health: *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 activities: *Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $250,000, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used to monitor and provide oversight of child survival, maternal and family planning/reproductive health, and infectious disease programs: *Provided further,* That the following amounts should be allocated as follows: $330,000,000 for child survival and maternal health; $28,000,000 for vulnerable children; $330,000,000 for HIV/AIDS; $185,000,000 for other infectious diseases; and $375,500,000 for family planning/reproductive health: *Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, and in addition to funds allocated under the previous proviso, not less than $400,000,000 shall be made available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, except for the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria Act of 2003 (117 Stat. 711; 22 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), for a United States contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the ''Global Fund''), and shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities: *Provided further,* That up to 5 percent of the funds made available under the previous proviso may be made available to the United States Agency for International Development for technical assistance related to the activities of the Global Fund: *Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $65,000,000 may be made available for a United States contribution to The Vaccine Fund, and up to $6,000,000 may be transferred to and merged with funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development'' for costs directly related to international health, but funds made available for such costs may not be derived from amounts made available for contributions under this and preceding provisos: *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 Act 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: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to lobby for or against abortion: *Provided further,* 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 Committees on Appropriations 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 to the maximum extent feasible, taking into consideration cost, timely availability, and best health practices, funds appropriated in this Act that are made available for condom procurement shall be made available only for the procurement of condoms manufactured in the United States: *Provided further,* That information provided about the use of condoms as part of projects or activities that are funded from amounts appropriated by this Act shall be medically accurate and shall include the public health benefits and failure rates of such use.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 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 No. 20 offered by Mr. SHERMAN:

In the item relating to ''UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT–CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND'', after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $290,000,000)''.

In the item relating to ''UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT–CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND'', after the third dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $290,000,000)''.

In the item relating to ''CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION'', after the aggregate dollar amount, insert the following ''(reduced by $359,000,000)''.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself as the opponent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) will

control 10 minutes on his amendment. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) will control 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I introduced this amendment on behalf of myself and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN). The gentlewoman is the chairwoman of the subcommittee that deals with the Middle East on the Committee on International Relations. I am the ranking member of that subcommittee of that committee that deals with terrorism and nuclear proliferation.

We are both concerned that the World Bank has decided to make loans of $359 million to the government of Iran. We are also both concerned that we have an opportunity here to help the Child Survival Account, to save perhaps millions of children's lives simply by providing it more funding than this bill provides, to those programs that provide immunization, those that treat diarrhea and other easily curable diseases. So we see an opportunity both to deal with the World Bank's decision and to increase child survival.

Mr. Chairman, just a couple of months ago, the World Bank, over American objections, approved $359 million for Iran. They did so at the same time that the IAEA was deliberating not whether Iran was developing nuclear weapons, we all know that they are, but the degree to which they should be sanctioned for their clear violation of nuclear proliferation control agreements.

Now, the government of Iran spends the minimum necessary on domestic projects in order to stay in power. This $359 million allows them to fund those minimal domestic projects. Then the government of Iran uses what is left over to develop nuclear weapons and to support terror. It is the number one state sponsor of terror as identified by the United States State Department.

So this bill as presently written puts money in the World Bank. One quarter of the World Bank's assets and funds, roughly, are those of the American taxpayer, and then $359 million is going from the World Bank to Iran.

□ 1315

We need to make it clear that Members do not have to go back to their districts and defend sending American tax dollars to Tehran at a time when they are developing nuclear weapons.

We also need to help the child survival accounts. I would have wanted to cut $359 million from the World Bank and add a full $359 million to child survival. As a result of the outlay rules and timing of outlays, this amendment was in order only if we increased child survival by $290 million. So if my colleagues are fiscal conservatives, this amendment saves the government $69 million, but, more importantly, it funds some of the very best U.S. AID programs. It provides additional money for child survival and maternal health. It provides for those very effective treatments for easily curable and preventable diseases.

This amendment enhances the bill.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition reluctantly to this amendment.

While I have absolutely no sympathy for the government of Iran and would strongly prefer that the World Bank not approve loans to that country, I oppose this amendment because its passage will not in any way affect lending to Iran.

What the amendment would do is cut $359 million from the International Development Association, which is almost half of the proposed fiscal year 2005 U.S. contribution. IDA funds loans to the poorest countries in the world, mostly African countries, at low rates of interest and on a long-term repayment schedule.

IDA is the source of much of the capital that poor countries use to rebuild vital infrastructure and deal with the chronic problems of poor health and education systems. The World Bank, through the IDA loan window, has spent over $1 billion to combat HIV/AIDS to date. The bank is also the center for the ''Education for All'' initiative, which aims to provide a free, primary education to the 110 million children around the world who currently do not attend school.

Because the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation was $1.9 billion below the President's request, we had to make some tough choices. In that context, the funding currently in the bill for IDA represents a $200 million cut from the President's request. I am certainly not totally satisfied with the quality of the World Bank's lending programs and will be monitoring closely the result of the new Performance Evaluation Scheme. The cuts the committee made were in that context, but cutting further would be a mistake and would only serve to reduce the bank's overall lending capacity without in any way affecting Iran.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend, my distinguished colleague from California, for the time, and I rise in strong support of the Sherman/Ros-Lehtinen amendment and ask my colleagues to render their full support to it.

Iran's unconventional weapons program, and its fondness for using terrorism as statecraft, have made this pariah state a litmus test of the war on terror.

For at least two decades, the Iranian regime has been pursuing a covert nuclear program. It has undertaken a number of efforts for the manufacture and testing of centrifuge components, including at facilities owned by military industrial organizations.

According to multiple reports of the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Iranian regime's deceptions and nuclear activities have dealt with the most sensitive aspects of the nuclear cycle.

Just last month, after the international community once again called on Iran to ''come clean'' with its efforts to develop a nuclear weapons capability, the Iranian foreign minister and the secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council retorted that Iran has to be recognized by the international community as a member of the nuclear club and that Iran is on an irreversible path, their own words, toward becoming a nuclear state.

It is, therefore, imperative that the international community join forces to deny Iran any and all avenues to bring to a halt Iran's progress on this path.

This Chamber has repeatedly articulated this position. Most recently, we adopted by an overwhelming vote H. Con. Res. 398 which clearly underscored the denial of financial and other resources to Iran is an overarching priority for the United States.

Yet, through the World Bank, Iran is receiving hundreds of millions of dollars in loans.

Now, we will hear some argue that these loans are for nonlethal programs. However, given the fungible nature of the fund, there is no effective way of preventing the manipulation of these funds.

We certainly cannot trust the terrorist regime in Teheran to apply those World Bank funds to good, humanitarian use; and, as we have discovered recently with the investigations into the UN's handling of the Oil-For-Food program, we certainly cannot trust international institutions to practice due diligence and oversight.

Further, even if the loans are applied for basic services in Iran, that just enables Iran's mullahs to increase their budget allocations to fund terrorist activities and intensify their efforts to develop nuclear weapons.

The Sherman/Ros-Lehtinen amendment seeks to bring an end to this farce. Given that this is an appropriations bill, we cannot go even further. However, the amendment is a good first step.

The amendment seeks to cut U.S. contributions to the World Bank by an amount equal to its recent loans to Iran. In turn, it shifts these funds to U.S. AID's child survival programs; that is, it denies funds to the Iranian regime while helping prevent children from dying from preventable or easily treatable diseases, providing them with immunizations and other inexpensive treatments.

I ask my colleagues to vote an overwhelming ''yes'' on the Sherman-Ros-Lehtinen amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am the only other speaker I have, if the gentleman is prepared to yield back the balance of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

First, let me deal with this view that somehow the World Bank is not the World Bank, it is separate agencies. It is true the World Bank has five different departments, but as the World Bank's own Web site says in referring to the two departments in question now, the IBRD and the IDA are run on the same lines. They share the same staff and headquarters, report to the same president and evaluate projects with the same standards. They go on to say the IDA simply takes the money out of a different drawer. So, if we are funding the World Bank, we funding the World Bank.

This vote on this amendment is our only chance this year to vote to put economic pressure on the government of Iran that is developing nuclear weapons. It is the only chance we have this year to respond to the World Bank and to show how we feel when they send our money to a government that our State Department has identified as the number one state sponsor of terrorism. It is our only chance to respond to the investigation of Senator LUGAR, who has shown that many experts estimate that between 5 percent and 25 percent of the money we send to the World Bank is misused; and it is our best opportunity to vote to increase child survival and to save children's lives, whether they are dying from diarrhea or dying from diseases for which immunization is possible.

This is our chance to speak as a caucus and to say that time for business as usual is over. We can walk out of here saying, well, we disagree with the World Bank, but there is nothing we can do about it. But then we have to go back to our districts, when a nuclear mushroom cloud explodes first in a test in Iran and then, God forbid, in a hostile use by the Iranian government, and defend our votes to support a bill, part of the money of which ended up in Tehran.

I see the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) here, and I do not know whether he wishes time. I commend the gentleman for his efforts to make sure that we deal with the World Bank, and I appreciate his support for this amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Sherman amendment is really not about Iran. It is about depriving the poorest countries in the world of development assistance for basic education, for health care, for HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment, and for environmental protection programs. It is about blocking the path towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals. I do not think this Congress wants to be remembered for this.

I know that Iran is a politically sensitive issue, and none of us believe that the World Bank should be making loans in Iran, but the funding contained in the foreign operations bill is for IDA, the concessional lending program of the World Bank which is designed to help the poorest countries of the world, with per capita incomes of $1 to $2 per day.

Mr. Chairman, Iran is not eligible to use the resources of IDA. The projects approved for Iran were funded by the IBRD, which is the market rate lending program of the bank. IBRD does not receive appropriated funds. There is no fungibility between IDA and IBRD resources.

So, Mr. Chairman, restricting the appropriations of funds to IDA will not affect Iran in any way. However, it will cut funding that supports development and health programs in sub-Saharan Africa and the poorest countries of Asia and Latin America. Over half of IDA resources are programmed for sub-Saharan Africa, and many of the programs would be supported on a grant basis, no longer just loans.

Diverting these funds into bilateral programs would deny six times, that is, again, six times, as much funding as the gentleman's cut. For every $1 of U.S. taxpayer money that goes into IDA, other donors and resources provide $6 of support. So if we cut this, we cut out six times as much of the money that goes to sub-Saharan Africa and other of the poorest countries of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I have already made what I think is a difficult decision to cut World Bank funding by $211 million below the request. Another $359 million cut would probably put U.S. leadership at risk at the bank, in addition to putting at risk billions of dollars of assistance for poor countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

To reiterate, Mr. Chairman, Iran is not eligible for IDA finances. IDA funding, which is the subject of this bill, the only source of funding that is in this bill for the World Bank, Iran is not eligible for any of those sources, and Iran would not be affected by a cut in funding to the IDA.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this 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 question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

Mr. KOLBE. 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. CANTOR) 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. 4818) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4818, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 4818 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 715, the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open for amendment at any point, and no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

Amendments 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, and 21;

Amendments 11 and 17 which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

Amendment 15, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

Amendments 9, 13 and 18, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding conference attendance;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding agricultural development in sub-Saharan Africa;

An amendment by Mr. SANDERS regarding Export-Import Bank loans, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. DEAL of Georgia regarding extradition, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. WEINER regarding Saudi Arabia, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. BUYER regarding monitoring of elections, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. OTTER regarding West Bank/Gaza;

An amendment by Mr. MENENDEZ regarding Latin America child survival and development assistance;

An amendment by Mr. SCHIFF regarding Armenian genocide;

An amendment by Ms. LEE regarding Global AIDS, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Ms. DELAURO regarding child survival;

An amendment by Ms. WATERS regarding contract fraud; and

An amendment by Ms. MCCOLLUM regarding unexploded ordnance.

□ 1330

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed in the RECORD, or a designee, shall be considered as read, 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.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

Mr. OBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out that this is an effort to try to complete action on this bill before Members leave. I would also note that, as I count the minutes that this agreement provides for, when you include a time for votes, it means that we will be very lucky to be out of here by 10:30 or 11 o'clock at night. So we would appreciate Members' cooperation if Members want to get out of here, whether it is to catch airplanes or do something even more constructive. It would be helpful if they would work with the committee to try to limit the time that it takes for consideration of these amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and certainly concur.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I want to say that we have tried to accommodate everybody with their amendments, and I believe this agreement does so. I look forward to working with the chairman, and, hopefully, everyone will go along with the plan.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 715 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. 4818.

□ 1333

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. 4818) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes.

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 amendment No. 20 by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) had been postponed, and the bill was open from page 6, line 16 to page 12, line 4.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the remainder of the bill is considered as having been read and open for amendment at any point.

The text of the remainder of H.R. 4818 is as follows:

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses of the United States Agency for International Development to carry out the provisions of sections 103, 105, 106, and 131, and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $1,429,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That $194,000,000 should be allocated for trade capacity building: *Provided further*, That $300,000,000 should be allocated for basic education: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading and managed by the United States Agency for International Development Bureau of Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, not less than $15,000,000 shall be made available only for programs to improve women's leadership capacity in recipient countries: *Provided further*, That such funds may not be made available for construction: *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 $32,500, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used to monitor and provide oversight of such programs.

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER AND FAMINE ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses of the United States Agency for International Development to carry out the provisions of section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for international disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance, $335,500,000, to remain available until expended.

In addition, for necessary expenses for assistance for famine prevention and relief, including for mitigation of the effects of famine, $20,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds shall be made available utilizing the general authorities of section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and shall be in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this paragraph shall be available for obligation subject to prior consultation with the Committees on Appropriations.

TRANSITION INITIATIVES

For necessary expenses for international disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction assistance pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $47,500,000, to remain available until expended, to support transition to democracy and to long-term development of countries in crisis: *Provided*, That such support may include assistance to develop, strengthen, or preserve democratic institutions and processes, revitalize basic infrastructure, and foster the peaceful resolution of conflict: *Provided further*, That the United States Agency for International Development shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations at least 5 days prior to beginning a new program of assistance: *Provided further*, That if the President determines that it is important to the national interests of the United States to provide transition assistance in excess of the amount appropriated under this heading, up to $15,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be used for purposes of this heading and under the authorities applicable to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the previous proviso shall be made available subject to prior consultation with the Committees on Appropriations.

DEVELOPMENT CREDIT AUTHORITY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the cost of direct loans and loan guarantees provided by the United States Agency for International Development, as authorized by sections 108 and 635 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, funds may be derived by transfer from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out part I of such Act and under the heading ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'': *Provided*, That such funds shall not exceed $21,000,000, which shall be made available only for micro and small enterprise programs, urban programs, and other programs which further the purposes of part I of the Act: *Provided further*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such direct and guaranteed loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended: *Provided further*, That funds made available by this paragraph may be used for the cost of modifying any such guaranteed loans under this Act or prior Acts, and funds used for such costs shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the provisions of section 107A(d) (relating to general provisions applicable to the Development Credit Authority) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as contained in section 306 of H.R. 1486 as reported by the House Committee on International Relations on May 9, 1997, shall be applicable to direct loans and loan guarantees provided under this heading.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out credit programs administered by the United States Agency for International Development, $8,000,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development: *Provided*, That funds made available under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

PAYMENT TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the ''Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund'', as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1980, $42,500,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $618,000,000, of which up to $25,000,000 may remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading and under the heading ''Capital Investment Fund'' may be made available to finance the construction (including architect and engineering services), purchase, or long term

lease of offices for use by the United States Agency for International Development, unless the Administrator has identified such proposed construction (including architect and engineering services), purchase, or long term lease of offices in a report submitted to the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days prior to the obligation of these funds for such purposes: *Provided further*, That the previous proviso shall not apply where the total cost of construction (including architect and engineering services), purchase, or long term lease of offices does not exceed $1,000,000: *Provided further*, That contracts or agreements entered into with funds appropriated under this heading may entail commitments for the expenditure of such funds through fiscal year 2006: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to open a new overseas mission of the United States Agency for International Development without the prior written notification of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the authority of sections 610 and 109 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be exercised by the Secretary of State to transfer funds appropriated to carry out chapter 1 of part I of such Act to ''Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development'' in accordance with the provisions of those sections.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT FUND

For necessary expenses for overseas construction and related costs, and for the procurement and enhancement of information technology and related capital investments, pursuant to section 667 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $64,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this amount is in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for obligation only pursuant to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading and under the heading ''Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development'' may be made available for USAID's contribution to the Capital Cost Sharing Program only if all other agencies who have agreed to participate in that program during the current fiscal year are making their contributions to the program.

OPERATING EXPENSES OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 667 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $35,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006, which sum shall be available for the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II, $2,450,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $360,000,000 shall be available only for Israel, which sum shall be available on a grant basis as a cash transfer and shall be disbursed within 30 days of the enactment of this Act or by October 31, 2004, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That not less than $535,000,000 shall be available only for Egypt, which sum shall be provided on a grant basis, and of which sum cash transfer assistance shall be provided with the understanding that Egypt will undertake significant economic reforms which are additional to those which were undertaken in previous fiscal years: *Provided further*, That in exercising the authority to provide cash transfer assistance for Israel, the President shall ensure that the level of such assistance does not cause an adverse impact on the total level of nonmilitary exports from the United States to such country and that Israel enters into a side letter agreement in an amount proportional to the fiscal year 1999 agreement: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $250,000,000 should be made available only for assistance for Jordan: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $200,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used for the costs, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying direct loans and guarantees for Pakistan: *Provided further*, That amounts that are made available under the previous proviso for the cost of modifying direct loans and guarantees shall not be considered ''assistance'' for the purposes of provisions of law limiting assistance to a country: *Provided further*, That $13,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading should be made available for Cyprus to be used only for scholarships, administrative support of the scholarship program, bicommunal projects, and measures aimed at reunification of the island and designed to reduce tensions and promote peace and cooperation between the two communities on Cyprus: *Provided further*, That $35,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading should be made available for assistance for Lebanon, of which not less than $4,000,000 should be made available for scholarships and direct support of American educational institutions in Lebanon: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for assistance for the Central Government of Lebanon shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That $22,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading should be made available for assistance for the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste: *Provided further*, That $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading should be made available for assistance for Haiti: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading may 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, and the provision of such funds shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That in the previous proviso, 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: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading that are made available for a Middle East Financing Facility, Middle East Enterprise Fund, or any other similar entity in the Middle East shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That with respect to funds appropriated under this heading in this Act or prior Acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, the responsibility for policy decisions and justifications for the use of such funds, including whether there will be a program for a country that uses those funds and the amount of each such program, shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of State and the Deputy Secretary of State and this responsibility shall not be delegated.

INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR IRELAND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $18,500,000, which shall be available for the United States contribution to the International Fund for Ireland and shall be made available in accordance with the provisions of the Anglo-Irish Agreement Support Act of 1986 (Public Law 99–415): *Provided*, That such amount shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 2006.

ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES

(a) For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989, $375,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006, which shall be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for assistance and for related programs for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States.

(b) Funds appropriated under this heading shall be considered to be economic assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for purposes of making available the administrative authorities contained in that Act for the use of economic assistance.

(c) With regard to funds appropriated under this heading for the economic revitalization program in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and local currencies generated by such funds (including the conversion of funds appropriated under this heading into currency used by Bosnia and Herzegovina as local currency and local currency returned or repaid under such program) the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall provide written approval for grants and loans prior to the obligation and expenditure of funds for such purposes, and prior to the use of funds that have been returned or repaid to any lending facility or grantee.

(d) The provisions of section 529 of this Act shall apply to funds made available under subsection (c) and to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision of this or any other Act, including provisions in this subsection regarding the application of section 529 of this Act, local currencies generated by, or converted from, funds appropriated by this Act and by previous appropriations Acts and made available for the economic revitalization program in Bosnia may be used in Eastern Europe and the Baltic States to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989.

(e) The President is authorized to withhold funds appropriated under this heading made available for economic revitalization programs in Bosnia and Herzegovina, if he determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina has not complied with article III of annex 1–A of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina concerning the withdrawal of foreign forces, and that intelligence cooperation on training, investigations, and related activities between state sponsors of terrorism and terrorist organizations and Bosnian officials has not been terminated.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

(a) For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapters 11 and 12 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the FREEDOM Support Act, for assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet

Union and for related programs, $550,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That the provisions of such chapters shall apply to funds appropriated by this paragraph: *Provided further,* That funds made available for the Southern Caucasus region may be used notwithstanding any other provision of law, for confidence-building measures and other activities in furtherance of the peaceful resolution of the regional conflicts, especially those in the vicinity of Abkhazia and Nagorno-Karabagh: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $1,500,000 should be available only to meet the health and other assistance needs of victims of trafficking in persons: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated under this heading in this Act or prior Acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, that are made available pursuant to the provisions of section 807 of Public Law 102–511 shall be subject to a 6 percent ceiling on administrative expenses.

(b) Of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $65,000,000 should be made available for assistance for Armenia.

(c) Of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $57,000,000 should be made available, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for assistance for child survival, environmental and reproductive health, and to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and other infectious diseases, and for related activities.

(d)(1) Of the funds appropriated under this heading that are allocated for assistance for the Government of the Russian Federation, 60 percent shall be withheld from obligation until the President determines and certifies in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of the Russian Federation:

(A) has terminated implementation of arrangements to provide Iran with technical expertise, training, technology, or equipment necessary to develop a nuclear reactor, related nuclear research facilities or programs, or ballistic missile capability; and

(B) is providing full access to international non-government organizations providing humanitarian relief to refugees and internally displaced persons in Chechnya.

(2) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(A) assistance to combat infectious diseases, child survival activities, or assistance for victims of trafficking in persons; and

(B) activities authorized under title V (Nonproliferation and Disarmament Programs and Activities) of the FREEDOM Support Act.

(e) Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act shall not apply to—

(1) activities to support democracy or assistance under title V of the FREEDOM Support Act and section 1424 of Public Law 104–201 or non-proliferation assistance;

(2) any assistance provided by the Trade and Development Agency under section 661 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2421);

(3) any activity carried out by a member of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service while acting within his or her official capacity;

(4) any insurance, reinsurance, guarantee or other assistance provided by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation under title IV of chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2191 et seq.);

(5) any financing provided under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945; or

(6) humanitarian assistance.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the functions of the Inter-American Foundation in accordance with the provisions of section 401 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, $16,238,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006.

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

For necessary expenses to carry out title V of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1980, Public Law 96–533, $18,579,000, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided,* That funds made available to grantees may be invested pending expenditure for project purposes when authorized by the board of directors of the Foundation: *Provided further,* That interest earned shall be used only for the purposes for which the grant was made: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding section 505(a)(2) of the African Development Foundation Act, in exceptional circumstances the board of directors of the Foundation may waive the $250,000 limitation contained in that section with respect to a project: *Provided further,* That the Foundation shall provide a report to the Committees on Appropriations after each time such waiver authority is exercised.

PEACE CORPS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), $330,000,000, including the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for administrative purposes for use outside of the United States: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to pay for abortions: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 2006.

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

For necessary expenses for the ''Millennium Challenge Corporation'', $1,250,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not more than $30,000,000 may be available for administrative expenses of the Millennium Challenge Corporation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for the provision of assistance until the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation provides a written budget justification to the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further,* That up to 10 percent of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to carry out the purposes of section 616 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003: *Provided further,* That none of the funds available to carry out section 616 of such Act may be made available until the Chief Executive Officer of the Millennium Challenge Corporation provides a report to the Committees on Appropriations listing the candidate countries that will be receiving assistance under section 616 of such Act, the level of assistance proposed for each such country, a description of the proposed programs, projects and activities, and the implementing agency or agencies of the United States Government: *Provided further,* That section 605(e)(4) of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 shall apply to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading, and funds appropriated under this heading in division D of Public Law 108–199, may be made available for a Millennium Challenge Compact entered into pursuant to section 609 of the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 only if such Compact obligates, or contains a commitment to obligate subject to the availability of funds and the mutual agreement of the parties to the Compact to proceed, the entire amount of the United States Government funding anticipated for the duration of the Compact: *Provided further,* That the previous proviso shall be effective on the date of enactment of this Act.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GLOBAL HIV/AIDS INITIATIVE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on, HIV/AIDS, $1,260,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not more than $8,818,000 may be made available for administrative expenses of the Office of the Coordinator of United States Government Activities to Combat HIV/AIDS Globally of the Department of State: *Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $26,000,000 should be made available as a contribution to the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative.

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $328,820,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided,* That during fiscal year 2005, the Department of State may also use the authority of section 608 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, without regard to its restrictions, to receive excess property from an agency of the United States Government for the purpose of providing it to a foreign country under chapter 8 of part I of that Act subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of State shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and prior to the initial obligation of funds appropriated under this heading, a report on the proposed uses of all funds under this heading on a country-by-country basis for each proposed program, project, or activity: *Provided further,* That up to $10,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading should be made available for demand reduction programs: *Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not more than $26,117,000 may be available for administrative expenses.

ANDEAN COUNTERDRUG INITIATIVE

For necessary expenses to carry out section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to support counterdrug activities in the Andean region of South America, $731,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided,* That in fiscal year 2005, funds available to the Department of State for assistance to the Government of Colombia shall be available to support a unified campaign against narcotics trafficking, against activities by organizations designated as terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), and to take actions to protect human health and welfare in emergency circumstances, including undertaking rescue operations: *Provided further,* That this authority shall cease to be effective if the Secretary of State has credible evidence that the Colombian Armed Forces are not conducting vigorous operations to restore government authority and respect for human rights in areas under the effective control of paramilitary and guerrilla organizations: *Provided further,* That the President shall ensure that if any helicopter procured with funds under this heading is used to aid or abet the operations of any illegal self-defense group or illegal security cooperative, such helicopter shall be immediately returned to the United States: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available to support a Peruvian air interdiction program until the

Secretary of State and Director of Central Intelligence certify to the Congress, 30 days before any resumption of United States involvement in a Peruvian air interdiction program, that an air interdiction program that permits the ability of the Peruvian Air Force to shoot down aircraft will include enhanced safeguards and procedures to prevent the occurrence of any incident similar to the April 20, 2001 incident: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and prior to the initial obligation of funds appropriated under this heading, a report on the proposed uses of all funds under this heading on a country-by-country basis for each proposed program, project, or activity: *Provided further,* That section 482(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not apply to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further,* That assistance provided with funds appropriated under this heading that is made available notwithstanding section 482(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be made available subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further,* That no United States Armed Forces personnel or United States civilian contractor employed by the United States will participate in any combat operation in connection with assistance made available by this Act for Colombia: *Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not more than $16,285,000 may be available for administrative expenses of the Department of State, and not more than $4,500,000 may be available, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, for administrative expenses of the United States Agency for International Development.

MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Secretary of State to provide, as authorized by law, a contribution to the International Committee of the Red Cross, assistance to refugees, including contributions to the International Organization for Migration and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, and other activities to meet refugee and migration needs; salaries and expenses of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1980; allowances as authorized by sections 5921 through 5925 of title 5, United States Code; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, $756,000,000, which shall remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not more than $21,000,000 may be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for a headquarters contribution to the International Committee of the Red Cross only if the Secretary of State determines (and so reports to the appropriate committees of Congress) that the Magen David Adom Society of Israel is not being denied participation in the activities of the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement.

UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ASSISTANCE FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 2(c) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2601(c)), $20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NONPROLIFERATION, ANTI-TERRORISM, DEMINING AND RELATED PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses for nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs and activities, $382,000,000, to carry out the provisions of chapter 8 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for anti-terrorism assistance, chapter 9 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 504 of the FREEDOM Support Act, section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for demining activities, the clearance of unexploded ordnance, the destruction of small arms, and related activities, notwithstanding any other provision of law, including activities implemented through nongovernmental and international organizations, and section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for a voluntary contribution to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and for a United States contribution to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Preparatory Commission: *Provided,* That of this amount not to exceed $30,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be made available for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to promote bilateral and multilateral activities relating to nonproliferation and disarmament: *Provided further,* That such funds may also be used for such countries other than the Independent States of the former Soviet Union and international organizations when it is in the national security interest of the United States to do so: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for the International Atomic Energy Agency only if the Secretary of State determines (and so reports to the Congress) that Israel is not being denied its right to participate in the activities of that Agency: *Provided further,* That of the funds made available for demining and related activities, not to exceed $690,000, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used for administrative expenses related to the operation and management of the demining program: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available for programs and countries in the amounts contained in the table included in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided further,* That any proposed increases or decreases to the amounts contained in such table shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations and section 634A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and notifications shall be transmitted at least 15 days in advance of the obligation of funds.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 129 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $19,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, which shall be available notwithstanding any other provision of law.

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying loans and loan guarantees, as the President may determine, for which funds have been appropriated or otherwise made available for programs within the International Affairs Budget Function 150, including the cost of selling, reducing, or canceling amounts owed to the United States as a result of concessional loans made to eligible countries, pursuant to parts IV and V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and of modifying concessional credit agreements with least developed countries, as authorized under section 411 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and concessional loans, guarantees and credit agreements, as authorized under section 572 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1989 (Public Law 100–461), and of canceling amounts owed, as a result of loans or guarantees made pursuant to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, by countries that are eligible for debt reduction pursuant to title V of H.R. 3425 as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(5) of Public Law 106–113, $105,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided,* That not less than $20,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be made available to carry out the provisions of part V of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further,* That up to $75,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be used by the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Trust Fund administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development amounts for the benefit of countries that are eligible for debt reduction pursuant to title V of H.R. 3425 as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(5) of Public Law 106–113: *Provided further,* That amounts paid to the HIPC Trust Fund may be used only to fund debt reduction under the enhanced HIPC initiative by—

(1) the Inter-American Development Bank;

(2) the African Development Fund;

(3) the African Development Bank; and

(4) the Central American Bank for Economic Integration:

Provided further, That funds may not be paid to the HIPC Trust Fund for the benefit of any country if the Secretary of State has credible evidence that the government of such country is engaged in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights or in military or civil conflict that undermines its ability to develop and implement measures to alleviate poverty and to devote adequate human and financial resources to that end: *Provided further,* That on the basis of final appropriations, the Secretary of the Treasury shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations concerning which countries and international financial institutions are expected to benefit from a United States contribution to the HIPC Trust Fund during the fiscal year: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Treasury shall inform the Committees on Appropriations not less than 15 days in advance of the signature of an agreement by the United States to make payments to the HIPC Trust Fund of amounts for such countries and institutions: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Treasury may disburse funds designated for debt reduction through the HIPC Trust Fund only for the benefit of countries that—

(1) have committed, for a period of 24 months, not to accept new market-rate loans from the international financial institution receiving debt repayment as a result of such disbursement, other than loans made by such institutions to export-oriented commercial projects that generate foreign exchange which are generally referred to as ''enclave'' loans; and

(2) have documented and demonstrated their commitment to redirect their budgetary resources from international debt repayments to programs to alleviate poverty and promote economic growth that are additional to or expand upon those previously available for such purposes:

Provided further, That any limitation of subsection (e) of section 411 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 shall not apply to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided further,* That none of the funds made available under this heading in this or any other appropriations Act shall be made available for Sudan or Burma unless the Secretary of the Treasury determines and notifies the Committees on

Appropriations that a democratically elected government has taken office: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be paid to the HIPC Trust Fund for the benefit of any country that has accepted loans from an international financial institution between such country's decision point and completion point: *Provided further*, That the terms ''decision point'' and ''completion point'' shall have the same meaning as defined by the International Monetary Fund.

TITLE III—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 541 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $89,730,000, of which up to $3,000,000 may remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the civilian personnel for whom military education and training may be provided under this heading may include civilians who are not members of a government whose participation would contribute to improved civil-military relations, civilian control of the military, or respect for human rights: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading for military education and training for Guatemala may only be available for expanded international military education and training, and funds made available for Nigeria and Guatemala may only be provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for grants to enable the President to carry out the provisions of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, $4,777,500,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $2,220,000,000 shall be available for grants only for Israel, and not less than $1,300,000,000 shall be made available for grants only for Egypt: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated by this paragraph for Israel shall be disbursed within 30 days of the enactment of this Act or by October 31, 2004, whichever is later: *Provided further*, That to the extent that the Government of Israel requests that funds be used for such purposes, grants made available for Israel by this paragraph shall, as agreed by Israel and the United States, be available for advanced weapons systems, of which not less than $580,000,000 shall be available for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development: *Provided further*, That in addition to the funds appropriated under this heading, up to $150,000,000 for assistance for Pakistan may be derived by transfer from unobligated balances of funds appropriated under the headings ''Economic Support Fund'' and ''Foreign Military Financing Program'' in prior appropriations Acts and not otherwise designated in those Acts for a specific country, use, or purpose: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this paragraph shall be nonrepayable notwithstanding any requirement in section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this paragraph shall be obligated upon apportionment in accordance with paragraph (5)(C) of title 31, United States Code, section 1501(a).

None of the funds made available under this heading shall be available to finance the procurement of defense articles, defense services, or design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under the Arms Export Control Act unless the foreign country proposing to make such procurements has first signed an agreement with the United States Government specifying the conditions under which such procurements may be financed with such funds: *Provided*, That all country and funding level increases in allocations shall be submitted through the regular notification procedures of section 515 of this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for assistance for Sudan, Indonesia and Guatemala: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for demining, the clearance of unexploded ordnance, and related activities, and may include activities implemented through nongovernmental and international organizations: *Provided further*, That the authority contained in the previous proviso or any other provision of law relating to the use of funds for programs under this heading, including provisions contained in previously enacted appropriations Acts, shall not apply to activities relating to the clearance of unexploded ordnance resulting from United States Armed Forces testing or training exercises: *Provided further*, That the previous proviso shall not apply to San Jose Island, Republic of Panama: *Provided further*, That only those countries for which assistance was justified for the ''Foreign Military Sales Financing Program'' in the fiscal year 1989 congressional presentation for security assistance programs may utilize funds made available under this heading for procurement of defense articles, defense services or design and construction services that are not sold by the United States Government under the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for defense articles and services: *Provided further*, That not more than $40,500,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be obligated for necessary expenses, including the purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only for use outside of the United States, for the general costs of administering military assistance and sales: *Provided further*, That not more than $367,000,000 of funds realized pursuant to section 21(e)(1)(A) of the Arms Export Control Act may be obligated for expenses incurred by the Department of Defense during fiscal year 2005 pursuant to section 43(b) of the Arms Export Control Act, except that this limitation may be exceeded only through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That foreign military financing program funds estimated to be outlayed for Egypt during fiscal year 2005 shall be transferred to an interest bearing account for Egypt in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York within 30 days of enactment of this Act or by October 31, 2004, whichever is later.

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $104,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated or expended except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

TITLE IV—MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

For the United States contribution for the Global Environment Facility, $107,500,000 to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development as trustee for the Global Environment Facility, by the Secretary of the Treasury, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the Treasury, $850,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ENTERPRISE FOR THE AMERICAS MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT FUND

For payment to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund by the Secretary of the Treasury, for the United States contribution to the fund, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to the increase in resources of the Asian Development Fund, as authorized by the Asian Development Bank Act, as amended, $112,212,465, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the African Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury, $5,100,000, for the United States paid-in share of the increase in capital stock, to remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the African Development Bank may subscribe without fiscal year limitation for the callable capital portion of the United States share of such capital stock in an amount not to exceed $79,532,933.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FUND

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to the increase in resources of the African Development Fund, $118,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

For payment to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development by the Secretary of the Treasury, $35,431,111 for the United States share of the paid-in portion of the increase in capital stock, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations and shall be transmitted at least 15 days in advance of the obligation of funds.

LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of such capital stock in an amount not to exceed $121,996,662.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL FUND FOR AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

For the United States contribution by the Secretary of the Treasury to increase the resources of the International Fund for Agricultural Development, $15,000,000, to remain available until expended.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 301 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and of section 2 of the United Nations Environment Program Participation Act of 1973, $323,450,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

COMPENSATION FOR UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS TO INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 501. (a) No funds appropriated by this Act may be made as payment to any international financial institution while the United States Executive Director to such institution is compensated by the institution at a rate which, together with whatever compensation such Director receives from the United States, is in excess of the rate provided for an individual occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, or while any alternate United States Director to such institution is compensated by the institution at a rate in excess of the rate provided for an individual occupying a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) For purposes of this section, ''international financial institutions'' are: the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Asian Development Fund, the African Development Bank, the African Development Fund, the International Monetary Fund, the North American Development Bank, and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

RESTRICTIONS ON VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES

SEC. 502. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available to pay any voluntary contribution of the United States to the United Nations (including the United Nations Development Program) if the United Nations implements or imposes any taxation on any United States persons.

LIMITATION ON RESIDENCE EXPENSES

SEC. 503. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed $100,500 shall be for official residence expenses of the United States Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That appropriate steps shall be taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, United States-owned foreign currencies are utilized in lieu of dollars.

LIMITATION ON EXPENSES

SEC. 504. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed $5,000 shall be for entertainment expenses of the United States Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year.

LIMITATION ON REPRESENTATIONAL ALLOWANCES

SEC. 505. Of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, not to exceed $125,000 shall be available for representation allowances for the United States Agency for International Development during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That appropriate steps shall be taken to assure that, to the maximum extent possible, United States-owned foreign currencies are utilized in lieu of dollars: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act for general costs of administering military assistance and sales under the heading ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', not to exceed $4,000 shall be available for entertainment expenses and not to exceed $130,000 shall be available for representation allowances: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''International Military Education and Training'', not to exceed $55,000 shall be available for entertainment allowances: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act for the Inter-American Foundation, not to exceed $2,000 shall be available for entertainment and representation allowances: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act for the Peace Corps, not to exceed a total of $4,000 shall be available for entertainment expenses: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Trade and Development Agency'', not to exceed $4,000 shall be available for representation and entertainment allowances: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available by this Act under the heading ''Millennium Challenge Corporation'', not to exceed $130,000 shall be available for representation and entertainment allowances.

PROHIBITION ON TAXATION OF UNITED STATES ASSISTANCE

SEC. 506. (a) PROHIBITION ON TAXATION.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available to provide assistance for a foreign country under a new bilateral agreement governing the terms and conditions under which such assistance is to be provided unless such agreement includes a provision stating that assistance provided by the United States shall be exempt from taxation, or reimbursed, by the foreign government, and the Secretary of State shall expeditiously seek to negotiate amendments to existing bilateral agreements, as necessary, to conform with this requirement.

(b) REIMBURSEMENT OF FOREIGN TAXES.—An amount equivalent to 200 percent of the total taxes assessed during fiscal year 2005 on funds appropriated by this Act by a foreign government or entity against commodities financed under United States assistance programs for which funds are appropriated by this Act, either directly or through grantees, contractors and subcontractors shall be withheld from obligation from funds appropriated for assistance for fiscal year 2006 and allocated for the central government of such country and for the West Bank and Gaza Program to the extent that the Secretary of State certifies and reports in writing to the Committees on Appropriations that such taxes have not been reimbursed to the Government of the United States.

(c) DE MINIMIS EXCEPTION.—Foreign taxes of a de minimis nature shall not be subject to the provisions of subsection (b).

(d) REPROGRAMMING OF FUNDS.—Funds withheld from obligation for each country or entity pursuant to subsection (b) shall be reprogrammed for assistance to countries which do not assess taxes on United States assistance or which have an effective arrangement that is providing substantial reimbursement of such taxes.

(e) DETERMINATIONS.—

(1) The provisions of this section shall not apply to any country or entity the Secretary of State determines—

(A) does not assess taxes on United States assistance or which has an effective arrangement that is providing substantial reimbursement of such taxes; or

(B) the foreign policy interests of the United States outweigh the policy of this section to ensure that United States assistance is not subject to taxation.

(2) The Secretary of State shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days prior to exercising the authority of this subsection with regard to any country or entity.

(f) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of State shall issue rules, regulations, or policy guidance, as appropriate, to implement the prohibition against the taxation of assistance contained in this section.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the terms ''taxes'' and ''taxation'' refer to value added taxes and customs duties imposed on commodities financed with United States assistance for programs for which funds are appropriated by this Act; and

(2) the term ''bilateral agreement'' refers to a framework bilateral agreement between the Government of the United States and the government of the country receiving assistance that describes the privileges and immunities applicable to United States foreign assistance for such country generally, or an individual agreement between the Government of the United States and such government that describes, among other things, the treatment for tax purposes that will be accorded the United States assistance provided under that agreement.

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES

SEC. 507. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance or reparations to Cuba, Libya, North Korea, Iran, or Syria: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section, the prohibition on obligations or expenditures shall include direct loans, credits, insurance and guarantees of the Export-Import Bank or its agents.

MILITARY COUPS

SEC. 508. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance directly any assistance to the government of any country whose duly elected head of government is deposed by decree or military coup: *Provided*, That assistance may be resumed to such government if the President determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that subsequent to the termination of assistance a democratically elected government has taken office: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to assistance to promote democratic elections or public participation in democratic processes: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the previous provisos shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

TRANSFERS

SEC. 509. (a)(1) LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS BETWEEN AGENCIES.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriation Act.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), in addition to transfers made by, or authorized elsewhere in, this Act, funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be allocated or transferred to agencies of the United States Government pursuant to the provisions of sections 109, 610, and 632 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(b) TRANSFERS BETWEEN ACCOUNTS.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated under an appropriation account to which they were not appropriated, except for transfers specifically provided for in this Act, unless the President, not less than five days prior to the exercise of any authority contained in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to transfer funds, consults with and provides a written policy justification to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

(c) AUDIT OF INTER-AGENCY TRANSFERS.—Any agreement for the transfer or allocation of funds appropriated by this Act, or prior Acts, entered into between the United States Agency for International Development and another agency of the United States Government under the authority of section 632(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any

comparable provision of law, shall expressly provide that the Office of the Inspector General for the agency receiving the transfer or allocation of such funds shall perform periodic program and financial audits of the use of such funds: *Provided,* That funds transferred under such authority may be made available for the cost of such audits.

COMMERCIAL LEASING OF DEFENSE ARTICLES

SEC. 510. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, the authority of section 23(a) of the Arms Export Control Act may be used to provide financing to Israel, Egypt and NATO and major non-NATO allies for the procurement by leasing (including leasing with an option to purchase) of defense articles from United States commercial suppliers, not including Major Defense Equipment (other than helicopters and other types of aircraft having possible civilian application), if the President determines that there are compelling foreign policy or national security reasons for those defense articles being provided by commercial lease rather than by government-to-government sale under such Act.

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

SEC. 511. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation after the expiration of the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided in this Act: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the purposes of chapters 1, 8, 11, and 12 of part I, section 667, chapters 4, 6, 8, and 9 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, and funds provided under the heading ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', shall remain available for an additional four years from the date on which the availability of such funds would otherwise have expired, if such funds are initially obligated before the expiration of their respective periods of availability contained in this Act: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any funds made available for the purposes of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which are allocated or obligated for cash disbursements in order to address balance of payments or economic policy reform objectives, shall remain available until expended.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO COUNTRIES IN DEFAULT

SEC. 512. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to furnish assistance to the government of any country which is in default during a period in excess of one calendar year in payment to the United States of principal or interest on any loan made to the government of such country by the United States pursuant to a program for which funds are appropriated under this Act unless the President determines, following consultations with the Committees on Appropriations, that assistance to such country is in the national interest of the United States.

COMMERCE AND TRADE

SEC. 513. (a) None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for direct assistance and none of the funds otherwise made available pursuant to this Act to the Export-Import Bank and the Overseas Private Investment Corporation shall be obligated or expended to finance any loan, any assistance or any other financial commitments for establishing or expanding production of any commodity for export by any country other than the United States, if the commodity is likely to be in surplus on world markets at the time the resulting productive capacity is expected to become operative and if the assistance will cause substantial injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity: *Provided,* That such prohibition shall not apply to the Export-Import Bank if in the judgment of its Board of Directors the benefits to industry and employment in the United States are likely to outweigh the injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity, and the Chairman of the Board so notifies the Committees on Appropriations.

(b) None of the funds appropriated by this or any other Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be available for any testing or breeding feasibility study, variety improvement or introduction, consultancy, publication, conference, or training in connection with the growth or production in a foreign country of an agricultural commodity for export which would compete with a similar commodity grown or produced in the United States: *Provided,* That this subsection shall not prohibit—

(1) activities designed to increase food security in developing countries where such activities will not have a significant impact on the export of agricultural commodities of the United States; or

(2) research activities intended primarily to benefit American producers.

SURPLUS COMMODITIES

SEC. 514. The Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States Executive Directors of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Investment Corporation, the North American Development Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the African Development Bank, and the African Development Fund to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose any assistance by these institutions, using funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act, for the production or extraction of any commodity or mineral for export, if it is in surplus on world markets and if the assistance will cause substantial injury to United States producers of the same, similar, or competing commodity.

NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 515. For the purposes of providing the executive branch with the necessary administrative flexibility, none of the funds made available under this Act for ''Child Survival and Health Programs Fund'', ''Development Assistance'', ''International Organizations and Programs'', ''Trade and Development Agency'', ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'', ''Andean Counterdrug Initiative'', ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', ''Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'', ''Economic Support Fund'', ''Global HIV/AIDS Initiative'', ''Peacekeeping Operations'', ''Capital Investment Fund'', ''Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development'', ''Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General'', ''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'', ''Millennium Challenge Corporation'' (by country only), ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', ''International Military Education and Training'', ''Peace Corps'', and ''Migration and Refugee Assistance'', shall be available for obligation for activities, programs, projects, type of materiel assistance, countries, or other operations not justified or in excess of the amount justified to the Committees on Appropriations for obligation under any of these specific headings unless the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress are previously notified 15 days in advance: *Provided*, That the President shall not enter into any commitment of funds appropriated for the purposes of section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act for the provision of major defense equipment, other than conventional ammunition, or other major defense items defined to be aircraft, ships, missiles, or combat vehicles, not previously justified to Congress or 20 percent in excess of the quantities justified to Congress unless the Committees on Appropriations are notified 15 days in advance of such commitment: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to any reprogramming for an activity, program, or project for which funds are appropriated under title II of this Act of less than 10 percent of the amount previously justified to the Congress for obligation for such activity, program, or project for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the requirements of this section or any similar provision of this Act or any other Act, including any prior Act requiring notification in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, may be waived if failure to do so would pose a substantial risk to human health or welfare: *Provided further*, That in case of any such waiver, notification to the Congress, or the appropriate congressional committees, shall be provided as early as practicable, but in no event later than 3 days after taking the action to which such notification requirement was applicable, in the context of the circumstances necessitating such waiver: *Provided further*, That any notification provided pursuant to such a waiver shall contain an explanation of the emergency circumstances.

LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 516. Subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, funds appropriated under this Act or any previously enacted Act making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, which are returned or not made available for organizations and programs because of the implementation of section 307(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006.

INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

SEC. 517. (a) None of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'' shall be made available for assistance for a government of an Independent State of the former Soviet Union—

(1) unless that government is making progress in implementing comprehensive economic reforms based on market principles, private ownership, respect for commercial contracts, and equitable treatment of foreign private investment; and

(2) if that government applies or transfers United States assistance to any entity for the purpose of expropriating or seizing ownership or control of assets, investments, or ventures.

Assistance may be furnished without regard to this subsection if the President determines that to do so is in the national interest.

(b) None of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'' shall be made available for assistance for a government of an Independent State of the former Soviet Union if that government directs any action in violation of the territorial integrity or national sovereignty of any other

Independent State of the former Soviet Union, such as those violations included in the Helsinki Final Act: *Provided*, That such funds may be made available without regard to the restriction in this subsection if the President determines that to do so is in the national security interest of the United States.

(c) None of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'' shall be made available for any state to enhance its military capability: *Provided*, That this restriction does not apply to demilitarization, demining or nonproliferation programs.

(d) Funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'' for the Russian Federation, Armenia, Georgia, and Ukraine shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(e) Funds made available in this Act for assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union shall be subject to the provisions of section 117 (relating to environment and natural resources) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(f) In issuing new task orders, entering into contracts, or making grants, with funds appropriated in this Act or prior appropriations Acts under the heading ''Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'' and under comparable headings in prior appropriations Acts, for projects or activities that have as one of their primary purposes the fostering of private sector development, the Coordinator for United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia and the implementing agency shall encourage the participation of and give significant weight to contractors and grantees who propose investing a significant amount of their own resources (including volunteer services and in-kind contributions) in such projects and activities.

PROHIBITION ON FUNDING FOR ABORTIONS AND INVOLUNTARY STERILIZATION

SEC. 518. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for the performance of abortions as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for the performance of involuntary sterilization as a method of family planning or to coerce or provide any financial incentive to any person to undergo sterilizations. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be used to pay for any biomedical research which relates in whole or in part, to methods of, or the performance of, abortions or involuntary sterilization as a means of family planning. None of the funds made available to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, may be obligated or expended for any country or organization if the President certifies that the use of these funds by any such country or organization would violate any of the above provisions related to abortions and involuntary sterilizations.

EXPORT FINANCING TRANSFER AUTHORITIES

SEC. 519. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation other than for administrative expenses made available for fiscal year 2005, for programs under title I of this Act may be transferred between such appropriations for use for any of the purposes, programs, and activities for which the funds in such receiving account may be used, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 25 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That the exercise of such authority shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

SPECIAL NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 520. None of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be obligated or expended for Liberia, Serbia, Sudan, or Zimbabwe except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

DEFINITION OF PROGRAM, PROJECT, AND ACTIVITY

SEC. 521. For the purpose of this Act, ''program, project, and activity'' shall be defined at the appropriations Act account level and shall include all appropriations and authorizations Acts earmarks, ceilings, and limitations with the exception that for the following accounts: Economic Support Fund and Foreign Military Financing Program, ''program, project, and activity'' shall also be considered to include country, regional, and central program level funding within each such account; for the development assistance accounts of the United States Agency for International Development ''program, project, and activity'' shall also be considered to include central, country, regional, and program level funding, either as: (1) justified to the Congress; or (2) allocated by the executive branch in accordance with a report, to be provided to the Committees on Appropriations within 30 days of the enactment of this Act, as required by section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH ACTIVITIES

SEC. 522. Up to $13,500,000 of the funds made available by this Act for assistance under the heading ''Child Survival and Health Programs Fund'', may be used to reimburse United States Government agencies, agencies of State governments, institutions of higher learning, and private and voluntary organizations for the full cost of individuals (including for the personal services of such individuals) detailed or assigned to, or contracted by, as the case may be, the United States Agency for International Development for the purpose of carrying out activities under that heading: *Provided*, That up to $3,500,000 of the funds made available by this Act for assistance under the heading ''Development Assistance'' may be used to reimburse such agencies, institutions, and organizations for such costs of such individuals carrying out other development assistance activities: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by titles II and III of this Act that are made available for bilateral assistance for child survival activities or disease programs including activities relating to research on, and the prevention, treatment and control of, HIV/AIDS may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law except for the provisions under the heading ''Child Survival and Health Programs Fund'' and the United States Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Act of 2003 (117 Stat. 711; 22 U.S.C. 7601 et seq.).

AFGHANISTAN

SEC. 523. Of the funds appropriated by titles II and III of this Act, not less than $977,000,000 should be made available for humanitarian, reconstruction, and related assistance for Afghanistan: *Provided*, That $60,000,000 of the funds allocated for assistance for Afghanistan from this Act and other Acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for fiscal year 2005 should be made available for assistance for Afghan women and girls.

NOTIFICATION ON EXCESS DEFENSE EQUIPMENT

SEC. 524. Prior to providing excess Department of Defense articles in accordance with section 516(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations to the same extent and under the same conditions as are other committees pursuant to subsection (f) of that section: *Provided*, That before issuing a letter of offer to sell excess defense articles under the Arms Export Control Act, the Department of Defense shall notify the Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the regular notification procedures of such Committees if such defense articles are significant military equipment (as defined in section 47(9) of the Arms Export Control Act) or are valued (in terms of original acquisition cost) at $7,000,000 or more, or if notification is required elsewhere in this Act for the use of appropriated funds for specific countries that would receive such excess defense articles: *Provided further*, That such Committees shall also be informed of the original acquisition cost of such defense articles.

THE GLOBAL FUND TO FIGHT AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS AND MALARIA

SEC. 525. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds that are appropriated by this Act that are made available to support the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (Global Fund) may be made available to the Global Fund until the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that—

(1) the Global Fund is making concerted efforts to—

(A) establish a full time, professional, independent office which reports directly to the Global Fund Board regarding, among other things, the integrity of processes for consideration and approval of grant proposals, and the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of grants made by the Global Fund;

(B) strengthen domestic civil society participation, especially for people living with HIV/AIDS, in-country coordinating mechanisms; and

(C) establish procedures to assess the need for, and coordinate, technical assistance for Global Fund activities, in cooperation with bilateral and multilateral donors; and

(2) the Global Fund has established clear, consistent progress indicators upon which to determine the release of incremental disbursements;

(3) the Global Fund is releasing such incremental disbursements only if sufficient positive results have been attained based on those indicators; and

(4) the Global Fund is providing an appropriate level of support and oversight to country-level entities, such as country coordinating mechanisms, principal recipients, and local Fund agents, to enable them to fulfill their mandates.

DEMOCRACY PROGRAMS

SEC. 526. (a) The Secretary of Treasury should instruct the United States executive director to each international financial institution to use the voice and vote of the United States to support projects in Tibet if such projects do not provide incentives for the migration and settlement of non-Tibetans into Tibet or facilitate the transfer of ownership of Tibetan land and natural resources to non-Tibetans; are based on a thorough needs-assessment; foster self-sufficiency of the Tibetan people and respect Tibetan culture and traditions; and are subject to effective monitoring.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not less than $4,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' should be made available to nongovernmental organizations to support activities which preserve cultural

traditions and promote sustainable development and environmental conservation in Tibetan communities in the Tibetan Autonomous Region and in other Tibetan communities in China.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not less than $250,000 of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' should be made available for human rights and democracy programs for Tibetans.

(d) Not less than $27,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' should be allocated for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund: *Provided*, That up to $1,200,000 may be used for the Reagan/Fascell Democracy Fellows program.

(e) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, up to $1,500,000 of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' may be provided to make grants to educational, humanitarian, and nongovernmental organizations and individuals inside Iran and Syria to support the advancement of democracy and human rights in Iran and Syria, and such funds may be provided through the National Endowment for Democracy.

PROHIBITION ON BILATERAL ASSISTANCE TO TERRORIST COUNTRIES

SEC. 527. (a) Funds appropriated for bilateral assistance under any heading of this Act and funds appropriated under any such heading in a provision of law enacted prior to the enactment of this Act, shall not be made available to any country which the President determines—

(1) grants sanctuary from prosecution to any individual or group which has committed an act of international terrorism; or

(2) otherwise supports international terrorism.

(b) The President may waive the application of subsection (a) to a country if the President determines that national security or humanitarian reasons justify such waiver. The President shall publish each waiver in the Federal Register and, at least 15 days before the waiver takes effect, shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the waiver (including the justification for the waiver) in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

DEBT-FOR-DEVELOPMENT

SEC. 528. In order to enhance the continued participation of nongovernmental organizations in debt-for-development and debt-for-nature exchanges, a nongovernmental organization which is a grantee or contractor of the United States Agency for International Development may place in interest bearing accounts local currencies which accrue to that organization as a result of economic assistance provided under title II of this Act and, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, and any interest earned on such investment shall be used for the purpose for which the assistance was provided to that organization.

SEPARATE ACCOUNTS

SEC. 529. (a) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS FOR LOCAL CURRENCIES.—(1) If assistance is furnished to the government of a foreign country under chapters 1 and 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 under agreements which result in the generation of local currencies of that country, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall—

(A) require that local currencies be deposited in a separate account established by that government;

(B) enter into an agreement with that government which sets forth—

(i) the amount of the local currencies to be generated; and

(ii) the terms and conditions under which the currencies so deposited may be utilized, consistent with this section; and

(C) establish by agreement with that government the responsibilities of the United States Agency for International Development and that government to monitor and account for deposits into and disbursements from the separate account.

(2) USES OF LOCAL CURRENCIES.—As may be agreed upon with the foreign government, local currencies deposited in a separate account pursuant to subsection (a), or an equivalent amount of local currencies, shall be used only—

(A) to carry out chapter 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II (as the case may be), for such purposes as—

(i) project and sector assistance activities; or

(ii) debt and deficit financing; or

(B) for the administrative requirements of the United States Government.

(3) PROGRAMMING ACCOUNTABILITY.—The United States Agency for International Development shall take all necessary steps to ensure that the equivalent of the local currencies disbursed pursuant to subsection (a)(2)(A) from the separate account established pursuant to subsection (a)(1) are used for the purposes agreed upon pursuant to subsection (a)(2).

(4) TERMINATION OF ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.—Upon termination of assistance to a country under chapter 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II (as the case may be), any unencumbered balances of funds which remain in a separate account established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be disposed of for such purposes as may be agreed to by the government of that country and the United States Government.

(5) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall report on an annual basis as part of the justification documents submitted to the Committees on Appropriations on the use of local currencies for the administrative requirements of the United States Government as authorized in subsection (a)(2)(B), and such report shall include the amount of local currency (and United States dollar equivalent) used and/or to be used for such purpose in each applicable country.

(b) SEPARATE ACCOUNTS FOR CASH TRANSFERS.—(1) If assistance is made available to the government of a foreign country, under chapter 1 or 10 of part I or chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as cash transfer assistance or as nonproject sector assistance, that country shall be required to maintain such funds in a separate account and not commingle them with any other funds.

(2) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS OF LAW.—Such funds may be obligated and expended notwithstanding provisions of law which are inconsistent with the nature of this assistance including provisions which are referenced in the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference accompanying House Joint Resolution 648 (House Report No. 98–1159).

(3) NOTIFICATION.—At least 15 days prior to obligating any such cash transfer or nonproject sector assistance, the President shall submit a notification through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, which shall include a detailed description of how the funds proposed to be made available will be used, with a discussion of the United States interests that will be served by the assistance (including, as appropriate, a description of the economic policy reforms that will be promoted by such assistance).

(4) EXEMPTION.—Nonproject sector assistance funds may be exempt from the requirements of subsection (b)(1) only through the notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

ENTERPRISE FUND RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 530. (a) Prior to the distribution of any assets resulting from any liquidation, dissolution, or winding up of an Enterprise Fund, in whole or in part, the President shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations, in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, a plan for the distribution of the assets of the Enterprise Fund.

(b) Funds made available by this Act for Enterprise Funds shall be expended at the minimum rate necessary to make timely payment for projects and activities.

SUDAN

SEC. 531. (a) Of the funds appropriated by title II of this Act, not less than $311,000,000 should be made available for assistance for Sudan.

(b) Subject to section (c):

(1) Notwithstanding section 501(a) of the International Malaria Control Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–570) or any other provision of law, none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for the Government of Sudan.

(2) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for the cost, as defined in section 502, of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying loans and loan guarantees held by the Government of Sudan, including the cost of selling, reducing, or canceling amounts owed to the United States, and modifying concessional loans, guarantees, and credit agreements.

(c) Subsection (b) shall not apply if the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that—

(1) the Government of Sudan has disarmed and disbanded government-supported militia groups in the Darfur region;

(2) the Government of Sudan and all government-supported militia groups are honoring their commitments made in the cease-fire agreement of April 8, 2004; and

(3) the Government of Sudan is allowing full and unconditional access to Darfur to humanitarian aid organizations, the human rights investigation and humanitarian teams of the United Nations, including protection officers, and an international monitoring team that is based in Darfur and that has the support of the United States.

(d) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of subsection (b) shall not apply to—

(1) humanitarian assistance; and

(2) assistance for Darfur and for areas outside the control of the Government of Sudan.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of the Act and section 501 of Public Law 106–570, the terms ''Government of Sudan'', ''areas outside of control of the Government of Sudan'', and ''area in Sudan outside of control of the Government of Sudan'' shall have the same meaning and application as was the case immediately prior to the conclusion of the cease-fire agreement of April 8, 2004.

AUTHORITIES FOR THE PEACE CORPS, INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION AND AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

SEC. 532. Unless expressly provided to the contrary, provisions of this or any other Act, including provisions contained in prior Acts authorizing or making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, shall not be construed to prohibit activities authorized by or conducted under the Peace Corps Act, the Inter-

American Foundation Act or the African Development Foundation Act. The agency shall promptly report to the Committees on Appropriations whenever it is conducting activities or is proposing to conduct activities in a country for which assistance is prohibited.

IMPACT ON JOBS IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 533. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to provide—

(1) any financial incentive to a business enterprise currently located in the United States for the purpose of inducing such an enterprise to relocate outside the United States if such incentive or inducement is likely to reduce the number of employees of such business enterprise in the United States because United States production is being replaced by such enterprise outside the United States; or

(2) assistance for any program, project, or activity that contributes to the violation of internationally recognized workers rights, as defined in section 507(4) of the Trade Act of 1974, of workers in the recipient country, including any designated zone or area in that country: *Provided*, That the application of section 507(4) (D) and (E) of such Act should be commensurate with the level of development of the recipient country and sector, and shall not preclude assistance for the informal sector in such country, micro and small-scale enterprise, and smallholder agriculture.

SPECIAL AUTHORITIES

SEC. 534. (a) AFGHANISTAN, PAKISTAN, MONTENEGRO, VICTIMS OF WAR, DISPLACED CHILDREN, AND DISPLACED BURMESE.—Funds appropriated by this Act that are made available for assistance for Afghanistan may be made available notwithstanding section 512 of this Act or any similar provision of law and section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and funds appropriated in titles I and II of this Act that are made available for Montenegro, Pakistan, and for victims of war, displaced children, and displaced Burmese, and to assist victims of trafficking in persons and, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations, to combat such trafficking, may be made available notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(b) TROPICAL FORESTRY AND BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES.—Funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of sections 103 through 106, and chapter 4 of part II, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of supporting tropical forestry and biodiversity conservation activities and energy programs aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions: *Provided*, That such assistance shall be subject to sections 116, 502B, and 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(c) PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACTORS.—Funds appropriated by this Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I, chapter 4 of part II, and section 667 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, may be used by the United States Agency for International Development to employ up to 25 personal services contractors in the United States, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of providing direct, interim support for new or expanded overseas programs and activities managed by the agency until permanent direct hire personnel are hired and trained: *Provided*, That not more than 10 of such contractors shall be assigned to any bureau or office: *Provided further*, That such funds appropriated to carry out title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, may be made available only for personal services contractors assigned to the Office of Food for Peace.

(d)(1) WAIVER.—The President may waive the provisions of section 1003 of Public Law 100–204 if the President determines and certifies in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate that it is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(2) PERIOD OF APPLICATION OF WAIVER.—Any waiver pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be effective for no more than a period of 6 months at a time and shall not apply beyond 12 months after the enactment of this Act.

(e) SMALL BUSINESS.—In entering into multiple award indefinite-quantity contracts with funds appropriated by this Act, the United States Agency for International Development may provide an exception to the fair opportunity process for placing task orders under such contracts when the order is placed with any category of small or small disadvantaged business.

(f) RECONSTITUTING CIVILIAN POLICE AUTHORITY.—In providing assistance with funds appropriated by this Act under section 660(b)(6) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, support for a nation emerging from instability may be deemed to mean support for regional, district, municipal, or other subnational entity emerging from instability, as well as a nation emerging from instability.

(g) NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY.—Funds appropriated by this Act that are provided to the National Endowment for Democracy may be provided notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation.

(h) WORLD FOOD PROGRAM.—Of the funds managed by the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance of the United States Agency for International Development, from this or any other Act, not less than $6,000,000 shall be made available as a general contribution to the World Food Program, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

(i) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.—Public Law 107–57, as amended, is further amended—

(1) in section 1(b)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''2004'' and inserting ''2005''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''2004'' and inserting ''2005'';

(2) in section 3(2), by striking ''and 2004'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''2004, and 2005''; and

(3) in section 6, by striking ''2004'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''2005''.

ARAB LEAGUE BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

SEC. 535. It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the Arab League boycott of Israel, and the secondary boycott of American firms that have commercial ties with Israel, is an impediment to peace in the region and to United States investment and trade in the Middle East and North Africa;

(2) the Arab League boycott, which was regrettably reinstated in 1997, should be immediately and publicly terminated, and the Central Office for the Boycott of Israel immediately disbanded;

(3) the three Arab League countries with diplomatic and trade relations with Israel should return their ambassadors to Israel, should refrain from downgrading their relations with Israel, and should play a constructive role in securing a peaceful resolution of the Israeli-Arab conflict;

(4) the remaining Arab League states should normalize relations with their neighbor Israel;

(5) the President and the Secretary of State should continue to vigorously oppose the Arab League boycott of Israel and find concrete steps to demonstrate that opposition by, for example, taking into consideration the participation of any recipient country in the boycott when determining to sell weapons to said country; and

(6) the President should report to Congress annually on specific steps being taken by the United States to encourage Arab League states to normalize their relations with Israel to bring about the termination of the Arab League boycott of Israel, including those to encourage allies and trading partners of the United States to enact laws prohibiting businesses from complying with the boycott and penalizing businesses that do comply.

ELIGIBILITY FOR ASSISTANCE

SEC. 536. (a) ASSISTANCE THROUGH NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—Restrictions contained in this or any other Act with respect to assistance for a country shall not be construed to restrict assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapters 1, 10, 11, and 12 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and from funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'': *Provided*, That before using the authority of this subsection to furnish assistance in support of programs of nongovernmental organizations, the President shall notify the Committees on Appropriations under the regular notification procedures of those committees, including a description of the program to be assisted, the assistance to be provided, and the reasons for furnishing such assistance: *Provided further*, That nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion or involuntary sterilizations contained in this or any other Act.

(b) PUBLIC LAW 480.—During fiscal year 2005, restrictions contained in this or any other Act with respect to assistance for a country shall not be construed to restrict assistance under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to carry out title I of such Act and made available pursuant to this subsection may be obligated or expended except as provided through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply—

(1) with respect to section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any comparable provision of law prohibiting assistance to countries that support international terrorism; or

(2) with respect to section 116 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or any comparable provision of law prohibiting assistance to the government of a country that violates internationally recognized human rights.

RESERVATIONS OF FUNDS

SEC. 537. (a) Funds appropriated by this Act which are earmarked may be reprogrammed for other programs within the same account notwithstanding the earmark if compliance with the earmark is made impossible by operation of any provision of this or any other Act: *Provided*, That any such reprogramming shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That assistance that is reprogrammed pursuant to this subsection shall be made available under the same terms and conditions as originally provided.

(b) In addition to the authority contained in subsection (a), the original period of availability of funds appropriated by this Act and administered by the United States Agency

for International Development that are earmarked for particular programs or activities by this or any other Act shall be extended for an additional fiscal year if the Administrator of such agency determines and reports promptly to the Committees on Appropriations that the termination of assistance to a country or a significant change in circumstances makes it unlikely that such earmarked funds can be obligated during the original period of availability: *Provided*, That such earmarked funds that are continued available for an additional fiscal year shall be obligated only for the purpose of such earmark.

CEILINGS AND EARMARKS

SEC. 538. Ceilings and earmarks contained in this Act shall not be applicable to funds or authorities appropriated or otherwise made available by any subsequent Act unless such Act specifically so directs. Earmarks or minimum funding requirements contained in any other Act shall not be applicable to funds appropriated by this Act.

PROHIBITION ON PUBLICITY OR PROPAGANDA

SEC. 539. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes within the United States not authorized before the date of the enactment of this Act by the Congress: *Provided*, That not to exceed $750,000 may be made available to carry out the provisions of section 316 of Public Law 96–533.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENTS TO UNITED NATIONS MEMBERS

SEC. 540. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act for carrying out the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used to pay in whole or in part any assessments, arrearages, or dues of any member of the United Nations or, from funds appropriated by this Act to carry out chapter 1 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the costs for participation of another country's delegation at international conferences held under the auspices of multilateral or international organizations.

NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS—DOCUMENTATION

SEC. 541. None of the funds appropriated or made available pursuant to this Act shall be available to a nongovernmental organization which fails to provide upon timely request any document, file, or record necessary to the auditing requirements of the United States Agency for International Development.

PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS THAT EXPORT LETHAL MILITARY EQUIPMENT TO COUNTRIES SUPPORTING INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM

SEC. 542. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be available to any foreign government which provides lethal military equipment to a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined is a terrorist government for purposes of section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act. The prohibition under this section with respect to a foreign government shall terminate 12 months after that government ceases to provide such military equipment. This section applies with respect to lethal military equipment provided under a contract entered into after October 1, 1997.

(b) Assistance restricted by subsection (a) or any other similar provision of law, may be furnished if the President determines that furnishing such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States.

(c) Whenever the waiver authority of subsection (b) is exercised, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with respect to the furnishing of such assistance. Any such report shall include a detailed explanation of the assistance to be provided, including the estimated dollar amount of such assistance, and an explanation of how the assistance furthers United States national interests.

WITHHOLDING OF ASSISTANCE FOR PARKING FINES OWED BY FOREIGN COUNTRIES

SEC. 543. (a) Subject to subsection (c), of the funds appropriated by this Act that are made available for assistance for a foreign country, an amount equal to 110 percent of the total amount of the unpaid fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties owed by such country shall be withheld from obligation for such country until the Secretary of State submits a certification to the appropriate congressional committees stating that such parking fines and penalties are fully paid.

(b) Funds withheld from obligation pursuant to subsection (a) may be made available for other programs or activities funded by this Act, after consultation with and subject to the regulation notification procedures of the appropriate congressional committees, provided that no such funds shall be made available for assistance to the central government of a foreign country that has not paid the total amount of the fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties owed by such country.

(c) Subsection (a) shall not include amounts that have been withheld under any other provision of law.

(d) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) no sooner than 60 days from the date of enactment of this Act, or at any time with respect to a particular country, if the Secretary determines that it is in the national interests of the United States to do so.

(e) Not later than 6 months after the initial exercise of the waiver authority in subsection (d), the Secretary of State, after consultations with the City of New York, shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations describing a strategy, including a timetable and steps currently being taken, to collect the parking fines and penalties owed by nations receiving foreign assistance under this Act.

(f) In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) The term ''fully adjudicated'' includes circumstances in which the person to whom the vehicle is registered—

(A)(i) has not responded to the parking violation summons; or

(ii) has not followed the appropriate adjudication procedure to challenge the summons; and

(B) the period of time for payment of or challenge to the summons has lapsed.

(3) The term ''parking fines and penalties'' means parking fines and penalties—

(A) owed to—

(i) the District of Columbia; or

(ii) New York, New York; and

(B) incurred during the period April 1, 1997 through September 30, 2004.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR THE PLO FOR THE WEST BANK AND GAZA

SEC. 544. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated for assistance for the Palestine Liberation Organization for the West Bank and Gaza unless the President has exercised the authority under section 604(a) of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1995 (title VI of Public Law 104–107) or any other legislation to suspend or make inapplicable section 307 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and that suspension is still in effect: *Provided*, That if the President fails to make the certification under section 604(b)(2) of the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1995 or to suspend the prohibition under other legislation, funds appropriated by this Act may not be obligated for assistance for the Palestine Liberation Organization for the West Bank and Gaza.

WAR CRIMES TRIBUNALS DRAWDOWN

SEC. 545. If the President determines that doing so will contribute to a just resolution of charges regarding genocide or other violations of international humanitarian law, the President may direct a drawdown pursuant to section 552(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 of up to $30,000,000 of commodities and services for the United Nations War Crimes Tribunal established with regard to the former Yugoslavia by the United Nations Security Council or such other tribunals or commissions as the Council may establish or authorize to deal with such violations, without regard to the ceiling limitation contained in paragraph (2) thereof: *Provided*, That the determination required under this section shall be in lieu of any determinations otherwise required under section 552(c): *Provided further*, That the drawdown made under this section for any tribunal shall not be construed as an endorsement or precedent for the establishment of any standing or permanent international criminal tribunal or court: *Provided further*, That funds made available for tribunals other than Yugoslavia, Rwanda, or the Special Court for Sierra Leone shall be made available subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

LANDMINES

SEC. 546. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, demining equipment available to the United States Agency for International Development and the Department of State and used in support of the clearance of landmines and unexploded ordnance for humanitarian purposes may be disposed of on a grant basis in foreign countries, subject to such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe.

RESTRICTIONS CONCERNING THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 547. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to create in any part of Jerusalem a new office of any department or agency of the United States Government for the purpose of conducting official United States Government business with the Palestinian Authority over Gaza and Jericho or any successor Palestinian governing entity provided for in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply to the acquisition of additional space for the existing Consulate General in Jerusalem: *Provided further*, That meetings between officers and employees of the United States and officials of the Palestinian Authority, or any successor Palestinian governing entity provided for in the Israel-PLO Declaration of Principles, for the purpose of conducting official United States Government business with such authority should continue to take place in locations other than Jerusalem. As has been true in the past, officers and employees of the United States Government may continue to meet in Jerusalem on other subjects with Palestinians (including those who now occupy positions in the Palestinian Authority), have social contacts, and have incidental discussions.

PROHIBITION OF PAYMENT OF CERTAIN EXPENSES

SEC. 548. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act under the heading ''International Military Education and Training'' or ''Foreign Military

Financing Program'' for Informational Program activities or under the headings ''Child Survival and Health Programs Fund'', ''Development Assistance'', and ''Economic Support Fund'' may be obligated or expended to pay for—

(1) alcoholic beverages; or

(2) entertainment expenses for activities that are substantially of a recreational character, including but not limited to entrance fees at sporting events, theatrical and musical productions, and amusement parks.

HAITI

SEC. 549. The Government of Haiti shall be eligible to purchase defense articles and services under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.), for the Coast Guard.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

SEC. 550. (a) PROHIBITION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 may be obligated or expended with respect to providing funds to the Palestinian Authority.

(b) WAIVER.—The prohibition included in subsection (a) shall not apply if the President certifies in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate that waiving such prohibition is important to the national security interests of the United States.

(c) PERIOD OF APPLICATION OF WAIVER.—Any waiver pursuant to subsection (b) shall be effective for no more than a period of 6 months at a time and shall not apply beyond 12 months after the enactment of this Act.

(d) REPORT.—Whenever the waiver authority pursuant to subsection (b) is exercised, the President shall submit a report to the Committees on Appropriations detailing the steps the Palestinian Authority has taken to arrest terrorists, confiscate weapons and dismantle the terrorist infrastructure. The report shall also include a description of how funds will be spent and the accounting procedures in place to ensure that they are properly disbursed.

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO SECURITY FORCES

SEC. 551. None of the funds made available by this Act may be provided to any unit of the security forces of a foreign country if the Secretary of State has credible evidence that such unit has committed gross violations of human rights, unless the Secretary determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that the government of such country is taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the security forces unit to justice: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to withhold funds made available by this Act from any unit of the security forces of a foreign country not credibly alleged to be involved in gross violations of human rights: *Provided further*, That in the event that funds are withheld from any unit pursuant to this section, the Secretary of State shall promptly inform the foreign government of the basis for such action and shall, to the maximum extent practicable, assist the foreign government in taking effective measures to bring the responsible members of the security forces to justice.

FOREIGN MILITARY TRAINING REPORT

SEC. 552. The annual foreign military training report required by section 656 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall be submitted by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate by the date specified in that section.

AUTHORIZATION REQUIREMENT

SEC. 553. Funds appropriated by this Act, except funds appropriated under the headings ''Trade and Development Agency'', ''Millennium Challenge Corporation'', and ''Global HIV/AIDS Initiative'', may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672 and section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956.

CAMBODIA

SEC. 554. The Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States executive directors of the international financial institutions to use the voice and vote of the United States to oppose loans to the Central Government of Cambodia, except loans to meet basic human needs.

PALESTINIAN STATEHOOD

SEC. 555. (a) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be provided to support a Palestinian state unless the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) a new leadership of a Palestinian governing entity has been democratically elected through credible and competitive elections;

(2) the elected governing entity of a new Palestinian state—

(A) has demonstrated a firm commitment to peaceful co-existence with the State of Israel;

(B) is taking appropriate measures to counter terrorism and terrorist financing in the West Bank and Gaza, including the dismantling of terrorist infrastructures;

(C) is establishing a new Palestinian security entity that is cooperative with appropriate Israeli and other appropriate security organizations; and

(3) the Palestinian Authority (or the governing body of a new Palestinian state) is working with other countries in the region to vigorously pursue efforts to establish a just, lasting, and comprehensive peace in the Middle East that will enable Israel and an independent Palestinian state to exist within the context of full and normal relationships, which should include—

(A) termination of all claims or states of belligerency;

(B) respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity, and political independence of every state in the area through measures including the establishment of demilitarized zones;

(C) their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force;

(D) freedom of navigation through international waterways in the area; and

(E) a framework for achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the newly elected governing entity should enact a constitution assuring the rule of law, an independent judiciary, and respect for human rights for its citizens, and should enact other laws and regulations assuring transparent and accountable governance.

(c) WAIVER.—The President may waive subsection (a) if he determines that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to do so.

(d) EXEMPTION.—The restriction in subsection (a) shall not apply to assistance intended to help reform the Palestinian Authority and affiliated institutions, or a newly elected governing entity, in order to help meet the requirements of subsection (a), consistent with the provisions of section 550 of this Act (''Limitation on Assistance to the Palestinian Authority'').

COLOMBIA

SEC. 556. (a) DETERMINATION AND CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated by this Act that are available for assistance for the Colombian Armed Forces, may be made available as follows:

(1) Up to 75 percent of such funds may be obligated prior to a determination and certification by the Secretary of State pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) Up to 12.5 percent of such funds may be obligated only after the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that:

(A) The Commander General of the Colombian Armed Forces is suspending from the Armed Forces those members, of whatever rank who, according to the Minister of Defense or the Procuraduria General de la Nacion, have been credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights, including extra-judicial killings, or to have aided or abetted paramilitary organizations.

(B) The Colombian Government is vigorously investigating and prosecuting those members of the Colombian Armed Forces, of whatever rank, who have been credibly alleged to have committed gross violations of human rights, including extra-judicial killings, or to have aided or abetted paramilitary organizations, and is promptly punishing those members of the Colombian Armed Forces found to have committed such violations of human rights or to have aided or abetted paramilitary organizations.

(C) The Colombian Armed Forces have made substantial progress in cooperating with civilian prosecutors and judicial authorities in such cases (including providing requested information, such as the identity of persons suspended from the Armed Forces and the nature and cause of the suspension, and access to witnesses, relevant military documents, and other requested information).

(D) The Colombian Armed Forces have made substantial progress in severing links (including denying access to military intelligence, vehicles, and other equipment or supplies, and ceasing other forms of active or tacit cooperation) at the command, battalion, and brigade levels, with paramilitary organizations, especially in regions where these organizations have a significant presence.

(E) The Colombian Armed Forces are dismantling paramilitary leadership and financial networks by arresting commanders and financial backers, especially in regions where these networks have a significant presence.

(3) The balance of such funds may be obligated after July 31, 2005, if the Secretary of State certifies and reports to the appropriate congressional committees, after such date, that the Colombian Armed Forces are continuing to meet the conditions contained in paragraph (2) and are conducting vigorous operations to restore government authority and respect for human rights in areas under the effective control of paramilitary and guerrilla organizations.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Funds made available by this Act for the Colombian Armed Forces shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) CONSULTATIVE PROCESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter until September 30, 2006, the Secretary of State shall consult with internationally recognized human rights organizations regarding progress in meeting the conditions contained in that subsection.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AIDED OR ABETTED.—The term ''aided or abetted'' means to provide any support to

paramilitary groups, including taking actions which allow, facilitate, or otherwise foster the activities of such groups.

(2) PARAMILITARY GROUPS.—The term ''paramilitary groups'' means illegal self-defense groups and illegal security cooperatives.

ILLEGAL ARMED GROUPS

SEC. 557. (a) DENIAL OF VISAS TO SUPPORTERS OF COLOMBIAN ILLEGAL ARMED GROUPS.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of State shall not issue a visa to any alien who the Secretary determines, based on credible evidence—

(1) has willfully provided any support to the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), the National Liberation Army (ELN), or the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC), including taking actions or failing to take actions which allow, facilitate, or otherwise foster the activities of such groups; or

(2) has committed, ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the commission of gross violations of human rights, including extra-judicial killings, in Colombia.

(b) WAIVER.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of State determines and certifies to the appropriate congressional committees, on a case-by-case basis, that the issuance of a visa to the alien is necessary to support the peace process in Colombia or for urgent humanitarian reasons.

PROHIBITION ON ASSISTANCE TO THE PALESTINIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SEC. 558. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to provide equipment, technical support, consulting services, or any other form of assistance to the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation.

WEST BANK AND GAZA PROGRAM

SEC. 559. (a) OVERSIGHT.—For fiscal year 2005, 30 days prior to the initial obligation of funds for the bilateral West Bank and Gaza Program, the Secretary of State shall certify to the appropriate committees of Congress that procedures have been established to assure the Comptroller General of the United States will have access to appropriate United States financial information in order to review the uses of United States assistance for the Program funded under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' for the West Bank and Gaza.

(b) VETTING.—Prior to the obligation of funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' for assistance for the West Bank and Gaza, the Secretary of State shall take all appropriate steps to ensure that such assistance is not provided to or through any individual, private or government entity, or educational institution that the Secretary knows or has reason to believe advocates, plans, sponsors, engages in, or has engaged in, terrorist activity. The Secretary of State shall, as appropriate, establish procedures specifying the steps to be taken in carrying out this subsection and shall terminate assistance to any individual, entity, or educational institution found to be involved in or advocating terrorist activity.

(c) AUDITS.—(1) The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall ensure that Federal or non-Federal audits of all contractors and grantees, and significant subcontractors and subgrantees, under the West Bank and Gaza Program, are conducted at least on an annual basis to ensure, among other things, compliance with this section.

(2) Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' that are made available for assistance for the West Bank and Gaza, up to $1,000,000 may be used by the Office of the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development for audits, inspections, and other activities in furtherance of the requirements of this subsection. Such funds are in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND

SEC. 560. (a) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTION.—Of the amounts made available under ''International Organizations and Programs'', $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2005 shall be available for the United Nations Population Fund (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''UNFPA'').

(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS IN CHINA.—None of the funds made available under ''International Organizations and Programs'' may be made available for the UNFPA for a country program in the People's Republic of China.

(c) CONDITIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under ''International Organizations and Programs'' for fiscal year 2005 for the UNFPA may not be made available to UNFPA unless—

(1) the UNFPA maintains amounts made available to the UNFPA under this section in an account separate from other accounts of the UNFPA;

(2) the UNFPA does not commingle amounts made available to the UNFPA under this section with other sums; and

(3) the UNFPA does not fund abortions.

WAR CRIMINALS

SEC. 561. (a)(1) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act may be made available for assistance, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall instruct the United States executive directors to the international financial institutions to vote against any new project involving the extension by such institutions of any financial or technical assistance, to any country, entity, or municipality whose competent authorities have failed, as determined by the Secretary of State, to take necessary and significant steps to implement its international legal obligations to apprehend and transfer to the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (the ''Tribunal'') all persons in their territory who have been indicted by the Tribunal and to otherwise cooperate with the Tribunal.

(2) The provisions of this subsection shall not apply to humanitarian assistance or assistance for democratization.

(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply unless the Secretary of State determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the competent authorities of such country, entity, or municipality are—

(1) cooperating with the Tribunal, including access for investigators to archives and witnesses, the provision of documents, and the surrender and transfer of indictees or assistance in their apprehension; and

(2) are acting consistently with the Dayton Accords.

(c) Not less than 10 days before any vote in an international financial institution regarding the extension of any new project involving financial or technical assistance or grants to any country or entity described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations a written justification for the proposed assistance, including an explanation of the United States position regarding any such vote, as well as a description of the location of the proposed assistance by municipality, its purpose, and its intended beneficiaries.

(d) In carrying out this section, the Secretary of State, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall consult with representatives of human rights organizations and all government agencies with relevant information to help prevent indicted war criminals from benefiting from any financial or technical assistance or grants provided to any country or entity described in subsection (a).

(e) The Secretary of State may waive the application of subsection (a) with respect to projects within a country, entity, or municipality upon a written determination to the Committees on Appropriations that such assistance directly supports the implementation of the Dayton Accords.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) COUNTRY.—The term ''country'' means Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia.

(2) ENTITY.—The term ''entity'' refers to the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Montenegro and the Republika Srpska.

(3) MUNICIPALITY.—The term ''municipality'' means a city, town or other subdivision within a country or entity as defined herein.

(4) DAYTON ACCORDS.—The term ''Dayton Accords'' means the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, together with annexes relating thereto, done at Dayton, November 10 through 16, 1995.

USER FEES

SEC. 562. 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) and the International Monetary Fund to oppose any loan, grant, strategy or policy of these institutions that would require user fees or service charges on poor people for primary education or primary healthcare, including prevention and treatment efforts for HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and infant, child, and maternal well-being, in connection with the institutions' financing programs.

FUNDING FOR SERBIA

SEC. 563. (a) Funds appropriated by this Act may be made available for assistance for Serbia after March 31, 2005, if the President has made the determination and certification contained in subsection (c).

(b) After March 31, 2005, the Secretary of the Treasury should instruct the United States executive directors to the international financial institutions to support loans and assistance to the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (or a government of a successor state) subject to the conditions in subsection (c): *Provided*, That section 576 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1997, as amended, shall not apply to the provision of loans and assistance to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (or a successor state) through international financial institutions.

(c) The determination and certification referred to in subsection (a) is a determination by the President and a certification to the Committees on Appropriations that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (or a government of a successor state) is—

(1) cooperating with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia including access for investigators, the provision of documents, and the surrender and transfer of indictees or assistance in their apprehension, including making all practicable efforts to apprehend and transfer Ratko Mladic;

(2) taking steps that are consistent with the Dayton Accords to end Serbian financial, political, security and other support which has served to maintain separate Republika Srpska institutions; and

(3) taking steps to implement policies which reflect a respect for minority rights and the rule of law, including the release of political prisoners from Serbian jails and prisons.

(d) This section shall not apply to Montenegro, Kosovo, humanitarian assistance, assistance to promote democracy in municipalities, or assistance to nongovernmental organizations to promote democracy.

COMMUNITY-BASED POLICE ASSISTANCE

SEC. 564. (a) AUTHORITY.—Funds made available by this Act to carry out the provisions of chapter 1 of part I and chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, may be used, notwithstanding section 660 of that Act, to enhance the effectiveness and accountability of civilian police authority in Jamaica and El Salvador through training and technical assistance in human rights, the rule of law, strategic planning, and through assistance to foster civilian police roles that support democratic governance including assistance for programs to prevent conflict and foster improved police relations with the communities they serve.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

SPECIAL DEBT RELIEF FOR THE POOREST

SEC. 565. (a) AUTHORITY TO REDUCE DEBT.—The President may reduce amounts owed to the United States (or any agency of the United States) by an eligible country as a result of—

(1) guarantees issued under sections 221 and 222 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961;

(2) credits extended or guarantees issued under the Arms Export Control Act; or

(3) any obligation or portion of such obligation, to pay for purchases of United States agricultural commodities guaranteed by the Commodity Credit Corporation under export credit guarantee programs authorized pursuant to section 5(f) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act of June 29, 1948, as amended, section 4(b) of the Food for Peace Act of 1966, as amended (Public Law 89–808), or section 202 of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, as amended (Public Law 95–501).

(b) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only to implement multilateral official debt relief and referendum agreements, commonly referred to as ''Paris Club Agreed Minutes''.

(2) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only in such amounts or to such extent as is provided in advance by appropriations Acts.

(3) The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only with respect to countries with heavy debt burdens that are eligible to borrow from the International Development Association, but not from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, commonly referred to as ''IDA-only'' countries.

(c) CONDITIONS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised only with respect to a country whose government—

(1) does not have an excessive level of military expenditures;

(2) has not repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism;

(3) is not failing to cooperate on international narcotics control matters;

(4) (including its military or other security forces) does not engage in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights; and

(5) is not ineligible for assistance because of the application of section 527 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only with regard to the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Debt Restructuring''.

(e) CERTAIN PROHIBITIONS INAPPLICABLE.—A reduction of debt pursuant to subsection (a) shall not be considered assistance for the purposes of any provision of law limiting assistance to a country. The authority provided by subsection (a) may be exercised notwithstanding section 620(r) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 or section 321 of the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975.

AUTHORITY TO ENGAGE IN DEBT BUYBACKS OR SALES

SEC. 566. (a) LOANS ELIGIBLE FOR SALE, REDUCTION, OR CANCELLATION.—

(1) AUTHORITY TO SELL, REDUCE, OR CANCEL CERTAIN LOANS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may, in accordance with this section, sell to any eligible purchaser any concessional loan or portion thereof made before January 1, 1995, pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to the government of any eligible country as defined in section 702(6) of that Act or on receipt of payment from an eligible purchaser, reduce or cancel such loan or portion thereof, only for the purpose of facilitating—

(A) debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps; or

(B) a debt buyback by an eligible country of its own qualified debt, only if the eligible country uses an additional amount of the local currency of the eligible country, equal to not less than 40 percent of the price paid for such debt by such eligible country, or the difference between the price paid for such debt and the face value of such debt, to support activities that link conservation and sustainable use of natural resources with local community development, and child survival and other child development, in a manner consistent with sections 707 through 710 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, if the sale, reduction, or cancellation would not contravene any term or condition of any prior agreement relating to such loan.

(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall, in accordance with this section, establish the terms and conditions under which loans may be sold, reduced, or canceled pursuant to this section.

(3) ADMINISTRATION.—The Facility, as defined in section 702(8) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, shall notify the administrator of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 of purchasers that the President has determined to be eligible, and shall direct such agency to carry out the sale, reduction, or cancellation of a loan pursuant to this section. Such agency shall make adjustment in its accounts to reflect the sale, reduction, or cancellation.

(4) LIMITATION.—The authorities of this subsection shall be available only to the extent that appropriations for the cost of the modification, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, are made in advance.

(b) DEPOSIT OF PROCEEDS.—The proceeds from the sale, reduction, or cancellation of any loan sold, reduced, or canceled pursuant to this section shall be deposited in the United States Government account or accounts established for the repayment of such loan.

(c) ELIGIBLE PURCHASERS.—A loan may be sold pursuant to subsection (a)(1)(A) only to a purchaser who presents plans satisfactory to the President for using the loan for the purpose of engaging in debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps.

(d) DEBTOR CONSULTATIONS.—Before the sale to any eligible purchaser, or any reduction or cancellation pursuant to this section, of any loan made to an eligible country, the President should consult with the country concerning the amount of loans to be sold, reduced, or canceled and their uses for debt-for-equity swaps, debt-for-development swaps, or debt-for-nature swaps.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—The authority provided by subsection (a) may be used only with regard to funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''Debt Restructuring''.

BASIC EDUCATION

SEC. 567. Of the funds appropriated by title II of this Act, not less than $400,000,000 shall be made available for basic education.

RECONCILIATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 568. Of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'', not less than $12,000,000 should be made available to support reconciliation programs and activities which bring together individuals of different ethnic, religious, and political backgrounds from areas of civil conflict and war.

DEBT RESTRUCTURING AUTHORITY

SEC. 569. Funds appropriated under the heading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'' in title II of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004 (Public Law 108–106) may be made available for the costs, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of modifying direct loans and loan guarantees for Iraq, without regard to the sectoral allocations and related provisos under that heading in such Act: *Provided*, That the authority of this section shall be used subject to prior consultation with the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the obligation of funds pursuant to the authority provided in this section shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That amounts made available pursuant to the authority of this section are designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of S. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by H. Res. 649 (108th Congress): *Provided further*, That amounts made available pursuant to the authority of this section shall not be considered ''assistance'' for the purposes of provisions of law limiting assistance to a country.

TRADE CAPACITY BUILDING

SEC. 570. Of the funds appropriated by this Act, under the headings ''Trade and Development Agency'', ''Development Assistance'', ''Transition Initiatives'', ''Economic Support Fund'', ''International Affairs Technical Assistance'', and ''International Organizations and Programs'', not less than $517,000,000 should be made available for trade capacity building assistance.

EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES FOR CENTRAL AND SOUTH EUROPEAN COUNTRIES AND CERTAIN OTHER COUNTRIES

SEC. 571. Notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(e)), during fiscal year 2005, funds available to the Department of Defense may be expended for crating, packing, handling, and transportation of excess defense articles transferred under the authority of section 516 of such Act to Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Former Yugoslavian Republic of

Macedonia, Georgia, India, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Mongolia, Pakistan, Romania, Slovakia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

CUBA

SEC. 572. None of the funds appropriated by this Act under the heading ''International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement'' may be made available for assistance to the Government of Cuba.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE COALITION PROVISIONAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 573. (a) ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW OFFICE.—(1) The Office of the Inspector General of the Coalition Provisional Authority shall be reconstituted as a separate office within the Department of State and redesignated the Office of the Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (hereinafter ''the Office'').

(2) Any reference in title III of Public Law 108–106 to the ''Office of the Inspector of the Coalition Provisional Authority'' or to the ''Inspector General of the Coalition Provisional Authority'' shall be deemed to be a reference to the Office of the Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction or the Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, respectively.

(3) Any reference in title III of Public Law 108–106 to ''appropriated funds'' shall be deemed to be a reference to funds appropriated in that Act and in Public Law 108–11 under the heading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund''.

(b) INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE OFFICE.—The Inspector General of the Coalition Provisional Authority (hereinafter ''the Inspector General'') and Assistant Inspectors General of that office should be reappointed by the Secretary of State to serve in the same capacity in the Office established by subsection (a).

(c) PURPOSE AND AUTHORITIES.—(1) The Inspector General shall—

(A) conduct independent and objective audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated for the ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'';

(B) make independent and objective recommendations on policies designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in the administration of such programs and operations, and to prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse in such programs and operations; and

(C) provide an independent and objective means of keeping the Secretary of State fully and currently informed about problems and deficiencies relating to the administration of such programs and operations and the necessity for and progress of corrective action.

(2) The Inspector General shall have the duties, responsibilities, powers, and authorities described in sections 3001 (f), (g), and (h) of Public Law 108–106.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE.—

(1) The Inspector General shall report directly to and be under the supervision of the Secretary of State.

(2) Any reference in title III of Public Law 108–106 to the ''Coalition Provisional Authority'' or to the ''head of the Coalition Provisional Authority'' shall be deemed to be a reference to the Department of State or to the Secretary of State, respectively.

(e) COORDINATION WITH OTHER INSPECTORS GENERAL.—In carrying out the duties, responsibilities, and authorities of the Inspector General, the Inspector General shall coordinate with, and receive the cooperation of, the Inspector General of the Department of State, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, the Inspector General of the United States Agency for International Development, and any other Inspector General carrying out functions related to the provision of reconstruction assistance for Iraq with funds appropriated for ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund''.

(f) FUNDING.—Funds available pursuant to section 3001(n) of Public Law 108–106 shall be transferred to the Office and used for purposes of this section.

(g) The Office of Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction shall terminate on September 30, 2007.

OVERSIGHT OF IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION

SEC. 574. (a) Section 2207(a) of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense and for the Reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, 2004 (Public Law 108–106), is amended by striking ''The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Administrator of the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) and the Committees on Appropriations,'' and inserting ''The Secretary of State''.

(b) The allocation of any funds appropriated under the heading ''Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund'' in chapter 2 of title II of Public Law 108–106 for administrative expenses purposes pursuant to the authority contained in the seventh proviso under that heading, shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

INDONESIA

SEC. 575. Congress notes that the Indonesian Government and Armed Forces have pledged to cooperate with the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to its investigation into the August 31, 2002, murders of two American citizens and one Indonesian citizen in Timika, Indonesia. Therefore, funds appropriated under the heading ''International Military Education and Training'' may be made available for Indonesia if the Secretary of State determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that the Indonesian Government and Armed Forces are cooperating with the Federal Bureau of Investigation's investigation: *Provided*, That this restriction shall not apply to expanded international military education and training, which may include English language training.

This Act may be cited as the ''Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2005''.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

Pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

Amendments 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 14, and 21;

Amendments 11 and 17, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

Amendment 15, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

Amendments 9, 13, and 18, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding conference attendance;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding agricultural development in sub-Saharan Africa;

An amendment by Mr. SANDERS regarding Export-Import Bank loans, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. DEAL of Georgia regarding extradition, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. WEINER regarding Saudi Arabia, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. BUYER regarding monitoring of elections, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. OTTER regarding West Bank/Gaza;

An amendment by Mr. MENENDEZ regarding Latin American child survival and development assistance;

An amendment by Mr. SCHIFF regarding Armenian genocide;

An amendment by Ms. LEE regarding global AIDS, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Ms. DELAURO regarding child survival;

An amendment by Ms. WATERS regarding contract fraud; and

An amendment by Ms. MCCOLLUM regarding unexploded ordnance.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in the request, or a designee, or the Member who caused it to be printed in the RECORD, or a designee, shall be considered as read, 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.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in the request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

Are there any points of order to the portion of the bill which is open?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 565(a)(3) for the reason it violates rule XXI, clause 2, which prohibits legislative language in a general appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona concedes the point of order, and the point of order is sustained. This language is thereby stricken from the bill.

Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill?

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:

In title II, at the end of the item relating to ''CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND'', insert the following:

In addition to the amount provided in the preceding paragraph for a United States contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, $800,000,000 for such purpose, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That such amount is designated as an emergency requirement

pursuant to section 402 of S. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by H. Res. 649 (108th Congress).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved on the amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that today I rise, having just returned yesterday afternoon, from the 15th International AIDS Conference in Bangkok, Thailand, as the only Member of this body in attendance. This was the third International AIDS Conference which I have had the privilege to participate in: several years ago, Durban, South Africa; following that Barcelona, Spain; and now Bangkok, Thailand.

My experiences at these conferences, especially very recently in Bangkok, confirmed the vital need for this amendment, which designates $800 million in emergency funding for the Global Fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. Together with the $400 million which the base bill provides for the fund, my amendment would increase the total United States contribution to the fund to $1.2 billion this coming fiscal year.

Based on its projection of need, the fund estimates that it will require approximately $3.6 billion in fiscal year 2005. By bringing the total United States contribution to the fund to $1.2 billion, this amendment would provide one-third of that figure as laid out in the Global AIDS legislation. The funding will help treat an additional 2 million people for tuberculosis and an additional half million people for AIDS.

Having spent this week, well, the last few days, actually, among the international leaders on the global pandemic, and also with people living with the virus, I can tell my colleagues that the international community is quite disappointed, to put it mildly, about the United States' failure to deliver on promised funding to date; and this amendment would help restore what many see as really the lack of United States leadership and credibility on the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

This point was reinforced by Secretary of Health Tommy Thompson's decision to allow a delegation of only approximately 50 people to attend the World AIDS conference this year, down by 236 the year before in Barcelona. It is shameful, I believe, that this administration has prevented many of our best and our brightest scientists at the Centers for Disease Control and the National Institutes of Health from gaining new insights from their colleagues in the international community and from sharing the research they have conducted on this pandemic with their colleagues in the global community.

It is tragic that this administration's unilateralist and ideological tendencies have now spread, unfortunately, to the fight on HIV and AIDS. It is morally wrong to allow right-wing ideology to trump science when it comes to the administration's HIV/AIDS prevention policies. Their policies set aside 33 percent of all funding for abstinence only. That denies access to lifesaving technology, including condoms. Simply put, this is irresponsible, unethical, and inhumane. Emphasis should be science based, not ideological.

It is unethical, I believe, that the antiretroviral treatment policies are focused more on protecting patents and big pharmaceutical companies than on the urgent need to get fixed-dose combination into the hands of those who need them. Emphasis really should be put on saving lives.

And I think it is pretty disingenuous that the administration has proposed cutting our support for the Global Fund, given all these enormous problems that we have, to a measly contribution of about $200 million, rather than the $1.2 billion, which is desperately needed.

I must thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and our ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for their unwavering commitment to helping to increase this funding and actually doubling the funding for this Global Fund twice as much as what the initial bill provided for. But, Mr. Chairman, I think we must go further in providing the resources.

We have a battle before us to get this devastating and deadly pandemic under control. And why the fund? This fund is the best way to get the money out into the hands of the NGOs immediately. It is a multilateral approach. For example, $1 billion could leverage up to $9 billion to $10 billion from the private sector, from additional donor countries, and from foundations. We are the wealthiest country in the world. We should be leading the charge. This Global Fund is the best vehicle to show that type of cooperation to provide for the quick release of this money.

I met with too many people, Mr. Chairman, who are living and dying with this disease. For example, I participated in one meeting with women leaders. There were maybe 50 to 75 women in the room. Over half of them were living with the virus. One woman happened to share a story with us, and she indicated that she had recently gotten married. She did not know that her husband was HIV infected. Four months later, after her marriage, lo and behold she has the virus.

I could go on and on with stories about orphans and vulnerable children; stories about women who cannot negotiate abstention; stories about women who are subjected to violence; stories about women and children that need help in terms of antiretroviral treatment. The quickest way for us to address this pandemic is to get the money out, and to get it out quickly.

The fund is headed by Secretary Tommy Thompson. It is directed by Dr. Feachem, based in Geneva, Switzerland. They know what they are doing in terms of establishing the criteria, and they know how to get the money out quickly. I would say the bureaucracy is not as stringent as it is through the bilateral programs. So, quite naturally, the money can get to where the people are more quickly and in a way that is more effective.

So I would just ask for consideration of this very modest amendment. It is only $800 million more, and it will save millions and millions of lives.

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

□ 1345

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to make my point of order unless the gentlewoman wishes to speak further.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), ranking member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. I want to acknowledge her very stellar work and her commitment to addressing this pandemic in a very real way.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her important leadership on this issue. I know that she recently returned from the HIV/AIDS conference in Bangkok. I know that in this very busy place we never have adequate time to really listen and learn, but she has truly been a leader, and I hope that we all have the opportunity to share her experiences with her. I thank her.

Mr. Chairman, while the bill before us already contains $2.2 billion for HIV/AIDS programs, which is the requested level, it only contains $400 million for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria. The Global Fund has made clear to us that a $400 million U.S. contribution for fiscal year 2005 will endanger completion of multiyear grant agreements it has already signed and will totally shut down the Fund's ability to make new grants. The Fund has appealed to us for a total U.S. contribution of $1.2 billion this year, which is its estimate of the funds needed to meet anticipated demands for the next round of grant awards.

I want to point out that the committee has not been totally satisfied with the management performance of the Fund, and there are a number of reforms mandated in the bill to improve its performance. But, despite these concerns, the demand for increased funds for meeting the needs for HIV treatment, prevention, and awareness are vast and growing. One need only cite the daunting statistics of the most recent U.N. reports on the spread of HIV to understand the need for more funds. Based on this alone, I would support the gentlewoman's amendment.

I do, however, have another compelling reason to support the amendment,

and that is because I am convinced that the Global Fund is doing a better job at scaling up HIV treatment programs than our bilateral program currently is. As many of the Members know, the administration recently announced that the Food and Drug Administration would institute new policies that would dramatically speed up the process of approving generic drugs for HIV treatment. Unfortunately, this announcement was completely misleading.

As documented in a recent letter to HHS Secretary Thompson from our colleague from California (Mr. WAXMAN), ranking member on the House Committee on Government Reform, the administration's announcement in May that the FDA would be able to review these drugs in ''2 to 6 weeks'' raised the expectation of their imminent purchase and distribution. After close review, however, of FDA plans, it becomes clear that the expedited review starts only after companies have submitted a complete application to FDA. In order to have a complete application, these companies may have to repeat clinical studies, undergo a raw materials review, and submit to detailed inspections. The bottom line is that this presubmission process could add months, if not years, to the approval process.

The Bush administration has made treatment of those living with HIV its highest priority, stating that 200,000 people will be in treatment within 1 year and 2 million by 2007. As the cost for generic ''one pill combinations'' continues to decline to less than $150 per year, the United States is still purchasing brand-name drugs at four to five times that price. Without a viable regime in place to certify safe and effective generic drugs to treat HIV, our ability to meet the goals set out by the President will diminish. WHO has standards in place and in use today, but they are not currently recognized by the United States.

I believe that either the administration should implement a realistic plan for rapid approval of safe and effective combination therapies by expediting the FDA approval process, or we should participate in the WHO approval process.

I do not believe Congress should have to get involved in this issue. It is best left to medical experts to determine what is safe and effective in treating HIV. However, I also believe that the President should not mislead Congress and the American people. We should not continue indefinitely to purchase expensive brand-name drugs with no clear plan in place by the FDA to expedite its review of cheaper generics. Unfortunately, that is where we find ourselves today.

I intend, along with Chairman KOLBE, to follow up with Global AIDS Coordinator Tobias and Secretary Thompson. In the meantime, providing more funds to the Global Fund will speed progress toward reaching the treatment and prevention goals we all share.

I urge support of this amendment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) who has been sounding the alarm about this pandemic for many, many years. I thank him for his leadership.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lee amendment, and I want to talk about what this issue really means. The issue of whether or not we give the money for AIDS to the Global Fund or to the President's Millennium Account is a big decision. The Millennium Account is limited to 15 countries. The Global Fund deals the world over, including China, India and Russia, where the rates are going up at the fastest rates in the world.

So the question, first of all, is, do we want to reach the whole world or do we not? The President actually, unfortunately, I think, says good things but then in his allocations moves backward. He says he wants to reach the whole world but reduces the amount we are giving to the Global Fund.

Mr. Chairman, I include for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles, one on the 14th of July and one on the 15th of July, because these issues talk about a second problem. It is really related to this country's policies of using only brand-name drugs and making it difficult to use generics. The first thing is, they say, ''Well, they're not safe.'' One of these articles is about the Doctors Without Borders experiments. They have dealt with 12,000 patients worldwide. The multiple drug dose generic works. There is no question about it. So all this business about running all the drugs through the FDA to see if they work is simply a stall. There is no question about what they are doing.

Why is the stall there? If one company owns one drug and another company owns another drug, you can put them together in a pill and give the patient one pill, and it is a lot easier to monitor when a patient is taking one pill that has two or three components in it. But the problem of the patents get in the way of Pfizer and Merck getting together, or Ayerst or whatever company it is, they cannot work out how they can put their two drugs together in one. Who gets the money? Or what is the price?

The generics that the Indians and the Brazilians are making are much less expensive. We could get much more bang for our buck if we would use generics, because we would not only be getting less costly drugs but we would be able to get it down to single pills. If you care about this, you want to give the money to the Global Fund because they can use generics. They do not have to run it through the complicated process of the United States.

[From the New York Times, July 15, 2004]

FIXED-DOSE MIXTURES OF GENERIC AIDS DRUGS PROVE EFFECTIVE

(By Lawrence K. Altman)

BANGKOK, July 14.—The first large-scale study of AIDS patients receiving fixed-dose combinations of generic antiretroviral drugs in poor countries documented their effectiveness, scientists reported at the 15th International AIDS Conference here on Wednesday.

The combinations consist of three antiretroviral drugs formulated into one pill that is taken twice a day. The aim is to simplify therapy because experience has shown that the fewer the pills a patient needs to take, the better the compliance.

Doctors Without Borders, the group that carried out the study in 21 countries, bought the pills from two manufacturers in India, Cipla and Ranbaxy Laboratories Ltd.

Fixed-dose generic drug combinations have been controversial. Critics contend that they may be less effective than patented versions and not as safe.

This study expands on a much smaller study with similar results published in the Lancet early this month.

The findings from Doctors Without Borders should assure patients, donors, health workers, governments and others, said Dr. Alexandra Calmy, an AIDS adviser to Doctors Without Borders in Geneva.

When Doctors Without Borders began prescribing the fixed-dose combinations in 2002, ''we were convinced they would work or we would not have done it,'' said Dr. Calmy, who specializes in infectious diseases. ''It was common sense.''

But to make certain, her group undertook the study reported Wednesday.

''We found a very robust outcome, and the findings are important for the Global Fund and other groups that are recommending'' use of generic fixed dose combinations of antiretroviral drugs, Dr. Calmy said in an interview.

The combination that Doctors Without Borders uses for first-line therapy is the same one recommended by the World Health Organization, drugs known as stavudine, lamivudine, 3TC and nevirapine.

Of the 12,058 adults that Doctors Without Borders has treated with antiretroviral drugs in 21 countries in Africa, Central America and Asia since 2002, 6,861 received fixed-dose combinations. Since March, 80 percent of the group's new AIDS patients have received fixed-dose combinations.

Among the fixed-dose combination recipients, the probability of survival after one year was calculated as 82.4 percent, Dr. Calmy reported. About 60 percent of the deaths occurred in the first three months of therapy. The deaths occurred largely among patients who were so ill that they began the antiretroviral therapy too late to protect them from the infections that often kill patients as a complication of AIDS.

Among the 6,861 fixed-dose combination recipients, there was a significant increase in the number of immune cells, known as CD–4 cells, that are destroyed by H.I.V., the virus that causes AIDS. The CD–4 count rose by an average of 137 cells in a year, in about half the patients.

Because of logistical difficulties in treating patients in slums and rural areas in countries like Malawi with poor roads and transportation, Doctors Without Borders does not routinely monitor each patient with the tests that measure the amount of virus in the blood. Doctors in developed countries

routinely use such tests, known as viral loads, to determine the effectiveness of therapy.

However, a viral load test in a subset of patients showed that fixed-dose combinations failed in 12 percent of the 477 tested, which is comparable to findings in developed countries, Dr. Calmy said.

Among the 6,861 patients who had been on treatment for one year or longer, 51 had to switch to other drugs because they had suffered side effects to one or more of the drugs in the fixed-dose combination. For those who had taken a new regimen, the number of pills was 13 or more a day.

Nevirapine was the most common cause of the unwanted effects. Of the 51 who suffered reactions such as rashes and liver damage, 23 changed to other regimens. An additional nine patients switched to other drugs because they suffered nerve damage and disfiguring accumulations of fat on the neck, back and abdomen.

The frequency of adverse reactions was comparable to that observed among recipients of patented drugs in developed countries, Dr. Calmy said.

In a separate part of the study conducted in Malawi, Dr. Arno Jeannin's Doctors Without Borders team randomly tested the amount of H.I.V. in the blood of 477 patients who had received fixed-dose combinations there for six months or longer. Of these, H.I.V. could not be detected in 85 percent, showing the overall effectiveness of the fixed-dose combinations.

The annual cost of the fixed-dose combinations was $389 or less.

[From the New York Times, July 14, 2004]

EARLY TESTS FOR U.S. IN ITS GLOBAL FIGHT ON AIDS

(By Deborah Sontag)

The Bush administration did not consult with Mozambique last year before designating the country as a beneficiary of its emergency AIDS plan. Mozambique was simply informed that it would be one of 12 African nations, and 15 countries overall, awarded substantial financial assistance.

The pledge of big money was certainly welcome, said Francisco, Songane, the Mozambican health minister; AIDS has lowered life expectancy in Mozambique to 38. But the approach, perceived by many Mozambicans as arrogant and neocolonial, was not.

Mozambique, in southeastern Africa, had spent considerable time developing a national strategy to combat its high rate of H.I.V. infection. Other international donors had agreed to pool their contributions and let the Mozambicans control their own health programs. Thus, Mozambican officials recoiled when the Americans said earlier this year, ''We want to move quickly, and we know that your government doesn't have the capacity,'' Mr. Songane said.

The Bush administration wanted the bulk of its funding to go toward more costly brand-name antiretroviral drugs for treatment programs run by nongovernmental organizations. But Mozambique had already decided to treat its people with 3-in-1 generic pills, which were cheaper and simpler to take. Also, Mozambique did not want an American program dependent on costly foreign consultants, N.G.O.'s and the largesse of foreign political leaders, that would run parallel to its own.

There were confrontational meetings in Washington and in Maputo, the capital of Mozambique. And in the end, to the surprise of many, the Bush administration agreed to give Mozambique the kind of help it really wanted, by strengthening its laboratories, blood-transfusion centers and the Health Ministry itself—albeit indirectly, through a grant to Columbia University.

''What I witnessed in Mozambique was a disaster averted,'' said Dr. Steven Gloyd, an international health specialist at the University of Washington who works with Mozambique. ''So, for countries like Mozambique, this may turn out to be a positive intervention, even though it could be a lot more.''

Seventeen months after President Bush announced his five-year, $15 billion emergency AIDS initiative, the program is belatedly getting under way, and surprising some critics of what is seen as its go-it-alone approach. In some cases, the plan is proving to be more adaptive and collaborative than had been expected, especially when countries are strong enough to stand their ground.

The plan is already directing considerable money into health clinics, laboratories, testing centers and hospices, AIDS treatment, prevention of H.I.V. and care of orphans.

For every Mozambique, however, where Washington has altered its plans to meet local objections, there is a Zambia, where local officials are in the dark. The Zambian health minister, Brian Chituwo, said his government did not have a formal meeting on the program with the American ambassador until May, 15 months after Zambia's role was announced. Further, he said, on everything but blood-transfusion services, which were negotiated, the Americans' plans for Zambia have ''all come from Washington.'' The American plan, one senior United Nations official said, ''has created turbulence wherever it has gone.'' But another, Michel Sidibe, praised the Americans for making a ''major shift'' in May by signing ''a declaration of harmonization'' in which they pledged to coordinate their anti-AIDS activities with other donors.

The president's program, a centerpiece of his compassionate conservativism, has been a prime topic of conversation at the International AIDS Conference in Bangkok—and a magnet for some protests. On Tuesday, President Jacques Chirac of France accused the United States of blackmailing developing countries into bartering their right to produce generic H.I.V. drugs for free-trade agreements. American officials dismissed the charge as groundless.

After decades when the pandemic in Africa spread unchecked, billions in anti-AIDS money is suddenly pledged to assist the continent, and questions about how to channel that outpouring have taken center stage. The administration's AIDS effort is under sharp scrutiny because it is so big, so unabashedly Washington—dominated and tinged by the administration's political ideology.

Many critics see big pharmaceutical companies behind the Bush administration's preference for costlier brand-name drugs, conservative Christians behind its heavy promotion of abstinence, and hard-line unilateralists behind its decision to bypass the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria in creating its own plan.

Randall L. Tobias, a former chief executive of the Eli Lilly & Company drug group and a Republican donor who became the administration's global AIDS coordinator last October, lamented the politicized environment and suggested that critics refocus their antagonism. ''The enemy here ought to be apathy, denial and stigma,'' he said. ''I don't know why people spend so much time fighting each other.''

Still, the administration's refusal thus far to use its money to buy generics is complicating the roll-out of its own emergency plan. Like the Mozambicans, other African officials have resisted the distribution of brand name drugs as first-line therapy. As a result, in a half a dozen or more of the focus countries, the governments themselves or other donors are picking up most of the cost of life-saving drugs.

The goal set by President Bush in January 2003 was to treat two million people in five years. Under the plan, an estimated 6,000 to 10,000 people have started on antiretroviral drugs so far, according to a Congressional appropriations expert. The global AIDS office could not give a figure. In the slums of Lusaka, Zambia, American money was put to use quickly this spring renovating four clinics and training workers to distribute drugs. American doctors worked in concert with a local health official to salvage a stockpile of government AIDS drugs that were about to expire.

In late April, they started handing out drugs that ward off death for some very ill people, and within two months, they had 700 patients on antiretroviral therapy.

''There was a patient whose family had sadly sent her off to a hospice'' to die, said Jeffrey Stringer, a doctor from the University of Alabama who is running the program. Recently, a health worker escorted the patient back home.'' And there was a woman who couldn't crawl who has now gained weight and is walking around.''

Dr. Stringer, who is working in collaboration with the Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation in Los Angeles, noted that he had not voted for President Bush. But he had to admit, he said, ''They ponied up.''

Other American experts are more skeptical.

''Sure, off the bat, you can put 5,000'' on antiretroviral drugs, said Josh Ruxin, an assistant clinical professor of public health at Columbia and a consultant to Rwanda and Nigeria. ''They're easy to ID, they're terribly sick, they need drugs now, they live in cities, they have cell phones. So that's the low-hanging fruit. But then what happens? You quickly reach a point where you can't treat more people unless you develop the national health systems, and that is not something I've heard the American government commit to in a big way.''

FOR BUSH, A 'WORK OF MERCY'

Mr. Bush presented the President's Emergency Fund for AIDS Relief in his 2003 State of the Union address, which also began the countdown to the war in Iraq. He called it a ''work of mercy,'' offering the soft power of American humanitarianism to counterbalance the imminent use of military force.

''As our nation moves troops and builds alliances to make our world safer, we must also remember our calling as a blessed country to make this world better,'' he said.

Mr. Bush declared a five-year goal of getting 2 million into treatment, preventing 7 million infections and providing care to 10 million infected people and AIDS orphans in what he called the most afflicted countries in Africa and the Caribbean.

The 14 focus countries named were: Botswana, Ethiopia, Guyana, Haiti, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda and Zambia. Vietnam was added last month at Congress's insistence that there be another nation from a different region.

The sheer ambition of the proposal stunned advocates for huge increases in global AIDS funding into applause. Jeffrey Sachs, the Columbia University economist, called the president's commitment ''historic'' and a ''breakthrough.''

But at a time when American power was being imposed and questioned in the military arena, the AIDS plan struck some as another kind of unilateralism. They feared that Mr. Bush's program would undermine the multilateral Global Fund, which assists eight times as many countries, including

India, China and Russia, whose infection rates are rising rapidly. And these experts thought it was retrogressive in its reliance on American universities, faith-based organizations and nongovernmental organizations, whose ability to pay higher salaries could drain workers from local public health systems that should be reinforced instead.

Dr. Paul Zeitz, executive director of the Global AIDS Alliance, said advocates were baffled. ''We thought the international community had come to a consensus that there needed to be a new way of doing business where we all worked together and helped strengthen national capacities,'' he said.

When he took office, Mr. Bush had inherited a kind of global momentum toward an international AIDS fund, and a drumbeat for action was building at home, too. Senators Bill Frist and John Kerry formed a bipartisan team to fight for greater American involvement. The Rev. Franklin Graham, who delivered the invocation at Mr. Bush's inauguration, was catalyzing the evangelical community to get over its aversion to the disease and confront it as part of its mission.

The push for an international fund was led by, among others, Mr. Sachs and Secretary General Kofi Annan at the United Nations. But the Bush administration was a major force in shaping the Global Fund as an independent, multilateral, public-private partnership, and not a World Bank or United Nations program.

The Global Fund's approach was conceived as a reaction against years of inefficient and often ineffective foreign development programs. The idea was to funnel aid from multiple donors to the affected countries and let them run their own health programs, thereby eliminating waste, duplication and burdensome demands on patients.

Yet it took a couple of years for the Global Fund, which is based in Geneva, to persuade countries to develop plans that could be financed, and to get the money flowing from government coffers into health care. The Bush administration was impatient, and concerned that other countries were not contributing their share. The Global Fund did not seem the ideal repository for the billions it wanted to pour into the pandemic.

After the 2003 State of the Union address, Richard Feacham, executive director of the Global Fund, said: ''There was to some degree a mood in Washington of dichotomy'' between the president's plan and the Global Fund. ''People felt the need to make a choice and see a rivalry. We worked extremely hard to convey the message that the world needs both. You can't stop the pandemic in 15 countries. The Global Fund is in 130. We also focus on TB and malaria, the greatest killer of African children.''

Right after the State of the Union address, Tommy G. Thompson, the secretary of health and human services, became the new chairman of the Global Fund, which made some European donors fear an American takeover. But Mr. Bush has instead moved to pull back. In his budget request for 2004, he sought to reduce America's contribution. And in his 2005 request, he is asking for a 60 percent cut in the contribution.

Congress, however, refused the Global Fund's allocation for 2004, instead nearly tripling the administration's request. It also increased the global financing to $2.4 billion, of which $1.9 billion goes for H.I.V./AIDS (and the rest for tuberculosis and malaria). Several members of Congress complained that $2.4 billion was not a lot of money for a global health emergency, especially compared with more than $100 billion spent on military operations in Iraq.

The global AIDS coordinator's office, in fact, had only $488 million in new money this year. It also used old money in new ways, though, By the end of the 2004 budget year, it will have committed—but not yet spent—$865 million, one-fifth of which is committed to faith-based groups. Some $253 million will go toward treatment programs, but the drug issue has made spending that money more difficult than expected.

GENERIC DRUGS VS. BRAND NAMES

''We are using generics here because they are cheaper,'' Mr. Songane of Mozambique said. ''And apart from being cheaper, they are prepared in a manner which is simple for our patients, and even simpler for our staff.''

Like Mozambique, many countries prefer generics because they can be used to treat more people and because, given patent problems, only generics now come in fixed-dose combinations, which combine three drugs in one tablet, improving adherence to pill-taking schedules.

Foreign-made 3-in-1 pills have been approved by the World Health Organization and purchased in bulk by the Global Fund and many developing countries. But the Bush administration is insisting on brand-name antiretroviral drugs because the generics have not been reviewed by the Food and Drug Administration. The F.D.A., Mr. Tobias said, is the most stringent regulatory authority in the world and should make the determination whether drugs for an American overseas program are safe and effective, and of the highest quality.

Mr. Tobias noted that the World Health Organization recently withdrew two generic antiretroviral drugs made by Cipla of India from its list of approved treatments. (Its fixed dose tablets remain on the list.) This, he suggested, cast doubt on the W.H.O.'s screening procedures.

Cipla has said that the problem lay not with the product but with a contract research laboratory that it no longer uses. Tests are being repeated in different labs, and the company says it is confident that the drugs will be back on the approved list soon.

Further, earlier this month, researchers who studied Cipla's Triomune reported in the Lancet medical journal, that fixed-dose generic AIDS drugs work as well as brand-name drugs, according to the first clinical trial. Triomune costs as little as $140 a year per patient, compared with about $562 for the brand-name versions in the 3-in-1 pill.

In early spring, the Americans discovered that resistance to their rule on brand-name drugs was coming even from the American organizations who were getting multicountry, multiyear grants to set up treatment programs. The American organizations, which are expected to receive more than $600 million over five years, are the Harvard School of Public Health; the Glaser foundation; the Joseph L. Mailman School of Public Health at Columbia University; and a faith-based consortium led by Catholic Relief Services.

Some expressed their preferences for generics outright. Barry R. Bloom, the dean of public health at Harvard, said, ''The Indian pills are terrific—you take just two a day.'' Allan Rosenfield, dean at Mailman, issued a statement urging the Bush administration to allow American money to purchase generics.

At an American-initiated conference in Botswana in late March, Jacqueline Patterson, who manages the program for a Protestant medical association that is part of the Catholic Relief Services' consortium, declared that most mission hospitals and clinics in Africa and the Caribbean were already using fixed-dose combinations and wanted to continue. She read comments from the field that voiced a collective anxiety about the imposition of brand-name drugs, resulting in fewer people in treatment and more skipping doses and sharing pills.

With countries like Mozambique, Namibia and Rwanda holding fast to their positions that generics would be their first-line drugs, American officials realized that their assistance in those places would be limited. They would be able to provide medicine for children, for whom only brand-name drugs are available, and for those adults, say, who had developed a resistance to the generics. But essentially, they would be providing technical support for the drug treatment program rather than the drugs themselves.

In May, the Bush administration announced that it would set up a new expedited review for generic antiretrovirals, including the 3-in-1 pills. If approved, the drugs would be eligible for use in the AIDS plan, it said.

An executive at an American foundation engaged in global AIDS work said it remained to be seen whether ''the F.D.A. process is real, a stalling tactic, or ultimately a tool for the R-and-D companies.'' But, he said, his foundation was encouraging foreign drug companies to submit dossiers to the agency.

So far, no foreign drug companies have applied for the expedited review. William F. Haddad, an American representative for Cipla, said the Indian company was left with unanswered questions about the accelerated approval process. ''When they come back to us with answers, Cipla will make up its mind about whether to apply,'' he said. ''But the bottom line is that this is a political act, not a scientific one. Why is the World Health Organization's stamp of approval O.K. for the World Bank and the Global Fund and not for the U.S.?''

ABSTINENCE VS. CONDOMS

With its focus on treatment, Mr. Bush's plan is profoundly changing a two-decades-long emphasis on H.I.V. prevention as the American strategy abroad. The prevention efforts are continuing but, on Congress's mandate, they are being given a new emphasis on abstinence, with $86 million devoted this year to promoting abstinence.

World Relief International, the humanitarian arm of the National Association of Evangelicals, is to receive $9.6 million over five years to promote abstinence. Deborah Dortzbach, international director for its H.I.V./AIDS programs, said World Relief would use a network of churches, schools and ''Choose Life'' clubs in Haiti, Kenya, Rwanda and Mozambique.

''We teach abstinence as an opportunity,'' she said, ''as a way to delay the gift of sexuality and its pleasures until they can experience it with responsibility.''

A guide for World Relief instructors includes a detailed chapter on condom use and how to negotiate the use of a condom with a reluctant partner. Ms. Dortzbach acknowledged, however, that many pastors were reluctant to discuss condoms at all with youths and needed some persuasion to mention them during marriage counseling.

Any discussion of condoms, Ms. Dortzbach said, emphasized that condoms were not perfectly safe and that ''the only guarantee for protection is abstinence,'' which is the Bush administration's message.

That message is predicated on the success of the A B C model in Uganda, which stands for Abstain, Be Faithful, Condomize. Critics say, however, that the Americans are paying too little attention to ''C.''

The American government is probably buying more condoms now than at any time in its history, Mr. Tobias said, but Congress did not want a broad distribution of condoms to be the primary prevention tool, as it has been historically. In Africa, too, some experts question the efficacy of condoms, given

that infection rates continue to climb as many men refuse to use them.

The Bush administration's strategy does suggest condoms for ''high risk'' individuals like prostitutes, soldiers, drug users and ''serodiscordant'' couples. But critics say everybody in a sub-Saharan country with a sky-high infection rate is high risk.

''In their approach, they ignore the basic reality that a large share of unmarried adolescents are already sexually active and so at high risk,'' said Jodi L. Jacobson, executive director of the Center for Health and Gender Equity in Maryland. ''They also ignore the fact that marriage doesn't protect married teens and women from H.I.V., and that sexual violence and coercion are facts of life.''

THE LONGER TERM

In Maputo, health officials said that they were struck by the Americans' obsession with numeric goals.

''To see an increase in numbers of people on antiretrovirals, that was their only concern,'' said Mr. Songane, the health minister. ''But this is a complex disease. We can not judge the success of our fight just by the numbers of people on treatment.''

The Mozambicans wanted to move gradually and to strengthen their health sector at the same time. They did not want to neglect other health issues, like malaria, childhood diseases and maternal health. They did not want to use nongovernmental organizations where the Americans would pay the salaries, buy the drugs and purchase the vehicles that would travel to the villages to distribute the drugs.

''In one year, two years' time, who is going to follow those people?'' he asked. ''When the N.G.O. is gone, who is going to take over?''

Dr. Paul Farmer, an American renowned for his treatment programs in rural Haiti, said international projects intending to help poor countries should pay heed, as Mozambique does, to the need to integrate AIDS treatment with overall health care.

''When you're in a clinic in rural Haiti and someone comes in with a broken arm or in obstructed labor, you can't say, 'Sorry, we only do AIDS prevention and care,'" said Dr. Farmer, a Harvard professor. ''The massive loss of life due to H.I.V. disease is only one symptom of a very sick world in which hundreds of millions are going without any modern medical care at all. Addressing AIDS properly offers a chance to set some of this right.''

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment; and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I count myself among the Fund's strongest supporters. Last year, I worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to increase the U.S. contributions to the Fund from the President's request of $200 million to $550 million.

Not including funds in the bill under discussion, the United States has made available nearly $1.2 billion of the Fund's $3.4 billion in pledges and contributions through 2004.

However, this is a global disease, and we must have the commitment of many partners to fight it. That's why Congress requires that other donors match the U.S. funds, at a 2:1 ratio. Unfortunately, other countries have not contributed enough this year for the entire U.S. contribution to be released—we have nearly $190 million waiting for other donors to step up to the plate. The Committee took this fact into account in making its recommendation.

I must note that it is more than unfortunate that some in the AIDS community continue to scold the United States for not giving more to the Global Fund. Their time would be better spent encouraging other donors to contribute and to improving the Fund's operations.

Of the more than $3 billion that the Fund has approved in grants, only $428 million has even made it out of the Global Fund's account. That means nearly $2.6 billion in committed funding is simply sitting in the Global Fund's account.

The Committee has recommended provisions in this year's bill to help the Fund improve its disbursements. I can only ask that others begin to take a hard look at the Fund's operations, rather than blindly call for more money, more money. We need the Fund around for the long-term, and improving its operations is the only way to maintain public confidence in it.

If other countries step up to the plate, and provide sufficient contributions to allow more from the U.S. than Congress appropriates, and if the Fund improves its operations, then we will take these developments into account for future years.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Lee amendment to add $800 million to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

The HIV/AIDS epidemic is having a devastating impact on Africa and the world. Over 60 million people have been infected by the AIDS virus since the beginning of the epidemic, and 42 million people are currently living with this dreadful disease. Approximately three million people died of AIDS last year, and another five million people became infected with HIV.

The HIV/AIDS epidemic has already curtailed the economic development of many countries in Africa. AIDS is responsible for shortages of skilled workers and teachers, high rates of absenteeism and labor turnover, and the deaths of workers and managers throughout business and government. Teachers and other skilled workers can be very difficult to replace. Tragically, in some parts of Africa, employers even find it necessary to hire two workers for every job opening, because they expect one of them to die of AIDS.

On May 1, 2003, the House passed H.R. 1298, ''the Global AIDS Bill,'' which authorizes appropriations of $3 billion per year over five years for global HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention efforts. This bill, which is critically needed and long overdue, was signed into law by the President on May 27 of last year. However, it has never been fully funded.

According to UNAIDS, HIV/AIDS has spread rapidly in Eastern Europe, and gained a strong foothold in India and China over the past year. Fortunately, there has been progress, as infection rates actually fell last year in a few hard-hit areas of Africa. Without adequate funding, however, our progress will be short-lived.

I urge my colleagues to support the Lee amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on 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.'' The amendment includes an emergency designation under section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and as such constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes an emergency designation. The amendment, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. LANTOS:

Page 18, line 22, after ''$2,450,000,000'', insert the following: ''(increased by $325,000,000)''.

Page 19, line 3, after ''$535,000,000'', insert the following: ''(increased by $325,000,000)''.

Page 19, line 8, after ''fiscal years:'', insert the following: ''*Provided further,* That of the amounts that are made available under the previous proviso for Egypt, $325,000,000 shall not be obligated until after September 1, 2005:''.

Page 42, line 13, after ''$4,777,500,000'', insert the following: ''(reduced by $325,000,000)''.

Page 42, line 16, after ''$1,300,000,000'', insert the following: ''(reduced by $325,000,000)''.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida wish to make a point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I do.

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.'' The amendment includes a legislative prohibition on the obligation of funds.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I request to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is sponsored by a distinguished list of Republicans and Democrats. It does not change by one penny the amount of aid that Egypt will receive. It merely shifts the ratio from military to economic aid, which is clearly in the interest of the Egyptian people since Egypt faces no military threat but its economic conditions are dire. The amendment does not alter the appropriations for Egypt.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this amendment includes language imparting direction regarding the obligation of funds. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. LANTOS:

Page 18, line 22, after ''$2,450,000,000'', insert the following: ''(increased by $570,000,000)''.

Page 19, line 3, after ''$535,000,000'', insert the following: ''(increased by $570,000,000)''.

Page 42, line 13, after ''$4,777,500,000'', insert the following: ''(reduced by $570,000,000)''.

Page 42, line 16, after ''$1,300,000,000'', insert the following: ''(reduced by $570,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is a very simple amendment. It shifts $325 million from Egypt's economic aid that we provide and increases Egypt's economic aid that we provide by that exact amount.

The logic of the amendment is clear. Egypt is facing no military threat. Few states on the face of this planet inhabit a strategic environment more secure than Egypt. Egypt shares land borders with three states, and it is at peace with all of them. Recently, Egypt's security environment has improved dramatically as Libya divested itself of its weapons of mass destruction.

Despite this enviable security environment, Egypt has embarked on a major military buildup of a sort one would expect from a nation under dire and imminent threat. This buildup is not only puzzling but, in my view, it is a policy choice with seriously damaging implications for Egyptian society. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the civilian leaders of Egyptian society are welcoming my amendment because this would enable them to deal with the dire economic conditions of that country in the field of education, health and other areas.

Per capita income in Egypt is less than $1,000. The majority of women over 15 are illiterate. Yet we are pouring our aid money into cutting-edge military equipment rather than into desperately needed economic and social programs. What do we get for this lavish support of the Egyptian military, over $30 billion in recent years? When we needed Egypt's support, the powerful Egyptian military on the whole has been AWOL. Just imagine how politically and militarily useful would have been Egyptian police presence in Afghanistan. It still would be. The Egyptian government said, ''Sorry, it's not our fight.''

□ 1400

And that is on its best days when it is not viciously criticizing our policies. If Egypt is not going to support us militarily, we can nevertheless serve the interests of the Egyptian people and our own national interest by supporting health, education, and economic development programs that contribute to the stability of Egypt. We can do this by correcting our own mistaken priorities in Egyptian foreign aid. That is exactly what we intend to do.

The amendment which the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR) and others support, would transfer the funds from military to economic assistance. This clearly is in the interests of the Egyptian people, and it is in the long-term interests of diminishing the military confrontation in the Middle East. Our amendment would not force the cancellation of any existing military contracts, contrary to a phony letter designed by the Department of State and distributed in this body.

One would have thought that the Department of State would learn the difference between fiction and fact because the Department of State sent out the Secretary of State to the United Nations on a globally televised program where he peddled fiction and was presenting it as fact. We do not want the Department of State to be equally embarrassed again by peddling fiction instead of dealing with facts.

The framework of the Egyptian-Israeli peace process is now 25 years old. We should no longer have to pay the Egyptian military political protection money to keep it in place. The biggest threat to Egyptian stability is its bloated military budget, which undermines economic and educational development and democratization. In fact, if we enhance our support for economic and social projects in Egypt, our credibility with the Egyptian people will soar.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this reasonable, logical amendment, which is in the interests of the Egyptian people, which is in the interests of strengthening the forces of peace in the Middle East, and which clearly is in our own national interests.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), distinguished ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, those who know me in this House know that I have a vast preference in almost all instances for economic assistance rather than military assistance, not just in the Middle East but in virtually every other area of the world. I think that for years we have been unbalanced in terms of military assistance as a policy weapon instead of trying to deal with more basic long-term economic and structural problems within recipient societies.

But I happen to believe that in this instance it would be counterproductive to pass the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from California. I greatly respect his knowledge in the area. I respect his passion. I respect his guts. But I think that at a time when we have been questioning unilateral practices on behalf of the White House, this would be a peculiarly strange time for me on this side of the aisle to practice some unilateralism myself, and I think that is what this amendment does.

Secondly, I would point out that it is in Israel's interest, as our most reliable ally in the region, it is in Israel's best interest for us to maintain the best possible relationships with our friends in the Arab world that we can possibly retain. And I would point out that right now we need Egypt to deal with the pending withdrawal from Gaza on the part of the Israelis. We need Egypt's help in training police so that we can see real security provided in that region and help protect Israel itself against attack.

And I also think that we do not at this point want to weaken Mr. Mubarak with his military because I think that civilian control of the military in that country is tenuous at best; and even though Mr. Mubarak is out of the military, it is in our interest for a decent and healthy and strong relationship between Mr. Mubarak and the Egyptian military to continue to exist.

I would urge Members to recognize that right now American influence in the Arab world is at an all-time low. Much exploitation has occurred against America's interests, much exploitation of Arab public opinion has occurred because of the activities in Iraq. Regardless of how we feel about that, we have to admit that that is the case with respect to Arab public opinion.

I think it would be a disastrous development for the Congress to take a unilateral action which would undercut the administration's ability to work with what moderate forces are left in

the Arab world, and I would strongly urge that we oppose this amendment.

I recognize the emotional force that lies behind the amendment; but sometimes we have to think with our heads, not with our spleens. This is certainly one of those occasions, and I would urge rejection of the amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR).

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Arizona for bringing this bill forward. And I rise in support of the amendment by the gentleman from California.

As he has stated, Egypt has embarked on a major military buildup of a sort one would expect from a nation under dire and imminent threat. Last year, the Egyptian Navy created 11 new battle units. At a time of 30 percent illiteracy and a per capita income of less than $1,000, Egypt is pouring its money into cutting-edge military equipment rather than schools, hospitals, and economic development.

The United States has a vital stake in Egypt's stability and prosperity, and the U.S. can best serve that goal and the strengthening of the relationship with Egypt by supporting educational and economic development, as well as political freedom, that contributes most effectively to Egyptian stability.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE), the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), and others will not, as the gentleman from Wisconsin suggests, preclude Egypt's ability to help the United States in brokering the pull-out from Gaza which Israel has embarked upon. It will not weaken Mr. Mubarak in the eyes of his military. My goodness, as the gentleman from California has stated, we have given Egypt $30 billion over the last 20 years. This will not preclude our ability to work with Egypt, a moderate Arab ally.

Instead, Mr. Chairman, this amendment supports the Egyptian people and the U.S. interests by transforming approximately 25 percent from the Egyptian military, changing that into economic assistance that will improve the quality of life of the Egyptian people and contribute to the overall prospects for peace in the Middle East.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment. For the last several years I have joined many of my colleagues, including this amendment's sponsor, in expressing concern about the composition of the United States aid package to Egypt. Why at a time when Egypt has no major enemies should we be providing over $1 billion each year in military assistance? Why, when economic conditions in Egypt are so dire, should we be maintaining such a high level of military aid even as economic assistance levels drop?

I share the concerns many of my colleagues have expressed about Egypt's record. Egypt's media is rife with anti-Israel and anti-Semitic images and language, including constant comparisons between Israel and the Nazis in television shows that perpetuate anti-Semitism. Egyptian officials have called Israel a ''terrorist organization'' by taking self-defensive actions against terrorists in the West Bank and Gaza. Egypt's move towards political reform has been slow and bumpy, with little support from that country's top leaders for adopting measures to make Egyptian society more democratic and inclusive.

As for Egypt's record on security and peace process issues, I have other serious concerns. The Egyptians have dragged their feet in stemming the flow of smuggled weapons through tunnels under the Egypt-Gaza border. The Egyptian leadership has not historically been helpful in pressing the Palestinians to comply with agreements they have already made and to negotiate with Israel on matters of grave importance to regional stability and security. Egypt has failed to return its ambassador to Israel since it recalled him nearly 4 years ago.

All these examples point to one conclusion: Egypt has not acted the way we should expect one of the largest recipients of United States foreign aid to act. Its policies have at times been in outright opposition to the best interests of United States national security. For these reasons, I agree with the message of the gentleman's amendment.

However, as much as I agree with my good friend's message, I am troubled by the timing. In the wake of Israeli Prime Minister Sharon's decision to pursue a unilateral Israel withdrawal from Gaza, which I strongly support, Egypt has signaled a new readiness to play a constructive role in making the region secure. Egyptian intelligence chief Omar Suleiman has become the point man in discussions with the Palestinians, delivering the message of the United States and the Quartet that the Palestinians must consolidate and reform their security forces and empower their prime minister rather than Chairman Arafat.

Egypt is taking actions right now that are supportive of what Israel has determined is in its best security interests. So at a time when Egypt is preparing to take on the Herculean task of consolidating and training the Palestinian security services, a task that will require steely resolve and sustained pressure on Arafat to achieve, I am concerned about the unintended consequences this amendment may have.

In a July 2 op-ed in The Washington Post, former Middle East envoy Dennis Ross, who has served both administrations and is probably one of the foremost experts in this region of the world, warned that the Egyptians are unlikely to succeed at the long list of goals they have, goals shared by both the United States and Israel without active United States support. I agree with Ambassador Ross, and I believe that this amendment could have the effect of chilling these efforts at a time when they could be most helpful for bolstering security in the region.

□ 1415

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank my good friend for eloquently and powerfully making the case for my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am now pleased to yield 2 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to be clear about what this amendment does not do. It does not cut the overall level of assistance to Egypt but merely redirects a portion of our military assistance to economic assistance.

For many years we went in the opposite direction. We decreased our economic assistance to Egypt, while our military aid has remained the same. At the same time, I have wondered why Egypt needs all of these advanced weapons from us. Who are they arming themselves against? Finland?

I have met repeatedly with senior Egyptian military leaders and posed this question to them. The answer I get is that they need capabilities to respond to the ''unknown threat.'' But someone, somewhere, must have an idea of what that threat is. Otherwise, how do you know what equipment to buy or what capabilities you need?

I recognize that Egypt has admirably provided the United States with overflight rights and swift transit through the Suez Canal. I also recognize that a certain level of interoperability between the United States and Egyptian forces is necessary in order for them to participate in future peacekeeping missions. Therefore, some level of military assistance is necessary to maintain that interoperability.

But I believe what Egypt needs now is not a larger, more powerful military, but a stronger, more prosperous economy. Decreasing our economic assistance while military assistance remains the same does neither Egypt nor us any favors.

Egypt faces significant economic challenges. Real wages stagnate, there is a growing debt burden, unemployment is far in excess of official estimates. All of this requires us to redouble our efforts to encourage economic reform in Egypt. Egypt's current economic growth rate is insufficient to absorb the 600,000 to 800,000 new entrants into the job market each year.

What is needed is more and faster reform, but the insistence of the government of Egypt on going slow on economic reform and has continued to discourage foreign direct and indirect investment, a key input if the Egyptian economy is to grow at a rate that will actually lower unemployment.

Shifting the emphasis of our aid to Egypt will also assist in supporting political reform there. Egypt has recently been saying all of the right things about political reform, although not much seems to be happening of late. The energy and enthusiasm for reform that emerged after Egypt's National Democratic Party's conference last year seems to have dissipated with opposition parties charging that the NDP has not consulted with them on the next steps in the reform process as promised.

Mr. Chairman, Egypt is an important partner to us in the pursuit of peace in the Middle East and Egypt has in the past taken courageous steps to pursue that peace. For that reason, I support the amendment and urge our colleagues to do so as well.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time.

I want to say to the author of this amendment that I understand his interest and I think it is a good-faith effort, but I just cannot agree with it.

I think the gentleman would agree, that one of the only stabilizing factors in the very unstable Middle East is the relationship that the United States has, on behalf of Israel, with President Mubarak and the nation of Egypt. Any change to the Egyptian military assistance account, I believe, would seriously undermine that strong U.S.-Egypt partnership that started in 1979 at the Camp David Accords and continues to be one of the foundations for achieving our own foreign policy goals in the Middle East.

Members know that U.S. military aid to Egypt is a cornerstone of the Camp David Accords. The Administration is opposed to an amendment that would modify our commitment to the parties as contained in that agreement. This commitment is the foundation of our efforts to promote peace in the region, to combat terrorism, and to advance interoperability with the Egyptian military.

In addition, this reduction in military assistance could lead to the cancellation of approximately $2.2 billion in total contract value. These contracts all go towards the purchase of United States products.

Our military assistance to Egypt has contributed to regional stability in an area that had previously been the scene of military conflict against Israel. This calming of tensions has enabled us to develop a strategic partnership with Egypt that has contributed to a broad range of U.S. objectives in the region, including the global War on Terrorism, the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq, and, more recently, the efforts to stop the humanitarian crisis in the Sudan.

Egypt has also taken a critical initiative to work with Israel to support the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip through the reorganization and training of the Palestinian security services.

On a bilateral military-to-military level, our assistance has helped to modernize the Egyptian military, thereby creating a defensive force that is interoperable with and capable of supporting, U.S. security goals in the region. We also continue to train Egyptian military officers through the IMET Program and to conduct joint exercises, thereby ensuring that our militaries both understand and support each other at critical moments.

This Egyptian capacity has enabled the Egyptian military to participate in international peacekeeping operations, to help us successfully prosecute Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, to enable our craft to safely transit the Suez Canal, to enable our planes to traverse Egyptian air space, and to provide our tankers with invaluable accession to Egyptian facilities.

This amendment would undermine this relationship, and I would hope that the Members would join the bipartisan leadership of the Committee on Appropriations in opposing this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that, if my amendment is approved, Egypt will still receive vast military assistance from the United States. At the present time, the bulk of our aid is military aid, and my amendment merely shifts the balance a bit.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend, the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the Chair of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and Central Asia of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lantos amendment. It is with sadness and great concern that I rise today to propose a shift in military aid to Egypt. I am saddened that Egyptian society is suffering from illiteracy, decreasing per capita income, and is clamoring for the right to exert their fundamental freedoms and civil liberties, while the Egyptian government has embarked on a significant military buildup of the sort one would expect from a nation under imminent threat.

Yet, as all of us know, Egypt currently occupies a secure, strategic environment, further improved by Libya's decision to verifiably disarm and dismantle its chemical, biological and nuclear missile programs.

Egypt's military aid is particularly daunting when considered within the context of the $1.3 billion in annual military aid that the U.S. provides to Egypt, in essence making us in this Chamber enablers of this increase in Egyptian battle units, Harpoon missiles and fast-attack aircraft.

This cannot and must not continue.

You will hear that the administration has concerns about this amendment. However, the amendment that I have cosponsored on a bipartisan basis is in keeping with President Bush's priorities to bring freedom, democracy and economic liberalization to the Middle East.

This amendment merely shifts funds from military aid to economic assistance for the purpose of supporting Egyptian civil society and improving the quality of life of the Egyptian people. It is in keeping with U.S. public diplomacy efforts by sending a clear message about U.S. priorities for Egypt's future and the future of Egypt's people. It builds goodwill with the people of the region by supporting educational, economic and political development, goals which contribute most effectively to Egypt's internal stability.

You might hear arguments about how this amendment undermines Egypt's efforts to provide security in Gaza. Let us not be fooled: Egypt is not using this military assistance for anything else but to strengthen its political stature in the region through a show of weapons and military capabilities.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is time to say no more excuses, and let us vote for the Lantos amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, very, very reluctantly I rise in opposition to the amendment of my good friend and, more importantly, our wise and respected colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations (Mr. LANTOS). He and I are hardly ever on opposite sides of an important issue relating to the Middle East.

Everyone knows this amendment will not become law, irrespective of what happens today. Neither the Senate nor the conference committee will accept this transfer. The administration would veto it if it did. So, if you pardon the use of a military metaphor, this is simply a shot across the bow.

There are ample reasons to take that shot. On democracy promotion, respect for human rights economic reforms, the Egyptian record is woefully inadequate. The state-sponsored media is filled with repulsive antisemitism and outrageous over-the-top scapegoating of Israel and the United States for the serious problems afflicting the Arab world. Egypt faces no external existential military threats.

But this is the wrong time to take this shot and the wrong time to pass this amendment. Why? Because it will not achieve its purposes, and it threatens to undercut America's national interests in seeking to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

How so? For the first time in a very long time, the political and military leadership of Egypt appears willing to take real risks that will enhance Israel's security and force Yasser Arafat to end his support for terrorism.

We are at a critical juncture in the Middle East. Prime Minister Sharon, the father of the settlement movement, has proposed and is deeply committed to an historic disengagement plan that will lead to the removal of all Israeli settlements and military installations from Gaza, at the cost of severing his ties to much of his own political base. This plan is supported by a substantial majority of the Israeli people.

Egypt has a huge stake in the success of the disengagement plan. The last thing they want is a terrorist base camp in Gaza that exports instability to their country and other parts of the region.

In recent weeks, Egypt has begun to play a very constructive role in discussions with Israel and the Palestinians to help ensure an orderly Israeli withdrawal from Gaza.

Most importantly, for the first time since the outbreak of violence, they have put significant pressure on Yasser Arafat. President Mubarak's envoy, General Omar Suleiman, has demanded that Arafat relinquish control over all Palestinian security forces and agree to their consolidation. In addition, he has told Arafat he must fire more than 70 corrupt Palestinian officials, or risk losing any Egyptian financial assistance. Egypt has expressed its willingness to train the Palestinian security services in Gaza as the disengagement plan proceeds.

In light of Arafat's repeated refusal to take steps that could stop the violence, we are not sure whether the Egyptian efforts will bear fruit.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude with a quote from the Associated Press from yesterday: ''The first time an Egyptian President took the risk of reconciling with Israel, he was shunned by other Arabs and vilified by his own citizens. A quarter century after Anwar Sadat became the first Arab leader to sign a peace treaty with Israel, his successor, Hosni Mubarak, is contemplating yet another risky step in the world of Middle East peacemaking: Sending Egyptians to help keep the peace in Gaza if Israel withdraws.

''And as with the 1979 treaty, which ushered in a lasting if cool peace, Egypt finds itself accused of a variety of missteps.''

Mubarak is acting on behalf of hated Israel to many of the people in the Arab world. What a strange time to propose this particular amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1⅔ minutes to our distinguished colleague and my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, when I hear about now is not the time, I guess my response is, when is it? I dare say it is long overdue.

Last November, President Bush said in a speech to the National Endowment for Democracy, ''As long as the Middle East remains a place where freedom does not flourish, if will remain a place of stagnation, resentment, and violence ready for export.''

Those in this body know that it is rare that I agree with President Bush, but he has it right on this occasion.

We learned on September 11 that this is not just an image problem, and I refer to the anti-American sentiment that is abundant in the Middle East, because we, unfortunately, are perceived to be aligned with regimes in the Middle East that do not serve their people well.

This is what our State Department in its Human Rights Report has to say about Egypt. ''The security forces committed numerous serious human rights abuses. The ruling party dominated the legislature.

□ 1430

''The mass media, labor, and large public sector entities control the licensing of new political parties, newspapers, private organizations to such an extent that as a practical matter, citizens do not have the meaningful ability to change their government.''

Yet we find ourselves considering another $1 billion plus and we are doing nothing to advance the cause of democracy and the nurturing of democratic institutions in the Middle East and specifically, in Egypt, and now is the time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

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

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly come, as many of my colleagues, probably this is as close to a 50–50 vote as we are normally going to have on this floor, to oppose this amendment, not because many of the points being made are not accurate, but because in 1998, Egypt and the United States agreed to a 10-year economic assistance phase-down. We agreed between our two nations to a long-term change in what had been the 1979 peace agreement. We need to be a nation that keeps our promises or renegotiates in good faith. It should not be done unilaterally from this body.

What I would say is, if, as I hope and will vote this is defeated, we should all work together to find new ways to ensure that Egypt has the assets and the impetus to do 100 percent successful sealing of the Gaza border, and particularly the tunnels that have been so troublesome. I look forward to working with both sides of the aisle after this vote to make that happen.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted and proud to yield 1 minute to my dear friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lantos amendment, and I appreciate so much the gentleman's leadership on this, as much as I appreciate the strong leadership of the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) on this legislation as a whole; excellently prepared, thoughtfully conceived.

I find it difficult to add to the arguments that have been made, so I will add a new argument. The State Department asserted earlier today that the United States had developed a strategic partnership with Egypt that has contributed to the global war on terrorism, stabilization, and reconstruction of Iraq.

If the truth be told, Mr. Chairman, Egypt has been largely absent from the war on terror, despite the contribution of $1.3 billion in military assistance by the people of the United States of America; despite its sizable and, we learned today, increasingly well-funded military force that has contributed no combat forces to our effort in Afghanistan; and, unlike Jordan, Egypt has not offered to send a single soldier to even help the Iraqi interim government establish peace and stability.

It is for these reasons that I think it is time to send a message to Egypt to transfer resources into humanitarian purposes and bring them on board on the war on terror.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 4½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) has 4¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, our efforts to achieve peace in the Middle East have a major part of their foundation in the accords of Camp David. Part of those accords were that we would provide a certain level of military assistance to our friends in Egypt. They and the Israelis are the friends that we have in that area. This amendment puts the finger of the Congress of the United States in the eye of our friends in Egypt. We have commitments made to them. Those commitments will be broken by this amendment.

Now, to go further, what do these accords do? They give the Egyptians, in addition to all things else, the required strength to come in to assist us, the U.N., and the Israelis in providing the necessary security at Gaza when Gaza is relinquished by Premier Sharon. The result of that will be that if we do not see that Egypt has sufficient funding, they may either choose not to or may be incapable of moving in to control the terrorists and other organizations which are sinister threats not only to Israel, to the United States, but to the peace in the area. This amendment is

therefore extremely counterproductive to the purposes of this Nation and to the commitments which we have made.

Beyond that, it poses a real threat to the security of Israel and the security of the area. Fancy, if my colleagues please, another Afghanistan directly on the borders of Israel full of terrorists, full of extremists, full of people who bring danger not just to world peace, but to Israel. I ask my colleagues to conceive of whether that is a wise policy for us to enunciate today by the adoption of this amendment.

Now, I say this with all respect to the author of the amendment. I am sure he is sincere in what he does. But the result of this action is counterproductive in the extreme. It breaches a sensible commitment made by the United States. It poses risks to Israel and significant danger to world peace.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute and 50 seconds to my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, while the words of the dean of the House are ringing in our ears, I would just point out that Egypt also has a vital interest in maintaining stability in Gaza. They are going to do so, move in to help deal with stability there, not because we bribe them, but because it is in their national interests. They cannot afford for it to fall apart.

I appreciate what the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations has done bringing forward this amendment. We have a long and productive relationship with Egypt, and it is not going to change if we change the emphasis. We have already invested in Egypt as the number two recipient of our aid, over $30 billion, much of it in military assistance. We bought interoperability.

The question, I think, is after 25 years, how do we make adjustments, 6 years after the most recent alignment. The gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) asks, 'is this the wrong time?' I think the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is saying now is the time, even if it does not pass, to signal that the way that we are going to have peace in Egypt, in the Middle East, is to stabilize the economy, shift away from massive military buildup, which they do not need, and feed that positive public opinion.

I can think of nothing more positive than for us to invest in the Egyptian people at a time when their government sadly has fallen short, fallen short in terms quieting virulent anti-Semitic rhetoric. It has fallen short in meeting the needs of the Egyptian people. They have all the military they need to deal with their current needs and with moving in to Gaza for their own interests. It is time to send a signal that we are going to beef up the economic side of the equation.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), a distinguished member of the Committee on International Relations.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lantos amendment; and I thank him, thank him for bringing this forward.

Per capita income in Egypt hovers around $1,000 a year. Illiteracy, 30 percent, over 50 percent for women. With this kind of poverty, why are we continuing to fund the military complex instead of providing economic aid to the Egyptian people? There is no need for military assistance to protect Egypt's borders. They have no enemies in the region.

But let us please examine their record.

When I hear my colleagues talk about their aid in our war against terrorism, who are we kidding? They have contributed no combat forces in Afghanistan. They have contributed no help to the United States in Iraq. They have done nothing to stop the virulent anti-Semitism and anti-United States rhetoric that is rampant in their media, and they do not need $1.3 billion in order to support Israel's withdrawal from the Gaza.

The Egyptians claim they are supporting Israel's efforts in the Gaza, but how are they doing that? They have done nothing to stem the flow of arms and terrorists. They have done nothing to close the tunnels. They have done nothing to help train a single Palestinian in their security forces.

Their economy is in shambles. It is time that we do something for the Egyptian people.

Mr. LANTOS. How much time do we have, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Arizona has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to yield 1 minute and 45 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

This amendment does not cut aid for Egypt. What it does is, it cuts aid for Egypt's military; and it takes the same amount of money and gives that money to the civilian economy in Egypt, to help the citizens of Egypt. And it is to send a signal to the Egyptian leaders and to the Egyptian military that it is unacceptable for the United States people to give money to the Egyptian military, even as a sieve has been created which allows for the transfer, the smuggling of guns and other weapons, explosives from Egypt into the Gaza, which is being used by Palestinian radicals to kill Israeli civilians.

That is the signal that we are sending, not to the Egyptian people, they can keep the money; but to the Egyptian military that they must do their job to secure their borders so that there is peace in Gaza, so that Israelis are not made victims of a trusting relationship between the United States and the Egyptian government and military. That is the signal which we are sending, and that is hopefully what will happen as we renew, through Egypt and its leaders, the commitment to the principles embraced by former President Anwar Sadat who, in his 1988 address to the Israeli Knesset, said, What is peace for Israel? It means Israel lives in the region with her Arab neighbors in security and safety. Is that logical? I say yes. It means that Israel lives within its borders secure against any aggression. Is that logical? And I say yes. It means that Israel abates all kinds of guarantees that will ensure these two factors. To this demand, I say yes.

We need Anwar Sadat's kind of leadership in Israel today. Vote ''yes'' on the Lantos amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues think that Egypt needs more high-tech military equipment, vote against our amendment. If my colleagues believe that the Egyptian people, with a per capita income of less than $1,000 and a social system which is a shambles, need more economic aid, then vote for the Lantos amendment. I urge my colleagues to do so.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say at the outset that I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the sponsor of this amendment; but I believe that adoption of the amendment would be a serious mistake and it will undermine our relations with one of our major allies in the Middle East.

This amendment is being proposed at the very time when the governments of Egypt and Israel are coordinating plans for Israel to withdraw from Gaza. In order for a withdrawal to be successful, both countries must cooperate on security and intelligence matters; and Egypt must be prepared to help ensure that terrorist organizations do not gain power in Gaza. Discussions, cooperation, and coordination on these matters are already occurring at the highest level of both governments.

I cannot imagine that at the very time that Israel and Egypt, after years of an admittedly cold, frosty peace, are finally engaged in serious discussions on military and on intelligence cooperation, that this Congress would choose this moment to disrupt this cooperation by cutting military assistance for Egypt.

As has already been indicated, the administration does strongly oppose this amendment, and part of the letter from Secretary Powell has been quoted in opposition to this amendment. I will include the entire letter in the RECORD at this point, but let me quote from one section of that letter.

In it the Secretary says: ''In Egypt we have an ally that can help us in war and in peace. Our credibility in this relationship depends to a great degree

upon being a reliable provider of assistance to the Egyptian military.

□ 1445

''A transfer of funds from the military assistance account to the economic account will damage the credibility of our bilateral relations at a very sensitive moment in the region, one that has witnessed Egyptian engagement in and support of our regional objectives.''

I include the full text of the letter for the RECORD.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, DC, July 14, 2004.

Hon. JIM KOLBE,
Chairman, Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I ask for your support on the subject of a possible amendment to the Fiscal Year 2005 Foreign Operations Appropriation bill that proposes to reduce our annual military assistance to Egypt by 25 percent and to reprogram it for economic assistance. We understand that the House may consider this amendment July 15. This matter is of urgent concern, as I believe that any changes to the Egypt military assistance account would seriously undermine the strong U.S.-Egypt partnership that has been built since the 1979 Camp David Accords and that continues to be one of the foundations for achieving U.S. foreign policy goals in the Middle East.

As you know, U.S. military aid to Egypt is a cornerstone of the Camp David Accords. The Administration is opposed to any amendment that would modify our commitment to the parties as contained in that agreement. This commitment is the foundation of our efforts to promote peace in the region, to combat terrorism, and to advance interoperability with the Egyptian military. In addition, a $325 million reduction in military assistance, as proposed, could lead to the cancellation of approximately $2.2 billion in total contract value; these contracts all go towards the purchase of U.S. products.

Our military assistance to Egypt has contributed to regional stability in an area that had previously been the scene of military conflict against Israel. This calming of tensions has enabled us to develop a strategic partnership with Egypt that has contributed to a broad range of U.S. objectives in the region, including the Global War on Terrorism, the stabilization and reconstruction of Iraq, and more recently, efforts to stop the humanitarian crisis in Darfur, Sudan. Egypt has also undertaken a critical initiative to work with Israel to support the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip through the reorganization and training of the Palestinian security services.

On a bilateral military-to-military level, our assistance has helped to modernize the Egyptian military, thereby creating a defensive force that is interoperable with, and capable of supporting, U.S. security goals in the region. We also continue to train Egyptian military officers through the International Military Education and Training Program and to conduct joint training exercises, thereby ensuring that our militaries both understand and support each other at critical moments. This Egyptian capacity has enabled the Egyptian military to participate in international peacekeeping operations, to help us successfully prosecute Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom, to enable our craft to safely transit the Suez Canal, to enable our planes to traverse Egyptian airspace, and to provide our tankers with invaluable access to Egyptian facilities.

In Egypt we have an ally that can help us in war and peace. Our credibility in this relationship depends to a great degree upon being a reliable provider of assistance to the Egyptian military. A transfer of funds from the military assistance account to the economic account will damage the credibility of our bilateral relations at a very sensitive moment in the region, one that has witnessed Egyptian engagement in and support of our regional objectives. I hope you will oppose this amendment.

Sincerely,

COLIN L. POWELL.

Again, I have great respect for the author of the amendment. However, this is not the time to make a cut of more than 40 percent of military assistance. Even if we were so inclined, now is not the time to take that kind of action that would disrupt our ongoing efforts to facilitate the withdrawal of Israel from Gaza. I urge the House to reject this amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

Since the 1978 Camp David accords, Egypt and the United States have shared a close relationship built around mutual strategic interests and common goals.

The U.S.-Egyptian military is both strong and important.

Our military assistance to Egypt has helped to build an Egyptian military that is interoperable with the United States, and actively supports U.S. security goals in the region. This Egyptian capacity has enabled our U.S. ships to safely traverse the Suez Canal, and enabled our planes to effectively traverse Egyptian airspace.

Let me be clear. I am not satisfied with the pace of economic and political reform in Egypt. I know many of the Egyptian people feel the same way. There are many issues the United States and Egypt will have to work through in the coming years. It is important for the United States to continue to press Egypt on these issues.

However, I believe this amendment would unwisely undermine the U.S.-Egyptian military relationship. This would be particularly damaging at a time when Egypt is providing important cooperation in the War on Terrorism and the peace process between Israel and the Palestinians. In addition, as we ask Egypt to take a more prominent role in the security of the Gaza strip, we should not undercut Egypt's ability to play the role we are asking them to play.

Mr. Chairman, for all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this amendment.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of my good friend from California Mr. LANTOS's amendment.

It is time for the United States to start redirecting aid to Egypt.

the United States has been providing military assistance to Egypt for over 20 years and Egypt has made peace with its neighbors.

Egypt no longer has to fear from any outside threats to its sovereignty and it's now time this aid move toward helping Egyptian people not the military.

The real threat to Egypt comes from the poverty and lack of freedom that exists in the country today.

We cannot continue to fund the military while people live in squalor and do not have the freedoms they deserve.

Egypt must start focusing on its people and its economic reforms.

Moving towards economic aid will help to push this process forward.

Egypt is a consistent violator of human rights and our funding needs to address how to begin to respect these rights.

Even in the State Department human rights reports, they reported that there is ''convincing evidence'' the police regularly use torture to extract confessions, and detain suspects without charging people or bringing them to trail.

I continue to see Egypt's lack of respect for minority and religious rights.

Our funding should not be building up Egypt military but instead on building its society.

Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of this amendment and urge my colleagues to support the passage of this important amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. 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. LANTOS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) will be postponed.

The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR) assumed the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise today to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and with the chairman of the subcommittee.

I want to first thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) for his work in overseeing the critical rebuilding effort in Iraq.

A key element in our foreign policy is developing and strengthening local governmental institutions. It is my

privilege to represent an organization, the Research Triangle Institute, which is helping to fulfill this laudable goal. I joined the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) on a Congressional delegation trip he led to Iraq in November, and we saw firsthand evidence of RTI's good work in Kirkuk and elsewhere.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina and I are coming together on the House floor today to discuss the important ongoing work which Congress supports and RTI conducts.

USAID's Local Governance Project has supported the establishment of 16 provincial councils and more than 700 local councils. The project staff of international experts in municipal government, supported by almost 3,000 Iraqi nationals, has worked to link local council leaders, citizens, and municipal service departments to improve service delivery to the citizens of Iraq. They have coached and trained 15 governors, 42 deputy governors, 420 department heads and more than 380 local service departments.

Working with USAID and RTI, Iraqis are building the capacity to deliver essential services, to develop transparent and participatory policy processes at the local level, and to develop civil society institutions that foster participation in political processes. USAID Administrator Andrew Natsios has remarked that local government will be the training ground for future national political leaders.

Mr. Chairman, that future is now.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) for such remarks on the local governance projects as he might want to make?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

Mr. BURR. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to be here, and I appreciate my colleague including me in this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina is correct. This is an exciting and important work. With the Committee on Appropriations' financial and USAID's technical support, Iraqis have seized the opportunity to participate in government and have demonstrated an aptitude for local governance. They are working hard to restore services in their communities. They are drafting and approving procedures and policies to efficiently provide government services. They are prioritizing the needs of the people within their communities, and they are developing budgets to support those plans.

The Iraqi people have discovered government that operates with the consent of the governed, and they are enthusiastic about it. Their representative officials have discovered accountability to the people, and they are eager to demonstrate their fidelity.

There is still a long way to go in Iraq before the seeds of democracy that have been planted are fully established. We cannot be short-sighted with respect to these kinds of activities in our foreign operations agenda. We must make certain that the work started by such programs can be sustained as a partnership not only between the United States and Iraq but also through our foreign operations activities throughout the world.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank both the gentlemen for their comments.

For decades, the Iraqi people have labored under the brutal dictatorship of Saddam Hussein. In the last year, Iraqis have established local governments and representative councils. These entities represent a radical departure from past practice in which the central government made all of the decisions, including many that we believe are appropriate for the local level, such as education or municipal services.

As the gentleman remarked, we face significant challenges in Iraq that are going to require our continuing oversight. The United States' assistance to Iraq is well over $21 billion thus far and is the largest single assistance program ever undertaken in the world.

The effective implementation of programs like the Local Governance Project is critical to American efforts to bring peace to the Middle East and to the successful withdrawal of American troops from Iraq, and I appreciate the gentlemen for bringing this to our attention today.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota:

In title II, in the item relating to ''MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION'', after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(increased by $250,000,000)''.

In title II, in the item relating to ''GLOBAL HIV/AIDS INITIATIVE'', after the aggregate dollar amount insert ''(increased by $90,000,000)''.

In title IV, in the item relating to ''CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION'', after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $425,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes on the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the distinguished chairman for his great work on foreign relations. I share his great concern with the fact that half the people in this world live on less than $2 a day, that half the people in this world have not made a phone call, that one-fifth of the people do not have safe drinking water, and that 115 million children do not have a school to go to.

We need to, with this crisis out there, have a razor-sharp focus on results, not dollars spent. We need to demand results from our aid programs, not try to comfort ourselves by saying that we spent some dollars on certain programs.

What this amendment does is it takes $425 million out of our contribution for this year to the World Bank, which has a poor track record of delivering results. The World Bank is far too much focused on process, as opposed to performance. They might record how many schools they built, but they are not focusing on how many children we have really educated. They may focus on what water treatments they have helped fund but not on how many families are really getting clean water from them.

They already do have sufficient capital to expand their programs. We put this money, $90 million of it, into the global AIDS initiative, which has a proven track record. It meets this year's commitment of our $15 billion plan that we have approved as a Congress. There are millions of orphans throughout Africa because of the AIDS epidemic. This is a horrible pandemic. It threatens the stability of the continent. It must be addressed.

We also put $215 million into the Millennium Challenge Account. Today in this bill only half of the President's request is funded. This gets us part of the way there. The Millennium Challenge Account has criteria that ensure results. They make sure that the countries that we are investing in rule justly, that they invest in their people, that they pursue free enterprise, economic freedom. There is substantial evidence that exists that shows that countries that do this have growing standard of livings, that they are more likely to eat better, live longer, have children in school rather than working in the fields, speak, assemble, worship more freely. They are three times more likely to elect their governments democratically, and they are less likely to fight wars.

It would be mistaken to say that this amendment reduced investments in aid. We indeed invest in a proven AIDS initiative. It is also mistaken to say that it is designated towards AIDS funds within IDA. IDA can continue their AIDS program with the capital they have already, and the MCA encourages health care spending. It is also mistaken to say that this reduces investment in Africa. The AIDS program is for Africa, and over half of the first 16 countries chosen for the Millennium Challenge Accounts were part of Sub-Saharan Africa.

So I encourage my colleagues to vote to support putting our dollars where the results are, in fighting AIDS, in

fighting other diseases, in fighting hunger and poverty.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I join the chairman in opposition to the amendment. Because what the amendment would do is cut $250 million from the International Development Association and IDA funds, loans to the poorest countries in the world, mostly African countries, at low rates of interest and long-term repayment schedules.

IDA is the source of much of the capital that poor countries use to rebuild vital infrastructure and deal with the chronic problems of poor health and education systems. This amendment, if we had unlimited funds and we can do it all, it might make sense, but in light of the good work of the committee in trying to balance needs in all the accounts, I do not think we can possibly deal with cutting $250 million from IDA, and, therefore, I am opposed to this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL), a cosponsor of this amendment.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

President Kennedy used to say, to govern is to choose, and we all would like to do a lot of things, but we do not have the resources to do everything.

As we know, the World Bank is sitting on top of $119 billion in equity, enough to make investments in the area that they need to make investments.

What we are talking about is an additional $90 million towards the President's own AIDS initiative. Now, he did a big signing, big photograph, but we have got to put the resources towards that to fight the scourge of AIDS across Africa and the Caribbean and $250 million towards the Millennium Challenge Corporation, another initiative by the President.

We cannot underfund these initiatives. They would go primarily to the countries that would also receive funding from the World Bank, but we do know by now that the World Bank has the resources. It is not shallow on resources. It has $119 billion in equity to make the types of loans that they need to make.

We know today that dealing with the health care crisis faced in Africa and Caribbean countries, that we would be alleviating one of the greatest problems for their development. That is in the area of AIDS and other health care. The Millennium Project and the President's AIDS initiative would attack those problems head on, and we cannot continue to underfund the President's initiative in those areas, which is what has happened.

By increasing the funding on the global AIDS initiative, we are showing our strong commitment to fight against AIDS in Africa and the Caribbean nations; and in another rare moment of bipartisanship, we are even working to support the President's own AIDS initiative, underfunding the administration's promise by close to $800 million this year.

Increasing funding for the Millennium Challenge Account is a good investment that gives impoverished families in the poorest countries access to health care, education and welfare. This is a policy we can all support over giving additional funds to the World Bank that has the capital that it needs now to continue to make the loans that are necessary for the World Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his leadership.

□ 1500

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Africa, I rise in strong opposition to the Kennedy amendment cutting funds for the International Development Association which is helping the Earth's poorest countries reduce poverty.

In 2005, a country with a gross national income per capita exceeding $2.45 a day is not eligible for IDA loans. Imagine the poverty and the misery of nations impacted by IDA loans. IDA serves 38 nations in Africa that are among the world's 48 poorest nations.

This amendment is exceedingly harmful to people of the 29 African nations that currently receive IDA support, but are not included in the President's AIDS initiative. Millions of poor Africans are the losers.

It is foolish to fight HIV by cutting IDA funding for HIV in Chad or cutting support for children's health in Madagascar or by cutting the support for building peace in war-torn Sierra Leone or cutting educational assistance to Malawi.

People living in desperation and misery on $1 or $2 a day should be supported in this House and International Development Association, and we should not punish the planet's poorest people.

The amendment's author mentioned, where is the accountability? I would like to point out that two nations, Turkey and Korea who were once recipients to this aid, are now participants in IDA. This is a program which does have oversight, which does help the poorest of the poor in the world; and I would urge that the Members not support this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to respond to the distinguished ranking member and my distinguished fellow Member from Minnesota. This is not a debate as to whether we give to the poorest countries on Earth, whether we give to sub-Saharan Africa. In both cases IDA gives, yes, to the poorest countries but so does the Millennium Challenge Account. In fact, the Millennium Challenge Account is required to go to the 74 poorest countries. If you look at the 16 countries that were included in the initial allocation, Madagascar, one of the ones my fellow colleagues mentioned, is a recipient of the Millennium Challenge Account as is Benin and Cape Verde and Ghana and Lesotho and Mali and Mozambique and Senegal. So we are addressing sub-Saharan Africa. We are addressing AIDS. We are doing it again in a way that focuses on results, that focuses on making sure we are making a difference for the poorest people in the world.

I do encourage my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) for his amendment in the sense that the support that it gives the Millennium Challenge Corporation, I think as he knows, I am one of his biggest champions. Indeed, it is our bill last year that carried the authorization for Millennium Challenge Corporation. But I do have to rise to oppose this amendment, cutting IDA to pay for addition funds through the Millennium Challenge Corporation and for HIV/AIDS.

As I said at the very outset and as the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has said, this bill is a bipartisan one which means none of us could get everything we wanted. Given that the subcommittee had a budget allocation of $1.9 billion that is below what the President requested for all his initiatives, we simply could not fund all of them. The Millennium Challenge Corporation is one that we were not able to fully fund. I wanted to. I would have liked to, but the dollars simply were not there. Already our legislation cuts the International Development Association which, of course, is known as IDA, by $211 million below the President's request. And I can assure you this is already giving the Department of Treasury heartburn. So I feel compelled to resist further cuts to this funding.

Diverting these funds into bilateral programs denies six times as much as the gentleman's cuts to the poorest nations. Now, I made this point on the Sherman amendment earlier, because other countries put up for every U.S. taxpayer dollar that is put up, other countries and donors and resources provide $6 for each of those. This means a cut of six times as much when we cut this money out of there.

Mr. Chairman, I think the ranking member and the subcommittee and I made a difficult decision to cut the World Bank funding by $211 million

below the request, but another $425 million would put U.S. leadership at risk at the bank, in addition to reducing billions of dollars of assistance for poor countries for Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

As an appropriations chairman, I have a responsibility to manage many requests and many priorities, Presidential and congressional. And I do think that in this bill we have found a good balance between the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the HIV/AIDS accounts, and the IDA. And I think we have met all of those requirements. And I look forward, let me just say, to working with the gentleman to support the Millennium Challenge Corporation in the years ahead.

I am excited about what it is going to do. We are at the very beginning of that, but I am very excited about the potential for the Millennium Challenge Corporation. I hope we can provide substantially more funding for it in the years ahead.

I can also say that if our committee receives a higher allocation in conference, which is possible if the Senate numbers are different, I will certainly work my hardest to ensure that more of that goes to the Millennium Challenge Corporation. But for now I am compelled to oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) will be postponed.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I do so for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the great ape populations are declining at an alarming rate worldwide.

The continuing destruction of habitat, in combination with the growth in the commercial bushmeat trade in Africa and increased logging activities in Indonesia, has led scientists to suggest that the majority of the great ape populations will be extinct in the next 10 to 20 years.

To address this crisis, in May 2001, UNESCO and UNEP established the Great Apes Survival Project, known as GRASP.

GRASP is uniquely placed to mobilize resources and provide a communication platform to bring the dramatic decline of great ape population to a halt.

But, sadly, Mr. Chairman, the bill we have before us includes no funding for the GRASP program.

While I recognize that assessed contributions to UNESCO are part of the CJS appropriations bill, voluntary contributions to UNESCO programs, like GRASP, are usually included in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill's International Organizations Account.

For fiscal year 2004, Congress appropriated almost $1.9 million in voluntary contributions to UNESCO programs. It is my hope that, in the further deliberations of this bill, both here and in the conference, serious consideration can be given to the funding of GRASP programs to protect the great apes from total extinction.

Could I ask my friend from Arizona, the distinguished Chair, for his help and cooperation on this very important issue as we move to the conference on this legislation.

Mr. KOLBE. Let me say I appreciate the gentleman calling this to our attention, and I agree with the importance of this program. I certainly would be happy to work with my friend from California as the bill moves to conference.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman very much for that.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. BLUMENAUER:

In title III, in the item relating to ''FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $20,000,000)''.

In title IV, in the item relating to ''GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $13,177,734)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

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

I rise today on an amendment dealing with the Global Environment Facility. It is the primary financing mechanism for important environmental work around the world. It helps developing countries address environmental challenges that may impact the United States as well as those countries. And as the world's largest donor to the institution, our country plays a critical leadership role.

The projects of the GEF fall into four major categories, conserving bio-diversity, expanding clean energy production and its use, cleaning up international waters, and protecting its fisheries, and phasing out ozone depleting chemicals. All critical priorities for this country and citizens around the world.

Since 1991, the GEF has funded over 1,000 projects in 160 different countries. And it is not just the investment that the United States made. A key point I think that needs to be focused on here is that for every dollar spent by the United States the GEF leverages $15 in funding from other sources.

I have a wide range of examples, but the committee is well aware of the good work; and I will conserve time by not going into that. But I do want to make the point that it is the United States as the largest shareholder that has a unique responsibility with this program. Two years ago, the Bush administration committed to increase its contribution to GEF for 4 years and to pay off our long-standing unpaid debt that was $210 million in 3 years. This agreement served as a catalyst for other donor governments to also increase their donations.

Now, I appreciate and I referenced earlier on the floor the difficulty that this subcommittee has given the allocation that they were given. But that said, the subcommittee reported out a funding level of $107 million with no arrearage payment. The amendment that I am offering here today would add $13.2 million in order to at least fully fund the President's budget request of $120.7 million and at least continue the commitment towards dealing with the arrearages even though it would put us behind schedule.

I appreciate this difficult situation the subcommittee is in. I am prepared to withdraw the amendment, but I would seek to ask either the Chair or the ranking member if there is some prospect that if we are able to work this through the process, if we might be able to continue meeting the commitment that the administration has made in the past to fund the arrearages.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I applaud the spirit of the gentleman's amendment and regret that I cannot support it in this context. We have worked hard to bring a bill to the floor under a requirement to reduce the President's request by $1.9 billion. And so in order to accomplish this, we were forced to make, as you know, many tough choices, and reducing funding for the Global Environmental Facility of the World Bank, unfortunately, was one of them.

I have always worked hard to get adequate funding for the GEF because I

believe it provides a vital source of funds for environmentally sound lending. The bill does provide $107.5 million for the GEF, which is the amount of our annual contribution. As you know, we did not include the additional $13 million requested for arrears and that is reflected in the funding levels of other banks as well.

It would be my hope that we could find a way to make up these arrears either in conference on this year's bill or next year. I know of the gentleman's commitment to GEF. I share that commitment. And I want to assure you of my intention to work towards this goal. I thank you for bringing this issue to the attention of my colleagues.

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

I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for his dedication to environmental issues and raising the funding for the Global Environmental Facility today.

As my colleague knows, the bill before the House today is bipartisan, as the gentlewoman has indicated, and of course that means that we do not get everything we want here. Given the priorities of the President, the priorities of both sides of the House, we did cut funding for the Global Environmental Facility by $13 million from the President's request.

□ 1515

But we did fund the entire regularly scheduled contribution of $107.5 million to the GEF so that we do not go further into arrears.

Just so my colleague understands that the GEF was not the one that was targeted specifically. The International Development Association, or IDA, which we just discussed in the last amendment, the concessional arm of the World Bank was cut $211 million from the administration's request.

So I appreciate my colleague raising the issue, and I appreciate his withdrawing the amendment and the bipartisan spirit within which the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and I have worked during the course of the year, and I thank the gentleman.

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

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

I appreciate both, again, the difficult situation that the subcommittee was facing and the comments from my friend the Chair and the ranking member.

I will withdraw the amendment, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that we could continue to focus on trying to keep this commitment. I appreciate that there were a number of other areas that we simply had to shut the door on in terms of paying arrears where we were in arrears, but this I hope, if we get to the point where there are additional resources, bears special attention because of the global impact of these environmental programs, how they are targeted at some of the most desperately needy of countries and how this is an area, if we do not continue to make progress, we are going to slide back.

But I appreciate the work that has been done and look forward to working with my colleagues so that hopefully we will be able to restore it and gain the benefit of those important investments.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. PAUL:

Title II of the bill is amended by striking the item relating to ''MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 10 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes the Millennium Challenge Account. When this program was put in place a year ago, it was originally thought to be a program that would replace old-fashioned foreign aid, but because the votes were not there, instead of a transition from one form of foreign aid to another, it was just added on. That is the way we do things here. We keep adding on in order to satisfy everybody.

So the foreign aid bill now is up to nearly $20 billion, and that represents $1.25 billion for the Millennium Challenge Account, and it is a $266 million increase from 1 year ago. So we are making ''progress'', if one is a strong supporter of such programs.

The strongest argument of those who endorse foreign aid is a humanitarian argument: We are rich, they are poor, we have empathy, we must help, it is our moral obligation. For the most part, people go along with that. But I have a humanitarian argument, also. Mine is that it does not work and that, if we indeed care about people, we ought to be encouraging free markets and individual liberty, and that is when countries become more prosperous.

But the idea that we can promote humanitarian programs by taking literally money from poor people in this country and giving it to rich, influential leaders in other countries and we are going to have this miraculous success I think is a myth. It does not work that way, and there are people who are not benefitted.

Now, it may be said by those who have promoted the Millennium Challenge Account, that is exactly what we are trying to address. We want to reward countries that are moving in the direction of free markets. Now, that is a nice notion, but it cannot work. It is impossible because when we give money to a government, it is politicized. It becomes bureaucratic, and it has to be handed out to special interests.

When Paul Applegarth, the chairman of the corporation for the Millennium Challenge Account was before our committee, I asked him a question. I said, are there any American companies that will benefit by this type of program? I actually was pretty shocked with his answer, because he was very blunt. He said, I certainly hope so. In other words, even our American corporations benefit from programs like this.

So it would be nice to think that the poor people of these other countries are going to benefit, but I think it is a greater injury to the poor people of this country. My colleagues say the poor people of this country do not pay taxes. Well, that is incorrect, because the inflation tax is borne by the poor and the middle class, and that occurs when we spend too much money. And this is too much money spent the wrong way, and we do not have the authority to do it. Besides, how many of us ever get calls from our constituents saying please vote for more foreign aid? No, they are asking for more help here, and this distracts from it.

When we do not have the money, we run up the debt. Then we go and we literally print the money to pay the bills. We create the inflation and the higher cost of living, and it injures the low and middle income people the most, and they are the ones who are losing jobs.

So this is literally money coming out of our pockets for programs that could help us in this country.

My suggestion is, since I am a moderate here in the Congress, my moderate approach would be when we have a program like this, whether it is 1.25 or the whole $20 billion, my suggestion is cut it, cut the whole thing. Let us say we cut the $20 billion of foreign aid. I would take $10 billion and put it toward the deficit, and I would join my colleagues on the left and say, look, let us fund some of these programs that are needed or are coming up short. Why are we cutting veterans benefits at the same time? Why do we cut the Corps of Engineers? Why do we not fully fund our infrastructure?

This type of spending does not make any economic sense, and it does not make any moral sense.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and claim the time in opposition.

Because I am going to close, unless the gentlewoman from New York wishes to say something on this amendment, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER).

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise to support the amendment and in opposition to the 2005 Foreign Operations appropriations bill. At a time when our country is facing record budget deficits, I cannot justify voting for the largest foreign aid bill in history. We should not give away billions of dollars in foreign aid in the name of friendship when everybody knows that friendship cannot be bought.

Over the past four sessions of the U.N. General Assembly, 86 percent of the U.S. foreign aid recipients voted against the United States a majority of the time. Now, let me give my colleagues five specific examples.

Egypt is slated to get $1.836 billion in foreign aid in this bill, even though they voted against us at the U.N. 86 percent of the time.

Indonesia will get $151 million in foreign aid. They voted against us 83 percent of the time.

Nigeria will get $68 million in foreign aid. They voted against us at the U.N. 76 percent of the time.

Kenya will get $67 million. They voted against us at the U.N. 81 percent of the time.

Bangladesh will get $63 million in foreign aid. They voted against us 82 percent of the time.

Not one of these five countries contributed any money or troops to the war effort or reconstruction of Iraq.

Now, some might say, but what about the money we are giving Israel? Well, I fully and completely support 100 percent of the $2.58 billion in aid to Israel. They are, by far, our best ally in the Middle East. They are the only democracy in the Middle East, and they face increasing terrorist threats.

But I cannot in good conscience vote for a $19.4 billion foreign aid bill when only a tiny portion of it goes to support our valuable ally Israel.

I cannot go home to Orlando, Florida, and look waitresses and secretaries in the eye and tell them that we took taxpayer dollars from their paychecks and gave it in foreign aid to countries that do not even support the United States.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and vote ''no'' on the bill.

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

Let me follow up on the point I made earlier about the good intentions of a program like this to promote free market changes in certain countries, but, unfortunately, this backfires because once the money gets in the hands of the government we then require them to develop partnerships or alliances with businesses, which is exactly the opposite of free markets. This is closer to crony capitalism or fascism when we combine government money with business interests.

At the same time, we know that our corporations will also participate in these programs. So the money once again leaves the people of this country, many times the poor, and goes to these foreign aid programs which subsidize certain governments, solidifying powers of certain politicians, which then allows fungibility of their other funds to do other things and then encourage business partnerships between government and business which is not free markets, which literally is undermining the move that I think is intended and that is to improve the conditions of other countries.

If the conditions of a country are amenable to capitalism and investment, there is never a problem of a lack of investors. The fact that we have to do this, that means there are flaws in the system. This will not improve it. It actually makes it worse. Just because you have partnership with businesses does not mean you are moving toward free enterprise. That means you are moving toward a system of interventionism, or crony capitalism. It is not true reform.

So a program like this actually does the reverse. It has unintended consequences. It makes our problems worse. And, besides, we do not have the right to do it. We do not have the constitutional authority to do it, and we certainly do not have a moral authority to undermine the poor people of this country by making the conditions worse here.

For this reason, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment.

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

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

I do rise in opposition to this amendment.

I find it ironic that a few moments ago we had an amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota to take money out of IDA and put it into the Millennium Challenge Corporation. Now we are having an amendment to take everything out of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which suggests to me that maybe the subcommittee is just in the right place here in regards to the amount of the funds that we have.

I also find it ironic that the gentleman from Texas, who is a strong fiscal conservative, is offering this amendment. If ever there was anything in foreign assistance that made sense, it is the Millennium Challenge Corporation. I believe that it is the most dramatic departure from the way we have administered and provided foreign assistance since the Marshall Plan at the end of World War II, and I think it has a real opportunity to make a difference in the way that countries approach foreign assistance. In fact, we are already finding that to be the case, that countries that are not on the list of those who are eligible yet for consideration for the Millennium Challenge grants are saying what do we have to do to get on that, what kind of reforms do we have to undertake, and this is exactly what this Millennium Challenge Corporation, which we carried in our bill last year, does.

It is different than any other foreign assistance account that we have. It is different for four essential reasons.

First, the MCC will act as an incentive for countries to govern justly, to invest in their own people and create the right policy framework for economic growth. In short, it rewards good governance. No other development or economic assistance administered by USAID or the Department of State currently provides that kind of incentive.

Second, the MCC will offer up a laser focus on economic growth and poverty reduction. That is unlike current development assistance efforts where the U.S. government and other donors try to do a little bit of everything.

Third, the MCC recognizes that successful reforms have to be internally led. As I said a moment ago, this goes to countries where they have made a commitment to rooting out corruption, where they have openness and transparency, where they have a commitment to the rule of law, where they have a commitment to the protection of property rights. So it has to come internally in order to make this work. These are incentive kinds of grants, technical kinds of grants, things that will help the country do exactly what they need in order to have sustainable, long-term economic growth.

Fourth, the Congress has given the program the flexibility to meet the needs of the MCC countries as presented by the countries themselves.

□ 1530

In other words, it offers countries the prospect of local ownership and accountability for their own development, and that is why I believe this is critically important. The MCC promises to be one of America's best tools to help us address poverty, and I hope we can defeat this amendment. I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for the RECORD a copy of the letter sent to me by the Board of Directors of the MCC:

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. JIM KOLBE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As the members of the Board of Directors of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, we greatly appreciate your leadership and support for the Millennium Challenge Account (MCA), a key Presidential priority. The President's request will accelerate growth and opportunity

for countries that govern justly, invest in their people and encourage economic freedom.

We are concerned, however, that the limitations on your Subcommittee's appropriations allocation caused a reduction in MCA levels to $1.25 billion, half of the President's $2.5 billion request. This level of funding may compromise the Corporation's opportunity to commit to full multi-year support to all countries that qualified to compete for MCA assistance this year and could have an impact on the support for countries that may qualify in 2005. For this reason, we would strongly oppose any amendments which would impose additional reductions, and will work with you to achieve the necessary resources for this Presidential foreign assistance initiative. Such amendments could call into question our commitment to support those countries that have taken responsibility for their own development through adoption of sound policies.

We look forward to working with you to assure MCA is adequately funded as we proceed with our critical mission in the developing world.

Sincerely,

COLIN L. POWELL,
Chairman of the Board.

JOHN SNOW,
Vice Chairman of the Board.

ROBERT ZOELLICK,
U.S. Trade Representative.

PAUL V. APPLEGARTH,
CEO, Millennium Challenge Corporation.

ANDREW S. NATSIOS,
Administrator, U.S. Agency of International Development.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be postponed.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to enter into a colloquy with the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona, the subcommittee chairman, for entering into this colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, I am seeking at least $3 million from the State Department's Nonproliferation Anti-terrorism Demining and Related Programs Account to fund demining activities in Laos.

A persistent and deadly legacy of our country's involvement in the Vietnam War continues to kill and maim thousands of children, women, and men in the impoverished nation of Laos. I am speaking of the millions of unexploded cluster bombs left by a decade of bombing by the United States during the Vietnam War. This is a human rights tragedy for the people of Laos.

From 1964 to 1973, the U.S. flew 580,000 bombing runs over Laos, one every 9 minutes for 10 years. More than 2 million tons of ordnance were dropped on Laos, double the amount dropped on the European theater during the entirety of World War II. As many as 30 percent of these bombs dropped on Laos did not explode, leaving up to 20 million unexploded submunitions, known as bombies, litter throughout the country. These American bombies may be 30 years old, but they continue to kill and maim children as well as farmers clearing the land for farming.

In the first 5 months of 2004, 39 people died and 74 have been maimed by unexploded ordnance. In the 30 years since the end of the Vietnam War, an estimated 10,000 Laotian people, including thousands of children, have died. And yet while families struggle for food and survival, tens of thousands of acres of land cannot be put into agricultural production because the Earth is contaminated with this deadly cluster ordnance.

In today's dollars, our Nation spent $9 million every day for 10 years dropping millions of tons of bombs on Laos. This year, fiscal year 2004, the State Department will spend only $1.4 million helping to remove our Nation's deadly legacy.

We have a responsibility to help to end this ongoing human rights tragedy. I had intended to offer an amendment to more than double the level of the current funding in this account for Laos. However, I understand the chairman of the subcommittee has agreed he will seek to include language in conference with the other body that sufficient funds be found in the Nonproliferation Anti-terrorism Demining and Related Programs Account or from the Bilateral Assistance programs for Laos in order to continue this important work in fiscal year 2005; and, if possible, at $3 million in order to help provide for the expeditious removal of the unexploded munitions from Laos.

Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman agree he will help to include such language in conference with the Senate?

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is correct in her characterization. Assuming the availability of funds, we will seek to include report language that, at a minimum, would continue the program in Laos at the fiscal year 2004 level; but, if possible, at a higher level of $3 million.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I sincerely thank him for his courtesy and also for pursuing this. I also want to thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for her support on this matter. I look forward to working with both of them to address this important issue.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the intent of the gentlewoman's amendment, and I appreciate her thoughtful comments.

The problem of unexploded ordnance in Laos is real and will be addressed immediately. I would strongly urge a significant portion of the funds already in the bill for demining be used to address this problem in Laos, and I want to thank the gentlewoman for bringing this important issue to the attention of the committee.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. 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. GARRETT of New Jersey:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ATTENDANCE AT CONFERENCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 Federal employees at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, while those on both sides of the aisle may disagree exactly how we got here today, I think most of us, myself included, would say that, as far as the Federal budget is concerned, we are spending too much and the deficit is too high. That is why I am offering an amendment that is, I think, a commonsense approach to help limit spending and the abuse that our constituents at home complain about.

I will say this: when I go home to my town hall meetings, so many times constituents ask me, why in the world is Congress spending so much money on this or that particular program. In short, my amendment will limit the number of Federal employees that are able to be sent to international conferences to 50.

Recently, there has been a trend in our government to send far in excess of the amount of staff to these international conferences, costing our taxpayers millions and millions of extra dollars. This amendment would simply put a cap on that number.

Now, like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle on this, I understand

the importance of staff in our daily routines. I am simply saying that we should send the essential staff, those necessary in order to get the job done. Let me just give a couple of quick examples here why I bring up this amendment.

In this year, 2004, in a conference that was in Thailand for an AIDS conference, over 130 Federal employees of the U.S. Government were sent to this conference. Had my amendment been in place at that time, and been able to limit the amount of employees, Federal employees that went over there, we would have saved millions of dollars.

To put it in the context of dollars and cents, we could have provided a dose of nevirapine, which is an AIDS preventive medicine which provides benefits to babies, to over 216,616 newborns in Africa. Over almost a quarter of a million dosages could have been provided had we had a cap on people going there.

Another example, 2002: the U.S. sent 236 people to a conference in Barcelona, Spain. These employees were sent at a cost of $3.6 million. Again, my people at home, the constituents at home, ask why do we spend so much money.

Due to the limited amount of time I have right now on this amendment, I cannot go into more of the examples we have seen in past experience as far as excessive numbers of Federal employees going overseas to Federal conferences. I would simply urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this commonsense and important amendment to make a limit as to the amount of people we send over.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I will not take 5 minutes, but just want to say that I would have serious concerns about this amendment. I think it is something that we can work with and perhaps solve in conference, but I would have severe heartburn about an amendment that is as arbitrary as this.

Let us say we were, for example, to have a major conference, like the Camp David Accords, or what we had in the Sinai a few years ago, where we came very close to a settlement on the peace accords. Obviously, hundreds of people were involved in that. This would arbitrarily limit any of the funding here from being spent to send people to a conference of that nature.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, briefly.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Just very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the amendment would address those concerns, or the points the gentleman raises, and I share his concerns there. This applies to those that would come under this act, and that such conferences as those could very well conceivably be coming under the other act, like State Department and the like.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I realize they could be coming under State Department, the White House and others that are not funded under this bill; but there are a number from USAID, Treasury, and others that would be funded and could be affected as a result of this. So I just have real concerns about that, and we will try to work that out.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment No. 20 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), amendment No. 13 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), amendment No. 11 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), and amendment No. 17 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

□ 1545

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. SHERMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 111, noes 312, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 380]

AYES—111

Ackerman
Andrews
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Berkley
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Boswell
Brown (OH)
Burton (IN)
Cardoza
Chabot
Chandler
Clyburn
Coble
Costello
Cox
Crowley
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
English
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gingrey
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefley
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Israel
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
King (NY)
Kucinich
Lantos
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Manzullo
Markey
Matheson
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Moran (KS)
Nadler
Napolitano
Norwood
Oberstar
Owens
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Porter
Rahall
Ramstad
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Shimkus
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Toomey
Vitter
Wamp
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—312

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chocola
Clay
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer

Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Watson
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Carson (IN)
Collins
Cummings
Deutsch
Doggett
Greenwood
Holden
Isakson
Majette
Quinn

□ 1611

Messrs. CANTOR, BERRY, CARTER, HOEFFEL, MICHAUD, ALEXANDER, and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. LEWIS of Kentucky, VITTER, LANTOS, DEMINT, BARRETT of South Carolina, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, HOSTETTLER, COX, LOBIONDO, MORAN of Kansas, COSTELLO, FERGUSON, BISHOP of New York, GINGREY, PAYNE, OWENS, FOSSELLA, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Ms. WOOLSEY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. LANTOS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 287, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 381]

AYES—131

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brown (OH)
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Cardin
Cardoza
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cooper
Crane
Crowley
Davis (AL)
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Evans
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gingrey
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hoeffel
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hyde
Israel
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Leach
LoBiondo
Lynch
Markey
Matheson
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McNulty
Meehan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Otter
Pallone
Payne
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Saxton
Schrock
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—287

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bell
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Clay
Clyburn
Cole
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeGette
DeLauro
DeMint
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Maloney
Manzullo
Marshall
Matsui
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pelosi
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Buyer
Carson (IN)
Collins
Conyers
Deutsch
Doggett
Greenwood
Holden
Isakson
Jones (NC)
Keller
Majette
Peterson (PA)
Quinn
Stenholm

□ 1619

Mr. TIAHRT changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

Mr. SHAYS and Mr. UDALL of Colorado changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. KENNEDY OF MINNESOTA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 288, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 382]

AYES—133

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Andrews
Bachus
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Boehner
Bradley (NH)
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Coble
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hayworth
Hensarling
Hostettler
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (NY)
Kline
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Manzullo
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McInnis
McIntyre
McNulty
Mica
Moore
Myrick
Nadler
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Pallone
Paul
Pence
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Ramstad
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sanders
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Snyder
Souder
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tauzin
Terry
Thornberry
Toomey
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Walden (OR)
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—288

Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Bell
Bereuter
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Clyburn
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Grijalva
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Watson
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Carson (IN)
Collins
Deutsch
Doggett
Greenwood
Holden
Isakson
Majette
Peterson (PA)
Quinn
Stenholm
Waters

□ 1627

Mr. ROSS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 41, noes 379, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

AYES—41

Bartlett (MD)
Burgess
Chabot
Coble
Cox
Davis, Jo Ann
Duncan
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hayes
Hefley
Hostettler
Jones (NC)
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kucinich
McInnis
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Otter
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Rahall
Royce
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Toomey
Wamp

NOES—379

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley (CA)
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose

Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Carson (IN)
Collins
Deutsch
Doggett
Greenwood
Holden
Isakson
Istook
Lantos
Majette
Peterson (PA)
Quinn
Stenholm

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1635

Mr. BURGESS changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I missed several votes so that I could travel back to Pennsylvania to survey damage from a tornado strike yesterday afternoon in my Congressional District.

I respectfully request the RECORD to reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted:

''Yea'' on rollcall vote 377 on agreeing to House Resolution 615;

''Yea'' on rollcall vote 378 on agreeing to House Resolution 713;

''Yea'' on rollcall vote 379 on agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 462;

''No'' on rollcall vote 380 on agreeing to the Sherman amendment to H.R. 4818;

''No'' on rollcall vote 381 on agreeing to the Lantos amendment to H.R. 4818;

''No'' on rollcall vote 382 on agreeing to the Kennedy (of Minnesota) amendment to H.R. 4818; and

''No'' on rollcall vote 383 on agreeing to the Paul amendment to H.R. 4818.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to simply point out to the Members that by the calculation of the majority, a calculation with which I concur, that if everyone entitled to offer amendments uses the full time available to them under the unanimous consent agreement, we will finish voting sometime around 11 o'clock tonight. If Members would like another outcome, I would ask them to see whether or not they can assist us in limiting the time taken by Members on some of these amendments, if Members would like to get out of here before 11 o'clock.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. KILPATRICK

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Ms. KILPATRICK:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON CONTRACTS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to fund any contract in contravention of section 8(d)(6) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(6)).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

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

I first want to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), as well as our ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for working with us as we put together what we consider the best bill under the circumstances of our 302(b) allocation.

The amendment before us deals with small businesses in America. Currently, the procedure of the Federal Government is that they work with small businesses to get them into the procurement process so that they can grow their business and hire the people of America. This amendment today that will be a part of the Foreign Operations bill, and my chairman has accepted it, and I thank him very much, and I know that he will protect it as it goes through the process, will allow the small businesses of America to also procure government contracts for the international assistance that we give.

I recently met with my truck and bus owners and those who do parts on those buses and trucks, and what they said to me was they need assistance in getting some of the foreign contracts where we are buying trucks and buses and the like. This is an attempt to help those businesses and other small businesses in America who can and will assist as we rebuild communities around the world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member on the Committee on Small Business.

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, today we are considering the $19 billion Foreign Operations appropriation bill. Billions of dollars of this funding will be spent on Federal contracts performed overseas. This amendment ensures that U.S. small businesses have an opportunity to compete for this work.

Large contractors in the United States are currently required to submit subcontracting plans for work performed in the United States. These plans must simply identify small business goals and demonstrate that small companies have a reasonable opportunity to compete for these subcontracts. The Kilpatrick amendment merely extends this requirement to overseas contracts.

I cannot overstate the important role of small businesses in our economy. Whether domestic projects or overseas work, our Nation's small businesses deserve access to Federal contract opportunities. The Kilpatrick amendment eliminates these double standards and gives United States small businesses a chance to compete.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, a similar amendment like this was included in last year's appropriation bill, only to see it stripped out in conference. I hope that this is not the case this year. I urge its adoption.

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

We do believe that the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) will protect the amendment. It is a stimulant that our small businesses need so that they can grow their businesses and hire more of our American citizens as well as refund their lost taxes from local communities around the country.

With that, I again would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, and I do not rise in opposition to it. I think we all support the promotion of small business. We certainly need to have small enterprises get a fair shot at getting contracts and getting every business opportunity. And one of the things we have been pushing through AID is to do more with small businesses, both here and abroad.

The agency says that it has been essentially following the requirements of the proposed amendment now; and since it does simply restate current law, and in the interest of expediting business here in the House, I would accept this amendment and ask that we

review it in conference. So I am prepared to vote right now.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUYER

Mr. BUYER. 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. BUYER:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO REQUEST THE UNITED NATIONS TO ASSESS THE VALIDITY OF ELECTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by any official of the United States Government to request the United Nations to assess the validity of elections in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will be recognized.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) for 10 minutes.

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

My amendment seeks to end any possible form of manipulation of our elections in November. Article I of section 4 of the Constitution specifies that elections, including those for Federal offices in the United States, will be conducted by the States and the Congress, and the States and the Congress can only regulate and oversee the electoral process in this country.

For over 200 years this Nation has conducted elections fairly and impartially, ensuring that each person's vote will count. When problems have arisen over the years, by Constitution, authority was granted to Congress and the States to address them, and we have.

Congress passed the Voting Rights Act in 1965, and we have subsequently amended that act over the years. Just this last Congress, we enacted the Help America Vote Act to strengthen the election process.

Recently, nearly a dozen Members of this House have written United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan requesting ''to have election observers to monitor the Presidential election in the United States'' on November 2.

I suppose that through this letter, Members of this body were suggesting that we, the United States, need help, that the States cannot ensure the integrity of the election process and, therefore, we need the United Nations monitors to look over our shoulders to make sure we do it right in the United States.

Now, if my colleagues can imagine on Election Day, you get up, you have your breakfast, you grab your coffee and your Danish, and you are going to go to the voting booth. When you show up, you are curious because you see a white van out there that says the U.N. beside it and little blue helmets. The United Nations has arrived; we are going to ensure the integrity of the American electoral process.

The United Nations has sent monitors to Haiti, Nicaragua, Angola, Mozambique, and now what, the United States? I do not think so.

This request by Democratic Members to have the U.N. supervise United States elections is rather foolish, nonsense, and silly. If anybody wants to come here to learn how to conduct a proper election, let them come to the United States. We are happy to teach anybody the foundations of our Republic and democratic values.

This amendment prohibits Federal executive officials from asking the United Nations to come in and have any authority of our election process to assess the validity of the United States Federal elections. The authority to ensure the integrity of the United States elections rests with the States and the Congress by constitutional authority, and this amendment merely seeks to keep it that way.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time.

I would say to my friend, and he is my friend, that I think he is very wrong in offering this particular measure. We in the United States go all over the world telling people about free and fair elections and about transparency in that regard. I, along with other Members of this Congress, have traveled throughout the world monitoring elections on behalf of a variety of organizations that do not necessarily come under the aegis of the United Nations.

I would say to the gentleman, I was last week elected as president of the Organization For Security and Cooperation in Europe. That organization is one of the lead organizations in the world on election monitoring. Members from this body under the aegis of that body have gone to the Ukraine, to Belarus. Soon we will be going to Kazakhstan. I have gone to Russia.

□ 1645

I was welcomed, when Russians awakened on that morning and had their Danish and their coffee, at the election polling place; and, surprisingly, I found that a great deal fairer in some respects than what I saw in my own county when you were there in 2000. I suggest that if one were not there for any other reason other than to observe an election, it would be foolhardy for us to not take into consideration the importance of encouraging free and fair and transparent elections, and what better way than to tell the world we are wide open for your peerage into the freest and fairest system in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back and am prepared at the appropriate time to yield to additional Members.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY).

Mr. NEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in strong support of the Buyer amendment. It saddens me, Mr. Chairman, that some members of the body seem to think that we need the U.N. election monitors here in the United States. I was pleased to work with the Members on both sides of the aisle to secure passage of the Help America Vote Act, which passed overwhelmingly in the previous Congress. That bill is being implemented today as we speak and is addressing many of the problems referenced in the letter to the U.N.

Three billion dollars have already been provided and been appropriated pursuant to the bill, which provides for better voting machines, better registration systems and for more poll worker training. I have faith in the commissioners of the EAC Elections Commission to carry this out.

Mr. Chairman, the U.N. has its hands full helping countries around the world that have problems far beyond anything we have experienced here in the U.S. For example, just a few weeks ago in Afghanistan, Taliban forces determined to prevent the onset of democracy in that country killed 16 Afghans, simply because they had voter registration cards.

In India, Reuters reports that militants in Kashmir set off mines and fired at polling stations as voting began to elect a new parliament, killing at least seven people and wounding dozens.

In Myanmar, separatist guerrillas killed four soldiers, burned electoral rolls and destroyed voting machines.

In Turkey, a candidate for village headman was gunned down and others injured.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, the problems in other parts of the world far surpass anything we face in this country. The U.N. needs to focus its attention on situations like these where people cannot even register to vote without fear of being killed.

Of course, one of the biggest hurdles facing the U.N. election monitors will be assisting and setting up the framework for democratic elections in Iraq.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad the U.N. is helping other countries with their elections, and I hope they will continue to do so. We do not need them here in the United States, however.

I thank the gentleman from Indiana for offering the amendment, and I strongly support its adoption.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the distinguished chair of the Black Caucus.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) say we say that we need to end possible core manipulations with regard to our elections. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) may not be familiar, although he visited Florida right after the 2000 catastrophe, where so many African-American people and so many others were not allowed to vote, and their votes were simply not counted.

Our last speaker talked about how the U.N. had all this work to do all around the world. Let me tell you something. This is a democracy in the United States. The way this democracy is built, it is built upon the individual's right to vote and to have that vote counted, and basically that is what did not happen in Florida and in other places.

I would submit to you that this is not a Republican issue. This is not a Democratic issue. This is a red, white and blue issue. I cannot figure out anything that could be more important than making sure that every single person in your district and in my district have that right to vote and have that vote counted.

I do believe that if the gentleman, the sponsor of this amendment, were to have one of his constituents to come and say, ''Mr. BUYER, I could not vote for you,'' I believe that you would tear down walls, build bridges, do everything you could to make sure that that person could vote.

Just this weekend when I was down in Miami, there was a headline in the Miami Herald talking about things that Jeb Bush is doing or had tried to do to stop folk from being able to have their votes cast and counted. And so the beat goes on.

That is why the gentleman thinks the Congressional Black Caucus likes coming and saying that we want monitoring? We want to make sure that all of our constituents have their vote.

So it is not about manipulation. It is about integrity in this system. That is what it is all about. We want to make sure that another person is not selected but elected.

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

The Miami Herald report, when they did their analysis and actually looked at the Civil Rights Commission, stated that in fact that report was overstated. They also in the Miami Herald's report analyzed and said there was no widespread evidence of what the gentleman just said in the well.

In fact, the evidence points just the opposite, that the election in Florida, the officials were mostly permissive, not obstructionists when unregistered voters presented themselves; and, in fact, during the 18 months of litigation that followed the election of 2000, only two people in the State of Florida testified that they were not able to vote.

Now, of the 176,000 votes that were discarded ballots in the State of Florida, there were 65,000 that were undervotes, meaning people who went to vote, but they did not vote in the Presidential column. They voted for maybe State rep or State senator or for sheriff, but they did not vote for President. Then there were 111,000 that were overvotes.

Yes, when I was in Florida, yes, I saw thousands of ballots whereby people actually in the Presidential column, for one reason or another, decided that they would forget the one person, one vote. What they actually did was vote for three, four, five, six, seven people in the Presidential column. So, by their own hand, they spoiled their very own ballots.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, when President Bush was campaigning for office, he said that if we were humble and treated our allies and other nations with respect, that they would relate well to us.

I chaired the Helsinki Commission of this Congress from 1985 to 1995 and have served as the ranking member until this past year when I became the whip. I will tell my friend from Indiana, I went to country after country after country and said to them, you need to accept election monitors, because you need to ensure that the world is confident that your elections are honest and aboveboard.

I will tell my friend from Indiana that I believe America's elections will be aboveboard, but our Nation, I tell my friend from Indiana, ought to be too big, too confident, too proud to say to somebody, you cannot come to the United States and see for yourself. Because if we ask of others that they accept monitors, are we too proud, too arrogant, too self-satisfied to say to the world, but you cannot come to America, the freest, most open, most democratic land on the face of the earth?

I say to my friend from Indiana, I hope my colleagues reject this amendment, not because as some here will assert there is wrongdoing in America but because America ought to be proud to invite all of the world to come to America and see how democracy works.

Do we make mistakes? We do. But are we proud of our democracy? We are.

Come to America. See us act. See our democracy. Be proud.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds, and I would just say to the gentleman, please do not mischaracterize the amendment. I agree with you. We welcome people to come to this country to observe. What this amendment says, we do not believe that the United Nations should be here to assess the validity of the United States election process as monitors.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I will not even take the 60 seconds. It seems to me there is a lot of misconceptions about this amendment here. Yes, we do welcome observers to our elections. We welcome people coming into this country. We have thousands of them come in every year. We invite them to come. They come under various plans, journalists, politicians, all kinds of people, who look at elections at the local level, at the State level, at the national level at our conventions. I have hosted those people in my district on election day, on primary day, on general election day. We should want those people to come here.

What we are talking about is whether we have people come here that have some kind of official capacity to determine the validity of our elections. We have a uniquely, unlike most other countries which have national elections, a National Elections Supervisory Board. Ours are so scattered. Every State has the responsibility for determining the elections.

So it would not be possible or not be wise to do that, and that is why this amendment is a very simple amendment that makes sense. Yes, come and observe, but you are not going to be here to determine the validity of the elections.

Mrs. LOWEY. 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 first acknowledge the work that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) did on the election reform bill the last session. I was there every day attempting to help make it pass, but it has not been implemented. Forty-one States have asked to implement it in 2006; and then 27, including some of those, have asked to get a waiver. So we have not improved.

We had observers in Florida in November of 2002 requested by the Secretary of State. They came from Russia, Bosnia, Switzerland, United Kingdom and somewhere else; and we go all over the world observing elections. Why cannot we follow the same rules we insist on the world following? We write the rules. We enforce them everywhere but here. We want a fair election that is transparent, and we have not experienced it the last 4 years.

We are tired of making sure we vote and the votes do not get counted or getting intimidated to keep from voting. If we cannot do that as a democracy, we have no democracy. This is the very foundation of a democracy.

The first amendment right to freedom of speech, that is an expression of who they want in office, and they did not get the last one that was elected.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and wanted to stand in support of the Buyer amendment and say also I support this for two reasons.

Number one, I am very uncomfortable with the U.N., regardless of what their intentions could be. It is a political body. They are very, very anti-American and I think very ineffective. Just look at their record on human rights, their record on peace around the world, the records on democracy. The U.N. would not be who you want to come in and straighten out a problem.

Secondly, let us go under the assumption there was a problem and what did we do about it. One thing to remember, and I went down to Florida. Twenty-five of the counties in Florida that had the highest percentage of vote spoilage, or they were accused of it, how many were controlled by a Republican? Zero. All of the 25 had Democrat chief election officials.

Now, as a Republican who was asked to go down there and monitor the recount, I was expecting the worst. I went in there, as I know the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) did, and we sat in kind of bleachers and watched Theresa LePore and Judge Burton, two of the Democrats. Ironically, I forget the Republican's name. And they would hold the ballots up and look at the chads.

I expected the worst, but I want to say to my Democrat friends, they did the right thing. They were looking it in the eye. They were resisting all the political pressure from the outside. They were running Palm Beach and Broward and Dade County the way it should be run, on a local level. The Democrats were doing it, and the Democrats I think were doing a doggone good job. I went back and told my friends, you know what, that process is fair.

Key point being is we handled the problem, we handled it locally. We do not need a lot of outsiders from the U.N. to come in.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

□ 1700

Ms. WATSON. We need observing. I observed the election in 2000 from Micronesia. I was ashamed. I was embarrassed because I had to go out and interpret what had happened. I did not find those elections to be free or fair. The spaghetti ballot, the hanging chad, and the Supreme Court's decision, cutting off the counting of votes, so the person who had the largest number of votes did not win. And so we need the world to see how our elections are run because Florida cheated, and we are not going to allow it to cheat again.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) has 45 seconds remaining. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

I would say to the gentlewoman who spoke, who used the word ''cheating,'' I hope she would choose another word because she is definitely impugning the integrity of a lot of her Democratic colleagues in the State of Florida who supervised the election.

Number two, I think I must infer from that sense of outrage I am hearing from the other side that you are just as concerned about the systemic design to disenfranchise the absentee military vote, which I hope you are just as outraged about. But what this amendment is about is we welcome America to observe the integrity of our electoral process. We do not ask, though, for the United Nations to come as monitors at our polling stations in this country. That is what this amendment is about.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time and for her leadership on so many issues.

What in the world are we worried about? If we have nothing to hide, then we should not have any concern whatsoever. Yet, today's New York Times in their article on the front page cites ''election troubles already descending on Florida.''

I truly expect that our elections will be well maintained and done in an honest and fair way, but no American should be ashamed or scared to have our democratic system observed and monitored by an international agency if voters are truly not being disenfranchised in the United States.

We have all served as monitors elsewhere. Why not have the same standard in our own country?

[From the New York Times, July 15, 2004]

ELECTION TROUBLES ALREADY DESCENDING ON FLORIDA

(By Abby Goodnough)

MIAMI, July 14.—Three years after Gov. Jeb Bush announced a new voting system that he called ''a model for the rest of the nation,'' Florida is grappling with some of the same problems that threw the 2000 presidential election into chaos, as well as new ones that critics say could cause even more confusion this November.

The touch-screen voting machines intended to cure many of the ills of 2000 have raised a host of other concerns here just four months before the election. A new state rule excludes the machines from manual recounts, and the integrity of the machines was questioned after a problem was discovered in the audit process of some of them. Voting rights groups filed a lawsuit last week challenging the recount ban, and a Democratic congressman has also sued to request a printed record of every touch-screen vote.

The controversy over the new equipment is just one of Florida's challenges, which also include confirming which voters are ineligible, training poll workers on new policies and processing a flood of new registrations.

State officials announced on Saturday that they would throw out a controversial list used to remove felons from the voting rolls, acknowledging that Hispanic felons were absent from the list. Secretary of State Glenda E. Hood, appointed by Governor Bush last year, had earlier dismissed concerns from lawmakers and advocacy groups about the list of 48,000 suspected felons, which the state made public only after a judge's order.

The United States Civil Rights Commission, which issued a scathing report on the last election here in 2001, will examine problems with the list of felons in a hearing Thursday in Washington.

''The most important thing is to really show the voters that there are reasons to have confidence in these systems,'' said Bobbie Brinegar, president of the League of Women Voters of Miami-Dade County. ''But the mantra has been 'trust us.' And that is not good enough.''

Jacob DiPietro, a spokesman for Governor Bush, said the governor was ''taking full responsibility'' for the problem with the list, adding: ''His No. 1 priority is to have a seamless election and an election where people have confidence that their vote will be counted.''

The state, whose 36-day recount after the 2000 election stunned and divided the nation, is expected to be a major battleground again this year, with President Bush (the governor's brother) and Senator John Kerry, his probable Democratic opponent, fighting fiercely for its 27 electoral votes. Mr. Bush won Florida by 537 votes last time, but thousands of votes were discarded because of voter error on poorly designed ballots and other problems.

The Republican-led Legislature quickly passed an overhaul of the voting system in 2001, banning the punch-card ballots that caused so much trouble in 2000, giving counties money for new voting equipment and setting recount guidelines. It adopted two-thirds of the recommendations from a bipartisan task force that Governor Bush appointed after the 2000 election, but stayed away from some of the more contentious issues.

Most notably, lawmakers passed over recommendations to make the positions of county elections supervisors nonpartisan and to review the state's policy of permanently stripping felons of voting rights. The package that the Legislature adopted has played a role in the new turmoil. Tucked into the law was a provision keeping registration records secret. A state judge struck it down on July 2, opening the way for a close examination of the list of suspected felons to purge from the rolls.

Newspapers then reported that the list had a simple but glaring flaw: it guaranteed that no Hispanics, who tend to vote Republican here, would be purged, while thousands of blacks, who tend to vote Democratic, might be purged. Governor Bush moved quickly to drop it, but he was too late to avoid accusations from Democratic lawmakers and groups. The critics have denounced the effort to keep the list secret, the touch-screen problems and other troubles as purposeful efforts by Florida's Republican leadership to give President Bush an advantage here.

Unlike her predecessor Katherine Harris, who was co-chairwoman of President Bush's 2000 campaign in Florida even as she oversaw elections, Ms. Hood has publicly stayed away from politics. But critics say that Ms. Hood, a Republican and former Orlando mayor whom Governor Bush appointed, has sown doubt by dismissing criticism of the electoral system and by not answering questions sufficiently.

The abrupt resignation of Ed Kast, the state's director of elections, last month—he

said he wanted to pursue other interests—only deepened public distrust, said Sandy Wayland, a member of the Miami-Dade Elections Reform Coalition.

While previous secretaries of state were elected, Ms. Hood was the first appointed by the governor, the result of a 2003 change in the State Constitution. She reports to Governor Bush, who is therefore more directly responsible for her office's successes and failures.

''She is dealing with some really sophisticated, aggressive partisans,'' said Lance deHaven-Smith, a political science professor at Florida State University, speaking of the Jeb Bush administration. ''She has been a good soldier, getting up and saying, 'Everything is fine, not to worry.' And come to find out, some of the problems that people feared were actually there.''

The coalition asked Ms. Hood's office last month to allow an independent review of the touch-screen machines now used by 15 of 67 counties, including Miami-Dade, Broward and Palm Beach. The office said that only counties were authorized to seek such audits, and told reporters that the request was an effort to undermine voter confidence.

Through a public-records request, the coalition obtained e-mail messages and other documents from Miami-Date election officials who referred to a flaw in the touch-screen equipment's ability to audit elections results, a backup way of recording votes. The e-mail messages date back as far as June 2003.

Constance Kaplan, the Miami-Dade County elections supervisor, publicly acknowledged the problem this spring. This month, the company that makes the machines, Elections Systems and Software, provided software to correct the flaw, which the county and state say will not affect the machines' accuracy.

''It is important to note that the anomaly was rare, and all votes were counted as the anomaly did not affect the vote itself but rather the audit after,'' Ms. Hood's office wrote in a statement Tuesday.

Nicole de Lara, Ms. Hood's communications director, said that Ms. Kaplan's office had ''unfortunately'' not alerted Ms. Hood to the problem, and that she first learned of it from an article in The Daily Business Review in late May. Some critics suspect that Mr. Kast's resignation was related to the malfunction, but Mr. Kast said in an interview it was not.

Ms. Wayland is among many here who contend that counties like Miami-Dade and Broward adopted touch-screen technology too soon, swayed by aggressive lobbyists. The 52 counties that do not use touch-screen equipment use optional-scan machines, which produce records that can be manually recounted.

A recent analysis by The Sun-Sentinel found that touch-screen machines in South Florida failed to record votes eight times more often than optical-scan machines in the March presidential primary.

Nonetheless, Ms. de Lara said touch-screen machines were wholly reliable for tabulating votes. She added that they would never require a recount because under State law the only reason for a manual recount is ''voter intent'' when a voter makes too many or too few choices. Touch-screen machines do not allow people to vote for more than one candidate, she said. And if people do not choose any candidate for a given office, that is their prerogative, she said.

The rule says no manual recounts will be conducted when votes are cast by touch-screen machine.

The election reform coalition and other groups have also expressed concerns about a new policy on provisional ballots, used by Floridians if poll workers cannot verify their registration on the spot. The Legislature decided that provisional ballots cast outside a voter's home precinct can be thrown out, which voting-rights groups call unfair.

Florida is one of several States where people are questioning touch-screen technology. California's Secretary of State, Kevin Shelley, has prohibited the use of machines from Diebold Election Systems in four counties for the November election, and has ordered that touch-screen systems bought after July 1, 2005, produce a paper record that is verifiable by the voter.

''There's no question in my mind that ultimately there will be paper trails in every county in Florida,'' said Representative Robert Wexler, a Florida Democrat whose suits challenging paperless voting systems are on appeal. ''The only question is when.''

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds 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, for those of us who were here in this House on January 6, 2001, to challenge the election, this is, I guess, a matter of urgency. Monitoring elections is not punishment, it only helps our democracy. This is not a punishment. This is to say to all of the people, thousands who did not have their vote counted in 2000, that we care and this country is a democracy. Sweet land of liberty, that is what we know America to be. And no one should be ashamed or afraid, including the United States military, to have international monitors. All of us will demand that all votes are counted, civilians and the military. None of us should be afraid to have our election system scrutinized. Again, it is not a punishment, it is only to provide for a consistent, fair election. It is for the protection of the democracy that we believe in.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to turn in a copy of the Certified Vote Organization. Over 1,700 people, that is technologists, lawyers, political scientists, says that the technology that we are using in the upcoming election is flawed.

I come from Florida * * * No, we are not going to get over it. And we want verification from the world.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentlewoman's words be taken down. She said that ''you stole an election.''

The CHAIRMAN. All Members will suspend.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) asked that the gentlewoman's words be taken down.

The Clerk will report the words.

In the meantime, all Members will cease from conversation. The gentlewoman will be seated.

□ 1715

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

I come from Florida where you and others participated in what I call the United States coup d'etat. We need to make sure that it does not happen again. Over and over again, after the election, when you stole the election, you came back here and said get over it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4818) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, when certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

I come from Florida where you and others participated in what I call the United States coup d'etat. We need to make sure that it does not happen again. Over and over again, after the election, when you stole the election, you came back here and said get over it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As stated by the Chair in response to a parliamentary inquiry on February 27, 1985, Members should not accuse other Members of committing a crime, such as ''stealing'' an election. By accusing an identifiable Member of stealing an election, the gentlewoman's words are not in order.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the chair. I ask unanimous consent to clarify my words.

Mr. BUYER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

□ 1730

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The question is: Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. BUYER

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) to lay on the table the appeal of the ruling of the Chair.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 187, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—219

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

NOES—187

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

NOT VOTING—28

Alexander
Bell
Boucher
Brown (OH)
Carson (IN)
Collins
Davis (TN)
DeMint
Deutsch
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Ford
Gephardt
Greenwood
Hayes
Houghton
Isakson
Kind
Majette
McCarthy (MO)
McInnis
Meeks (NY)
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Quinn
Roybal-Allard
Stenholm
Waxman

□ 1814

Mr. BISHOP of New York and Mr. LIPINSKI changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PICKERING, LEWIS of California, THOMAS, and BURR changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 384, tabling the appeal of the ruling of the Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Without objection, the words are stricken from the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman may proceed in order this day.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

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. 4818, 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, all time for debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) had expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. FARR

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. FARR:

At the end (before the short title), add the following:

UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL IN COLOMBIA

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be made available for the assignment of any United States military personnel for temporary or permanent duty in Colombia if that assignment would cause the number of United States military personnel so assigned to exceed 550.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for the opportunity to debate an important topic on foreign aid to Colombia under the Plan Colombia.

The amendment that I am going to offer today would cap the military personnel in Colombia. The gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) knows how much Colombia means to me as a former Peace Corps volunteer in that country, and I would like to debate this issue with my colleagues here on the floor.

In the original Plan Colombia, Congress placed caps on the number of personnel that would be allowed in Colombia, U.S. military personnel and U.S. civilian personnel. Those caps were put in place to prevent the growth of the U.S. military commitment in Colombia. I became very concerned when I

heard the administration had asked Congress to increase the manpower caps in Colombia to 800 U.S. military personnel and 600 contractors.

It has been pointed out to Congress just last week by General Richard Cody, who told the House Committee on Armed Services that the recent troop deployments in Iraq have taken a toll on U.S. readiness to deploy elsewhere and even to replace troops currently deployed in U.S.-led military combat in Iraq and in Afghanistan. To quote General Cody, ''We are stretched thin with our active and reserve component forces right now. Absolutely.'' Yet the administration wants to double the number of troops allowed under the manpower caps from 400 to 800.

Even General Hill of SOUTHCOM recently said before the Committee on Government Reform that rebuilding the social and economic system is needed in order to solve the problems in Colombia.

But today the administration has been calling Members' offices to ask them to oppose the Farr-Schakowsky-McGovern amendment, because the administration is dead set on working to expand the military aid, not the economic aid to Colombia.

After 5 years of spending almost $4 billion on Plan Colombia, is it not time that we reassess our policy? The Committee on Armed Services did that. The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) is to be commended for his work on the Committee on Armed Services, because he was able to get a reasonable ceiling on U.S. personnel in Colombia. He got bipartisan support and amended the defense bill to do just that. I am asking the same in the foreign ops bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Farr-Schakowsky-McGovern amendment. This amendment simply puts the House on record in support of language that the House has already agreed to as part of the defense authorization bill, and it is consistent with the Committee on Appropriation's report language on troop levels in Colombia.

The amendment allows for funds to support an increase in the number of U.S. military personnel in Colombia but continues the practice of this Congress to limit that number. The amendment allows for the current cap of 400 U.S. military personnel allowed in Colombia to be raised by 150, for a total of 550.

Mr. Speaker, when Plan Colombia was first presented during the 106th Congress, we were told it was strictly for the purpose of counternarcotics. In order to ensure that would be the case, the House placed strict prohibitions on funds being used for purposes other than counternarcotics.

Since enactment of Plan Colombia, the policy has changed. Now, as many of us have warned, the Bush administration is seeking to increase military involvement by the United States in Colombia. The administration wants to double the number of U.S. soldiers that are permitted to be deployed to Colombia.

This House placed caps on the number of U.S. troops in Colombia for a reason, and we should stick to the caps. We have provided $3 billion to Colombia over the last several years. This bill seeks to provide over $700 million for the Andean Region, including Colombia, and now we are being asked to commit more of our Nation's sons and daughters to the violence in Colombia.

Make no mistake, this is no longer a counternarcotics mission, and it is not a fight against terrorism that has anything to do with 9/11. It is a war, and sending more troops to Colombia means risking the lives of more Americans.

My colleagues on the other side of this argument seem to see no limit to what is an acceptable cap on U.S. investment in Colombia in terms of dollars and lives. As justification, they seem comfortable to toss around terms like the ''war on drugs'' and ''fighting terrorism'' without really discussing what that means and what the implications are for our country.

Despite our investments in Colombia so far, there have been no improvements in the overall problem of drug consumption in this country, and there has been no reduction in the violence in Colombia.

I have seen firsthand what a beautiful country Colombia is. I have met people from all sectors of Colombian society and traveled throughout Colombia. It is a wonderful nation but one in the midst of a civil war.

I believe what the Colombian people want and need from the United States is support to help improve the lives of its people. Sending troops will not accomplish that goal. If we allow the administration to double the number of U.S. troops in Colombia this year, what will next year's request look like?

We have heard from numerous military and civilian experts about the strains being placed on our Armed Forces as a result of the military conflict in Afghanistan and Iraq and additional homeland security needs. Instead of sending another 400 of our service personnel to Colombia, we should look for ways to ease the burden on our forces.

Vote to affirm the House-passed defense authorization and in support of the Committee on Appropriations. Support the Farr-Schakowsky-McGovern amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 20 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in opposition to this amendment, which would limit the number of U.S. military and contractor personnel in Colombia. While I certainly can and would debate this on policy grounds, let me instead debate it on process, which I think is just as important here. This is an issue, and Members ought to know this, being currently decided in conference by the House and Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Permanent law limits the number of U.S. military and contractor personnel in Colombia to 400 each. That was enacted in the fiscal year 2002 foreign operations appropriations bill. The House Committee on Armed Services in their 2005 defense authorization bill included an increase in the number of military personnel to 500 and left the cap of 400 on contractor personnel. The Senate included in their bill an increase in military personnel to 800 and contractor personnel to 600, as the administration requested. Then on the floor of the other body, an amendment to limit these increases failed by a 40 to 58 vote.

This Committee was consulted by the administration on the personnel cap increase, and the House leadership decided that the authorizers would take the lead, which I think is appropriate.

The number of personnel in Colombia ought to be an issue of authorization. We provide the funds, but they should decide how many personnel may be in that country.

While my colleague may say this will allow the United States to get more deeply involved in Colombia, if one looks at the appropriation levels, that is not true. The Andean Counterdrug Initiative is streamlined from last year's $731 million.

So a vote in favor of this amendment would put this subcommittee right in the middle of the conference negotiations between the Armed Services Committees. I do not think we should be in that position.

Let me say a word on policy. Until recently, the agencies involved were able to work comfortably within the ceilings. The increased pace of implementation for all the programs we support being undertaken by the Uribe Administration offers an opportunity for real progress. The current cap levels have recently come to hurt management efficiency and planning and prevent full implementation of programs.

The average number of U.S. military and U.S. civilian contractors has grown as programs have been fully implemented or as new programs have started, such as the anti-kidnapping program started with the supplemental funds we appropriated last year.

During 2003, the number of U.S. military varied from 128 to 396; that of civilian contractors from 246 to 400. Requirements in our bill requiring human rights vetting and the prohibition on combat will be maintained.

Let me just say, in conclusion, that we have had some significant achievements in our efforts to eradicate coca in Colombia. Cultivation has been reduced by 21 percent in the last year on top of 15 percent in the year 2002. We

have reduced potential production of cocaine by over 20 percent. The number of communities that have voluntarily and manually eradicated cocaine is over 8,000 hectares in the year 2003.

So these are some of the reasons, but we will hear more in a little bit, why we ought to not support this amendment. I urge my colleagues not to do so.

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

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I support the Farr amendment and would like to take this opportunity to raise another equally important and related issue.

Colombia is a nation that has been embroiled in a 40-year civil war. Despite this fact, as Members of Congress we must seriously question Colombia's commitment to winning that fight. I say this because, currently, Colombian law excludes from their military draft individuals who are high school graduates. In other words, if you graduate from high school in Colombia, you do not have to serve in their military.

Colombia is sending its least fortunate citizens off to fight its civil war, but it is unwilling to require the sons and daughters of the elite to fight. If the elite, educated Colombians will not send their sons and daughters to fight in their own civil war, why should American troops be sent to Colombia in their place?

Every year we hear that this issue is being addressed by the Colombian government, but over and over again, fact remains, it has not been corrected, and every year we get an increase for more and more U.S. troops to fight in that civil war.

The Bush administration is willing to involve more U.S. men and women in Colombia's civil war, while the elite of Colombia society is protected from military service. This administration now wants to increase the troops to 800 people, exposing more of our young men and women to harm.

Colombia needs to reform its conscription laws to make military service universal and fair. It needs to change its laws to do away with the existing discriminatory practices and create a universal military service obligation without distinction for economic, social or education conditions.

The Bush administration wants an open policy to send as many military troops and contractors to fight in Colombia's 40 year civil war, while Colombia's elite has exempted itself from military service. We should not be involved in Colombia's civil war at all.

At a time when our military is already stretched thin in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Bush administration should not be sending yet more American troops overseas to fight in a war that well-off Colombians seem unwilling to fight for. I ask and urge our Members to support the Farr amendment and limit the U.S. involvement in this unjust civil war in Colombia.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. OSE).

Mr. OSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is interesting, the United States does a lot of things around the world. Some things we do very well, some things we do so-so, and some things we do not do very well. But it seems to me, curiously, that in a political body our history is that those things we do very well, we end up saying, ''Well, let's stop doing it.'' Those things we do so-so, we just kind of hold back. And those things we do very poorly, we end up saying, ''Let's throw more money at it.''

□ 1830

Well, I would share with the folks of this body that what we are doing in Colombia under Plan Colombia and have been doing under Plan Colombia for the last few years is working. We are helping a democracy in the Western Hemisphere get on its feet and protect its institutions with a minimum of investment.

Yes, we have spent $3 billion or $4 billion. Yes, we are going up incrementally, a very little bit, to 800 military personnel or as many as 600 civilian contractors under what is being discussed in the conference committee. But the net result, I say to my colleagues, is very positive. Let me just share a little with my colleagues.

Colombia, which has been a home for significant disruption in civil society over the past decade, let alone the 40 years that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) reported, homicides this year are down 16 percent from last year in the first 4 months of the year. Massacre events have dropped from 34 in the first 4 months of last year to 20 this year. Kidnappings have dropped from 820 to 447. Highway robberies have dropped from 445 to 336. Vehicle thefts have dropped from 4,859 to 3,489.

Mr. Chairman, the assistance we are giving our friends in Colombia is working. We are helping them protect their institutions and their civil society from encroachment by criminals and terrorists. It is absolutely important that we finish this job, that we help our friends protect their democratic institutions and come join us in the Western Hemisphere as a fully functioning democracy.

Now, I would just add that our efforts are not limited to law enforcement or military. We are also down in the despeje, helping the folks who used to do coca production learn other crops and alternatives. We are in there with the justice training, helping their justice system set up courts that function so that people have due process, so that we have fair trials. We are in there with USAID helping folks rebuild their country.

Now is not the time to pull the plug. Now is the time to pay attention to the effectiveness that we have clearly implemented in Colombia under Plan Colombia and move incrementally to improve their prospects.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Farr-Schakowsky-McGovern amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment about America, about us, and about the pressures placed on our uniformed men and women serving in the Armed Forces. In effect, this amendment matches what the House has already approved in the Defense authorization bill. In this sense, it is a conforming amendment. Everyone in this House knows that America's troops are stretched dangerously thin. Every day, there is a story in one of the major papers about the stresses facing American troops as more are deployed to Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere around the world. We are diverting troops from South Korea to Iraq, and we are placing burdens on our Guard and Reservists just to give some small amount of relief to our regular military units before they are redeployed into combat once again.

Faced with these tremendous strains, the administration has come forward and asked Congress to double the number of troops in Colombia, offering no more compelling a rationale than Colombia needs more of our men and women for their civil war.

The Farr amendment, like the Taylor provision in the Defense authorization bill, offers a prudent alternative: provide a modest increase of 150 more troops, give the U.S. military in Colombia a bit more flexibility and relief, retain the private contractor cap at 400, and evaluate our global military situation over the next 12 months.

I do not want any Member of this House to be fooled. This latest bid to raise the military troop cap will not be the last. The administration has assured Congress repeatedly that no increase to the troop cap would be necessary; yet, now their story has changed. Will it change again in another year or two? Let us refresh our memories on what the administration has told Congress about the current troop cap.

On April 4, 2001, General Peter Pace, commander of the U.S. Southern Command said, ''That troop cap, sir, is well within the limits that I need to do the job that I have been given, and I support it.''

On October 4, 2002, Brigadier General Galen Jackman, J–3 Chief of Operations at the U.S. Southern Command testified, ''We have a 400-person military cap in Colombia. We do not envision that that is going to change. Typically, we have maybe a couple of hundred people in the country at any given time.''

On March 7, 2003, Mark Grossman, the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs stated, ''There are caps on the number of people who can be in Colombia at any one time, and there is no one who is advocating the breaking of those caps.''

And on August 19, 2003, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld declared, ''I think it would be unlikely to be anything that would break that cap.''

Mr. Chairman, when Plan Colombia was first launched and American troops first sent down to Colombia, Congress was told we were only going to fight the drug trade. Then we were asked to commit our troops to fight not only a drug war, but to join the campaign in a counterterrorist, a counterinsurgency civil war. Now we are being asked to double the number of our soldiers, boots on the ground in Colombia. There is a term for what is happening in Colombia. It is called ''mission creep.''

Mr. Chairman, Congress was right 4 years ago to impose military personnel caps in Colombia. It was a smart and prudent safeguard against any rapid escalation of U.S. involvement in Colombia's internal armed conflict. We did the right thing then. The Farr-Schakowsky-McGovern amendment is the right thing to do now.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment on U.S. troop caps in Colombia.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 13½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe this is mission creep, this is more like Mission Success. But I want to say first before I get into it, and I appreciate that the gentleman from California has agreed to withdraw his amendment, as I have tremendous respect for the gentleman from California who has truly been committed to Colombia, who was in the Peace Corps in Colombia, and has worked through many of these problems. And the gentleman from Massachusetts has shown, through his personal visits to Colombia in a repeated way and in different areas that he is truly and deeply concerned, as is the gentlewoman from Illinois.

I think it is important that even when we have deep differences of philosophy on how to approach narcotics, how to approach things like sending our troops overseas, that we treat each other with respect here in this body and it is very important, even in these most contentious times, that we try to do that here; and we all need to work towards that. But we do have some disagreements.

First, the reason I say that I believe it is Mission Success is that one way we measure this is whether we have succeeded in reducing the massacres which have gone down this year compared to last year by 41 percent, massacre victims by 55 percent, kidnappings by 46 percent, executive kidnappings by 60 percent, illegal roadblocks by 66 percent, roadblock kidnappings by 61 percent, bank robberies by 66 percent; in addition to the statistics we are getting on cocaine and heroin seizures which are substantially up, but which often, as we all know are fungible, because it seems like we always discover more but, in fact, at this point, we cannot even find in organized areas big plots of heroin, which has been a growing problem. They have moved it into higher altitudes; and, quite frankly, we did not understand how hard it was going to be to continue to make the reductions. Similar in coca. They have reconfigured. We are making progress. We believe we are at a critical tipping point.

We have an administration in Colombia that has finally understood a basic point, not only about the DMZ, but about going after, in a repeated way, the coca growers.

I am a strong supporter, as the gentleman from California knows, of alternative development. We have met down in Colombia with leaders there and understand unless we can rebuild their justice system, it is the oldest democracy in South America, but unless we can rebuild that justice system, we have deep problems, and we have worked to try to make sure funding goes both ways.

But, quite frankly, nobody will run for office if they think they are going to be assassinated. Businessmen are fleeing the country if they think they are going to be kidnapped. I went in Nelson Mandela Village with many of the displaced people, and they do not want to go home because, first, the FARC comes through and terrorizes them, then the paramilitaries come through and terrorize them; often the kidnappings, and what they need is some order.

We have an administration under President Uribe who is giving the order. And, to my view, and I think to most observers, this is the model for Iraq. By the way, we are not asking for 800; we are saying a cap, and that way we do not have to come back. The number there of advisors varies. These are not fighters, soldiers in the sense of them shooting bullets like in Afghanistan and Iraq. These are advisors. In my opinion, this is where we want to be in Iraq, this is where we want to be in Afghanistan, where we are arguing how many advisors we have there.

But the people on the ground in Colombia who are fighting and dying are Colombians, not Americans. And they are fighting, by the way, over something that is our drug habit and Western Europe's drug habit. They did not have, and I heard them all the time here, a civil war. They have at different points in time, like many countries, had people who are displaced landowners or people who felt land distribution was unfair, which it generally is in South America, and had a civil war; but this is now a narcotics war with only a small pocket.

The total support for the FARC is less than the drug lords, terrorists, dealers, and other terrorists groups in the United States. We would not like it if Colombia referred to us as having a civil war because we have drug dealers in our country or we have terrorists in our country. The group that tried to negotiate the peace, and many of them have come out, may have at one time been there for altruistic, civil war motives; but this is a classic terrorism war at this point, and Uribe is going after it. He, as much as anybody. And we can see it in Medellin; we can see it in Putumayo and in other areas working for alternative development.

I believe this lifting of the cap which may be only 450, may be 500, hopefully will eliminate the need to come in, if there are times when we need a few more, of advisors to train the Colombians and to use the model where they are really turning the progress. Quite frankly, if we do not reach a tipping point, we have a problem, and we need to work together, that after these people start to move back into their villages, after they start to rebuild their communities, we absolutely have an obligation to help with the financial alternative development, to help them rebuild those institutions.

I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) working in this bill to allow, one group that I worked with was Kid Save where we have many of these older kids who are orphaned or who have been abandoned, and this bill now allows some money to be able through AID to help those kids in adoption in the United States and in Colombia; and that is the type of thing we need to be working towards. But to achieve that, we have to have order.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the ranking member of the committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Farr amendment.

As part of the fiscal year 2001 supplemental for Plan Colombia, Congress limited U.S. military and contractor presence in Colombia to 800 people. That bill, which first established our support for Plan Colombia, also strictly limited our assistance to Colombia for antinarcotic purposes.

As many of my colleagues may remember, that decision was made because Members were concerned that our involvement would increase as time went by and that the United States would expand the scope of its involvement from an antinarcotics campaign to an anti-insurgency campaign.

As the involvement of the Colombian terrorist organizations and drug trafficking increased, Congress approved an expansion of the authority governing our involvement in Colombia. Essentially, we allowed our resources and manpower to be used more broadly to pursue terrorist organizations involved in drug trafficking. The overall U.S. manpower caps remained in place, but were adjusted to allow 400 military and 400 contractor personnel, and this was done at the request of the administration in the 2002 Foreign Operations bill. The expanded authority was approved with those manpower limitations in mind; but this year, the administration has requested an expansion of our manpower cap to 800 military and 600 contractor personnel.

The House-passed Defense authorization bill partially grants this request, increasing the manpower cap to 500, while the Senate version of the bill grants the entire request to allow 800 military and 600 contractors. Today, the House should send a clear signal to the conferees in that bill by voting to limit our military presence to 550.

Our Armed Forces, and especially the Army and Special Forces, are stretched to the breaking point with our commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan.

□ 1845

It will take years for us to recover. While an increase of 400 may not seem large, I view this as a manifestation of a long-term plan to ramp up U.S. involvement in Colombia. Who knows what expansion will be sought next year?

The request to increase manpower is clearly intended to expand U.S. troop involvement in the Colombian's war against the FARC, that war that has been under way for 20 years. Solving Colombia's problems will not be accomplished with a few hundred additional U.S. soldiers. There must be a comprehensive effort that includes a plan for reintegration of former combatants back into Colombian society.

I respect the view of others. I certainly understand their point of view. I have always supported assistance for Colombia in the context of a plan that I thought made sense. The U.S. is now spending close to $1 billion a year in Colombia, including ever-increasing amounts found in the DOD appropriations bill. I do not support this manpower increase, because I believe it continues to expand U.S. involvement, and a violent political struggle will only lead to an ever-increasing commitment of U.S. manpower.

The amendment grants a modest increase in military manpower, reflects the House position as contained in the House defense authorization bill, and it is the soundest policy, in my judgment.

I urge my colleagues to support the Farr amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak, and I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) to put a cap on U.S. military and contract personnel assistance assigned to our friend, the Republic of Colombia.

Mr. Chairman, this is a bad amendment. It ties the hands of the President, our Commander in Chief, from making military and counterterrorism decisions. Specifically, this bill makes no exceptions to the cap, greatly limiting Presidential action. This can be a serious problem, should the President, Republican or Democrat, ever need to deploy U.S. personnel to safeguard American citizens or security, since the amendment would force all U.S. assistance under foreign operations to be cut off. This would mean that development programs, counternarcotics initiatives and U.S. security could be severely damaged under this amendment.

The increased pace of implementation for programs we support being undertaken by the Uribe administration in Colombia offers an opportunity for real progress towards our goals, but current cap levels hurt our efficiency, prevent full implementation of our programs.

Draft legislation to raise the military cap to 800 and the civilian cap to 600 was included in the fiscal year 2005 DOD authorization bill, as it was recognized it is necessary to increase the cap to ensure continued success in Colombia.

I think it is important to recognize that the Republic of Colombia is Latin America's oldest long-standing democracy, and it is important to recognize that Plan Colombia is working.

Let us take a closer look at the success in Colombia in fighting drugs in partnership with our friend, President Uribe. Coca cultivation has declined by 21 percent in Colombia and over 33 percent in the last 2 years. The Colombia coca crop has been reduced to 127,000 hectares from 169,000 hectares 2 years ago. Potential production has been reduced by 20 percent for export quality cocaine, and potential pure heroin production has been reduced by 10 percent just this past year in 2003.

Ladies and gentlemen, the elected government of Colombia is restoring basic protections to every Colombian community, because Plan Colombia is working. Police presence has been extended in all 158 municipalities in Colombia that had no police before, and 87 Colombian citizens have been extradited to the United States on narcotics-related charges. A government presence in all of Colombia's 1,098 municipalities has been established for the first time in the country's history.

Again, Plan Colombia is working, and Plan Colombia is a key component of our fight against terrorism.

We must also remember the strong link between terrorism and drug trafficking. The funds from drug sales are often funding worldwide terrorist activities. Specifically in Colombia, desertions among narcotrafficking terrorist groups are up 80 percent, and child soldiers are increasingly being voluntarily repatriated.

In 2003, nearly 7,000 narcoterrorists were captured. Colombia's murder rate has dropped by 20 percent. Terrorist incidents have dropped by 49 percent. Terrorism cases in Colombia were down 48 percent in 2003; and in a July, 2003, poll, 65 percent of Colombians say they felt more secure in July of 2003 than they did one year before in July of 2002, which happened to be one month before President Uribe took office.

Again, Plan Colombia is working.

Finally, on the human rights front, kidnappings are down by 26 percent in 2003. Homicides reached their lowest level since 1987. Of 2,500 human rights allegations in Colombia over the past year, there have been no allegations of human right abuses filed against U.S.-trained units and only 2 percent against the Colombian military, compared with 40 or 50 percent just 7 years ago.

Again, Plan Colombia is working. Our partnership with President Uribe is working. It is strong. The eradication of narcotics and regional security is a priority. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes at this time.

I want to respond to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Indiana. They say that Plan Colombia is working, and it is working under the existing caps. My point is that, as a person who lived in that country and worked in the economic development and the community development as a Peace Corps volunteer, is that I believe that Colombia has the capacity with our help to win this war on terrorism, to win this war on drugs, and it is the obscene amount of money that drug cartels dumped into the country that is doing it.

But you are not going to win that by putting all of the emphasis on the military side, and that is where the mission creep is. We have the most amount of money being spent on the military than we ever have, and we are winning the war. Now we need to spend money on the civilian side, on the economic side.

You cannot win this war. What you have to do is win the peace, and the peace will not be won until the investment is in Colombians to do the job for themselves.

My job in the Peace Corps was to work myself out of a job, and I think what we have lost track of here or lost sight of is that we are not really emphasizing how do we get these countries to do the job themselves. How do we get the contractors that are being paid American dollars, how do we get military that is our military to work themselves out of a job? Until we answer that and see that we are moving in that direction, I think we are asking the wrong question and we are quoting the wrong facts here.

Yes, it is moving in the right direction. In fact, we would argue that, because of the way it is moving, there ought to be a greater emphasis, not a less emphasis, on local economic development, on fighting the war on poverty. There is only 20 percent of the budget that now goes to the economic side of it. That is the least amount of money since the war in Colombia, the Plan Colombia began. So the mission creep is on the military side, and I think the mission creep ought to be on the other side, on the economic side. Until we win the war on poverty, we will not win the peace, and until we win the peace, we will not have a stable country.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I basically agree with the gentleman from California that I am disappointed that as we need more dollars, if we do, for some military operations that they would come out of the domestic side. Long term, you are absolutely right. We have to win the hearts of the people, but, as the gentleman knows, we have two variables that have complicated the final kind of push over the top.

One, they moved the heroin up higher on the mountains; and it requires a different military capability with the helicopters and different training. And, secondly, they moved east, into the country, into the jungles, farther from our air bases; and we need the capability, at least at certain periods of time, to increase the number of advisers to address those two things.

But, long term, if we are not moving in the direction you are talking, we will never win this war and we will not accomplish it. But there are times when you have to have different strategies, and I believe that is essential at this point in time.

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

In conclusion, I would ask for unanimous consent that, at the end of this, we withdraw the amendment to keep this dialogue going. I think we can focus on really trying to do the right thing in Colombia, and I do not think that there is any difference on either side of the aisle that we want the Colombians to be able to have the capacity to govern themselves in a peaceful fashion.

They certainly, of all the countries that we are involved in, have a better infrastructure, a longer-running democracy, more communities established all over the country, have well-educated people, but they also have a massive amount of poverty. The biggest problem with the drug war is it has displaced millions of people who just do not have an adequate place to live or a job or the social services or the health services and educational services that are necessary.

That is my concern, that if we are putting more emphasis essentially into the military, we are going to have less emphasis, because there is only so much money you can spend on what I think is so essential, to having a lasting peace in Colombia. And that is, we have got to provide for the infrastructure, the social, economic infrastructure of all of the people that have been displaced, and we are moving away from that, from the ability to have alternative crops.

Remember, the crops that are growing and are being destroyed are way out in the boonies in the middle of the jungles. You are not going to reestablish a market crop in the jungles. You are going to have to reestablish a market crop in the areas.

And, remember, Colombia has been one of the leading agricultural countries in the world. We have all been drinking its coffee forever, and the quality of that coffee is the highest there is. We could do more by paying more for Colombian coffee, would be the best help in economic aid to that country of anything that I can imagine.

But I would like to make sure that, as we go into conference on this bill and into the defense bill, that we keep in mind that the war in Colombia is not going to be won by mission creep of the military. It is going to be won when we start tipping the scale, as the gentleman from Indiana said, to put more emphasis in the peace effort and less in the war effort.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Farr amendment.

I am concerned about the use of U.S. funds in Colombia.

In particular, I am deeply concerned about four public statements by the President of Colombia in which he accused domestic and international human rights organizations of supporting armed groups and of being allied with terrorists.

These statements are not only unhelpful but are also deeply disturbing. Human rights organizations are working to assist with humanitarian aid and building civil society in local communities in Colombia that have been torn apart by the terrible violence.

The President's verbal assaults on human rights organizations do absolutely nothing to help the Colombian people or to help bring an end to the violence—instead his comments may cause a reverse in a recent trend of a decrease in politically motivated violence.

Despite the fact that the above violence has decreased, there are some areas of Colombia in which local communities continue to be victims of terrible violence and suffering.

For example, security in the special security areas, such as Arauca, has deteriorated under the current President.

According to Evangelical and Catholic church leaders, there have been dozens of cases in which pastors, priests, and lay leaders have been targeted by armed actors of the left and the right for refusing to take up arms. According to these reports, 37 Protestant pastors were killed in the first 6 weeks of 2003 and four Catholic clerics were assassinated in 2003. Most of these cases were in the State of Arauca.

The numbers of politically motivated murders have not changed for the better—in 2003, over 3,000 civilians were killed for political motives and at least 600 "disappeared."

Around 2,200 people were kidnapped, more than half by armed opposition groups and army-backed paramilitaries. Armed opposition groups such as the FARC and ELN were responsible for repeated and serious breaches of international humanitarian law, including hostage taking and the abduction and massacres. They carried out attacks using disproportionate and indiscriminate weapons that resulted in the death of numerous civilians.

The government and security forces increased their attempts to undermine the legitimacy of human rights defenders, peace activists and trade unionists. This coincided with paramilitary threats and attacks against human rights organizations. The attacks on these groups made it nearly impossible for many to continue documenting and reporting on human rights abuses by all armed actors—if the human rights organizations cannot do their work, the violations are largely under-reported.

Despite the declared cease-fire, paramilitaries were still responsible for massacres, targeted killings, "disappearances" torture, kidnappings and threats. They were allegedly responsible for the killing or "disappearance" of at least 1,300 people in 2003, over 70 of all attributable, non-combat, politically related killings and "disappearances."

Even the United Nations has noted an increase in complaints of serious human rights violations which directly involve the security forces themselves.

I would urge President Uribe to cease his senseless attacks on human rights organizations that simply hurt those who are helping the people of Colombia—instead he should vigorously pursue those who commit horrifying atrocities and terrorize communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, as we consider the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill today, it is important to reaffirm our commitment to our counternarcotics efforts in Colombia, to the people of Colombia, and to American citizens. I led three congressional delegations to Colombia last year and can say first hand that our significant investment, after years of effort, is beginning to see returns on the time, money, and resources spent in Colombia. Together with the strong commitment of President Alvaro Uribe and historic levels of support from the Colombian people, U.S. involvement is beginning to hit narcoterrorists where it hurts.

This year, the Administration is seeking a modest increase in the number of U.S. support personnel in Colombia. The existing caps on the number of U.S. civilian and military personnel contractors allowed in Colombia at any given time are proving too restrictive and in some cases, the ceilings, have prevented full implementation of already funded programs and hurt management efficiency.

An increase in the military and civilian contractor support provided to the Government of Colombia during the next two years is essential to maintain the current progress being

made by our programs in Colombia. There are also new programs developed since the ceilings were established, such as the anti-kidnapping initiative and the training of prosecutors and judicial police in preparation for the constitutionally-mandated transition to an accusatorial criminal justice system with oral trials, as well as the re-started Air Bridge Denial program that need to be fully supported by personnel.

Last month, several senior Administration officials, including Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, Roger Noriega, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict, Thomas O'Connell, Commander of U.S. Southern Command, General James Hill, and Assistant Secretary of State for Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs, Robert Charles testified before the Government Reform Committee and conveyed the need to reexamine military and civilian personnel caps if we are to continue in the right direction.

Accordingly, there is draft language included in the 2005 Defense Authorization bill that raises the number of military personnel permitted to 800 and the number of permitted civilian contractors to 600. The Administration's request to increase the number of troops and contractors deployable is critical to the continued success of U.S. policy in Colombia and to help President Uribe prosecute a unified campaign against terrorism and drug traffickers. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this request and urge all of my colleagues to continue their support of our unified campaign with Colombia to fight narcotics trafficking and terrorist activities.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I appreciate the opportunity. I am concerned, and I had an amendment that I originally drafted to restore development assistance and child survival and health money for Latin America to fiscal year 2004 levels. I will not be offering that amendment, and I would appreciate this chance to engage with you and hopefully as well as the chairman to discuss the issue.

As the ranking member on the Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere and a member of the Hispanic Caucus, I was outraged that the President's budget proposal slashed development funding to Latin America by an average of 11 percent. Latin America is the only region in the world to be cut in both total economic development aid and total narcotic and military aid.

So to make these cuts real beyond those percentages, let me just say that, as a result of the overall cuts to Latin America, the President's proposed budget cut the child survival and health funding in Guatemala by almost 15 percent at a time when Guatemala's malnutrition rate for children is extremely high, one of the highest in the world.

As for the new Millennium Challenge Account, it does little for the over 40 percent of Latin Americans living in poverty who live in all of the Latin American countries; and, in fact, only three of those countries will actually benefit from MCA funding this fiscal year.

And the region is at a critical moment. Over just the past year, two democratically elected leaders were removed from office. The region is threatened by mob rule, from the lynching of a mayor in Peru to the ousting of a democratically elected president in Bolivia. These incidents only highlight the destabilizing impact of poverty, hunger and economic disenfranchisement.

Democracy means little if you cannot feed your family, your children, cannot get an education and you feel disenfranchised from your government. And in that regard, I think we are losing the battle for the hearts and minds of Latin American's democracy in that respect, losing the battle for the hearts and minds of Latin Americans, and that is why I asked the distinguished ranking member of this committee whether the gentlewoman can offer us any hope that we are going to get some relief from those cuts.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1900

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) for raising what I think is a very important point. Like he is, I am perplexed; I am disappointed with the administration's budget request for Latin America. I do not think it reflects the priorities or the national interests of the United States.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) summarized some of the statistics; but for all of the Western Hemisphere, the development assistance, the child survival and health accounts were cut by 10½ percent in this year's request. And Central American countries received an even more disproportionate share of those cuts, a decrease of 17.8 percent.

Central American countries are our strong allies. They have become increasingly democratic. They are conducting fair and safe elections while electing governments that I believe history will view as turning points in these nations' future. But they do face daunting problems of poverty and corruption.

In countries such as Guatemala, El Salvador and Nicaragua, we are witnessing governments that are doing their best to tackle these problems head on. And we have of course recently negotiated a trade agreement with them that is going to require a lot of technical assistance for them to implement that. Add to these issues the need to get economic growth generated in Central America to provide a decent standard of living for their people, people are looking northwards for employment if not given any opportunities in their own country. Under those circumstances, I think Americans would support increasing assistance to these countries.

We do have in our report language that accompanies our bill before the House today language that directs the administration to restore the funding levels to last year's levels. I would prefer to see an increase and hope that we can see that sometime in the near future. I will push this issue further as we enter conference negotiations with the Senate, and I thank my colleague for raising this important issue. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the chairman and I want to assure my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), that I share the gentleman's commitment to working with you to increase the dollars for Latin America because we realize how critical this is.

The committee's recommendation to increase both the Child Survival and Development Assistance accounts by a combined total of $328 million above the President's request was in large part meant to restore cuts made to Latin American countries. In addition, the committee report as cited by the chairman contains specific directive language mandating that the Agency For International Development restore cuts made to Central American countries when the FY 2005 operating plans are developed.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Frankly, it is unclear to me why the administration would choose to reduce our commitment to our closest neighbors at a time when overall foreign aid is increasing. Additional funding would enable vital education, maternal and infant health, and democracy and agricultural programs to be restored.

It is my hope that the administration's fiscal year 2006 request will reflect the clear interests of Congress at a robust level of funding for Latin America, as evidenced by the gentleman's amendment.

I want to conclude by saying, I share our chairman's deep commitment to Latin America. We thank the gentleman for his comments on this issue, and we assure the gentleman that we are going to work together to make sure that Latin America gets the assistance that it rightly deserves.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. I thank the distinguished gentleman both for yielding as

well as for his work and commitment to the hemisphere. And I want to thank the ranking Democrat as well for her response to our concerns. I certainly hope and certainly agree with the chairman's comments that we want to see this funding increase in the future, because when we take in the consequences of inflation, the 2004 level is not enough. It is actually a decrease. And it should be a floor, not a ceiling; but we certainly need a floor to start with so we can build upon it. I appreciate the efforts in the report language.

I would just close by saying I hope that the chairman and the ranking member who have put some pretty strong report language in here, that the USAID understands that the committee and many Members here are serious, and that it will be followed, and that we will see these monies going for Latin America. Otherwise, next year we intend to pursue vigorously with the Hispanic Caucus and interested Members on both sides of the aisle the funding that is necessary for one of the most important parts of the world in terms of U.S. national interest on a variety of issues.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman for his engagement, his support and the ranking Democrat as well.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentleman with his comments. I am confident with his support and that of other Members of this body, we will get the attention of the administration on this issue.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OTTER

Mr. OTTER. 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. OTTER:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR PALISTINIAN AUTHORITY AND THE PALISTINIAN PEOPLE

SEC. ____. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) of the total amount of funds that are available in this Act for assistance for the Palestinian Authority (or any other Palestinian entity) or for the Palestinian people, not more than 25 percent of such amount may be obligated and expended during each quarter of fiscal year 2005; and

(2) none of the funds made available in this Act may be made available for assistance for the Palestinian Authority (or any other Palestinian entity) or for the Palestinian people during any quarter of fiscal year 2005 unless the Secretary of State determines that the Palestinian Authority has not provided support for acts of international terrorism during the 3-month period preceding the first day of that quarter.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to address what I believe to be a fatal flaw in the way we administer our foreign aid.

We cannot truly be effective either domestically or in our role on the world stage when our foreign policy forces us to support our friends while at the same time indiscriminately doling out money to our and their enemies.

All the efforts we put into promoting peace and cooperation is meaningless without requiring accountability from the recipients of our assistance. U.S. foreign aid should be based upon a recipient's demonstrated willingness to support our ideals and our aspirations for their region. When we provide aid to a country, we should be able to expect a marked change in that country's behavior in keeping with our goals.

Let me give a specific example of what I am talking about here. When they were much younger, I gave my children a monthly allowance. Unlike gifts of money or money that they earned themselves, this allowance came with some strings attached. It came with an understanding that I could expect certain behavior from them. On occasion they would forget about our bargain, and their behavior would not reflect the expectations that we had established. But when they did not receive their allowance, the next month they were quick to fix the problem so that we could peacefully live together.

Foreign aid is like an allowance which the United States is not obligated to offer and which should not come without certain strings attached. And yet we continue to treat it as if we are required to hand out money to nations and people who actively oppose the principles that we try to advance.

Today we have a golden opportunity to change the way we address the issues on foreign aid.

As part of his road map to peace, President Bush recommended giving foreign aid to the Palestine Authority for the first time in almost a decade. In light of that request, we should act now to infuse any aid with common sense and accountability so that we can advance the realistic goals that the President has set for the Middle East.

In a nutshell, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply require that any aid that we give to Palestine would only be given every quarter. In other words, it would be broken up into four payments over a year's period. And only 25 percent would be given in any one quarter. So January, February and March, at the end of March, the Palestine's would receive some aid. At the end of June, the Palestinians would receive some aid. At the end of September, same and just before Christmas once again.

The reason I approach it this way is because then the Secretary of State would be required to verify that in the previous quarter there had been no acts of terrorism, no human bombs that had ventured into Israel or had ventured into some other area, that the Palestinians had indeed not engaged in any acts of terrorism anywhere in the world.

And so every quarter, once every 3 months, once that is verified by the Secretary of State, then the Palestinians would receive some money. More like an allowance instead of alimony, that we treat it today as though we owed it to folks. Such a commonsense approach to accountability is the first step to reforming our foreign policy. It will provide, I believe, a powerful incentive for the recipients of this money in order to promote the kind of democracy and the kinds of values that we have in hopes for them.

The President is working to achieve a lasting peace in this region, realistically and in good faith, and I applaud his efforts. But if we are to see a change in the Middle East, our approach to foreign aid must change as well. What better time than now to implement a policy based upon behavior and responsibility, with the expectations that we offer at the same time that we offer the money.

I encourage you to take advantage of this opportunity to assist in the peace process by making sure that our assistance carries with it the same weight as our principles would.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I agree completely with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER). We certainly should not tolerate support for terrorism by any organization, that includes the Palestinian Authority. Indeed, the bill that is before you prohibits funds for the Authority, prohibits all funds for the Palestinian Authority, and includes a number of provisions affecting West Bank Gaza programs that would prohibit funds for any group or individual that supports terrorism.

This year the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and I strengthen the prohibition on funding for terrorist groups by banning funding through the West Bank/Gaza program for any individual, any individual or group that advocates terrorism. The new provision also requires an immediate cut-off of funds if any group currently receiving funds advocates or engages in terrorist activities.

On the other hand, it is important to continue the West Bank/Gaza programs because they provide important humanitarian and infrastructure assistance for the Palestinian people. It is important to stress that all of the funds in this program are provided through nongovernmental organizations or through American contractors, or in some cases, Israeli contractors for water and sewer infrastructure programs. Not one cent goes to the Palestinian Authority.

I appreciate the concerns that the gentleman has expressed. They are the concerns of this subcommittee, and they are, I can assure the gentleman, expressed in the bill here. I understand the gentleman is prepared to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I will try to take less than that if possible.

I rise in support of the Otter amendment. The question should be should we have any aid going to the West Bank and Gaza. That should be the question. Is it buying us pro-American values? No. Is it buying us less violence? No. Is it buying us a more transparent government? No. Is it buying us more democracy? No.

And to make matters worse those receiving the aid are refusing now to sign a declaration saying that the money will not go to terrorists. There is no reason in my eyes that we should be providing any aid at all.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman and I have discussed the case of the Berhane family, U.S. citizens who had their private businesses confiscated by the former Ethiopian government. While this occurred in 1977, the current government has not shown good faith in resolving this longstanding injustice. In 1999, the matter was nearly settled when the current Ethiopian government summarily deported Mr. Berhane to Eritrea.

Despite lip service since, the Ethiopian government has not settled this matter. It should have been resolved years ago. Additionally, as the distinguished chairman knows, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation has made a finding in support of the Berhane family claim and will not do business in Ethiopia until this issue has been settled. The CEO of the Millennium Challenge Corporation, Paul Applegarth, has indicated that the MCC may follow suit.

Mr. Chairman, Ethiopia is eligible for more than $60 million of funding in this bill in its present form. The government of Ethiopia should understand that any government that refuses to deal with the legitimate claims of American citizens is jeopardizing its eligibility for assistance funded by the U.S. taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that until these legitimate property claims are dealt with fairly by the Ethiopian government that the economic assistance funds in this bill for Ethiopia in the ESF account should be reprogrammed to the Child Survival and Health Programs Fund, specifically to the account of the ''communities severely affected by HIV/AIDS, including children displaced or orphaned by AIDS.''

□ 1915

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I have to say that I find that these are very troubling charges, but we have only been recently informed of the issue. I intend to ask the State Department for further information regarding the situation, and I can assure the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) that I will give it serious consideration.

The way Ethiopia deals with this issue will weigh heavily in the decisions we make in terms of policy and levels of assistance. So I appreciate the gentleman bringing this to our attention, and I will ask my staff to work with the gentleman to move towards a resolution.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I thank the gentleman very much.

AMENDMENT 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 offered by Mr. SANDERS:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON PROVISION BY EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF CREDIT TO ENTITIES REINCORPORATING OVERSEAS

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to approve an application for a master guarantee and political risk supplement where the applicant's charter or articles of incorporation show that the entity is incorporated or chartered in Bermuda, Barbados, the Cayman Islands, Antigua, or Panama.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this tripartisan amendment has widespread support across the ideological spectrum, from Democrats and Republicans, from progressives, conservatives to moderates. It is being cosponsored today by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO). It also enjoys the support of the AFL–CIO, the Teamsters, Taxpayers for Common Sense, Citizen Works and other national organizations.

Mr. Chairman, in a very profound way this amendment deals with the issue of patriotism, love of country and respect for the American people. At a time when our country is at war and young Americans are dying almost every day, at a time when our country has a $7 trillion national debt and when veterans are unable to get the health care that they need, this amendment asks a very simple question: Should the middle class of this country, people who work hard, love their country and pay their fair share of taxes, be asked to provide billions in loan guarantees to corporate expatriates, U.S. companies who set up phony headquarters abroad in order to avoid paying U.S. taxes? That is what this amendment is all about.

Mr. Chairman, enough is enough. The American people are growing sick and tired of large corporations throwing American workers out on the streets as they move to China, to India and to other low-wage countries; and they are equally outraged by companies who come begging to Washington for corporate welfare and taxpayer dollars while they move to tax-haven countries in order to avoid their tax obligations here.

Oh, they do not want to pay taxes in America, not them. That is for the suckers of this country. That is what they say, but they sure do want the taxpayers to help them out with corporate welfare. That is okay.

This amendment will begin the process of putting an end to that absurdity. I fully concede that this amendment is not going to solve this problem completely, no question about that, but its passage will be a shot across the bow to every corporation in America who thinks that they will be able to continue to rip off the taxpayers of this country with impunity. It will, in fact, make some companies think twice before they run to Bermuda or to Panama or to the Cayman Islands in order to avoid paying American taxes.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the Export-Import Bank from approving subsidized loan guarantees to corporate expatriates, companies who were formerly located in the United States but who have set up paper headquarters abroad in tax-haven countries in order to avoid paying taxes here.

Mr. Chairman, what every Member of Congress should know is that five out of the top 23 largest recipients of Export-Import Bank assistance since 2003 are corporate expatriates that have set up sham headquarters and post office boxes in places like Bermuda, Barbados and the Cayman Islands for the sole purpose of avoiding U.S. taxes.

Mr. Chairman, it is bad enough corporate expatriates are abandoning this country to dodge taxes, but it is unconscionable that these companies then

turn around and seek U.S. taxpayer assistance through the U.S. Export-Import Bank, forcing middle-class families to pick up the tab. Companies that dodge U.S. taxes should not be rewarded with taxpayer subsidies through the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about substantial dollars here. Let me give my colleagues some examples of what I am talking about.

Tyco International, everybody will remember Tyco International, one of the poster children for corporate greed, saved $400 million in U.S. taxes by reincorporating in Bermuda in 1997. What was the response of the Export-Import Bank to this deliberate attempt to avoid paying their fair share of taxes? What did they do when Tyco moved to Bermuda? Well, they gave Tyco $115 million in assistance since 1998. That is absurd.

In 2002, Ingersoll-Rand saved up to $60 million in U.S. taxes by reincorporating in Bermuda. Since 2002, this tax-dodging company received over $370 million in subsidized loans, loan guarantees and other financial assistance from the Export-Import Bank.

In 2002, Nabors Industry saved $10 million in taxes by reincorporating in Bermuda. Since that year, it has received over $300 million in taxpayer-backed financial assistance through the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Chairman, the time is now to say enough is enough. If corporations want to move to Bermuda and disown the United States, that is their right, but they do not have a right to then come back to the taxpayers of this country and ask the United States Congress and the Export-Import Bank to give them substantial sums of money.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, since I believe I will be the only one speaking here, I reserve my time.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Let me note that many of the companies that leave, and this is where I have a disagreement with the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), many of the companies that do leave our country leave because of high taxes, which I consider to be levels of taxation that are too high and levels of regulation that are too high in the United States of America.

We may have a fundamental disagreement on how high taxes should be and regulations should be on business, but where I do agree with the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is that businessmen have to make a decision. They are a part of the American family, and we have got to make a decision if we are going to stay part of the American family based on the rules and regulations that we are judged by and have to live by because we are part of the process.

If an American company does decide that taxes and regulation are too high and decide to change their status so they are no longer being treated and taxed or regulated as a domestic company, they should not expect then to receive the benefits of a company that is an American company. This makes all the common sense in the world.

I think it is a travesty, as the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has pointed out, there are some companies that have decided to leave this country and, thus, officially, in order not to pay the same tax load, then expect to receive and have received the benefit of such subsidies we are talking about tonight. This makes all the common sense in the world.

I would hope, however, that we would, number one, pass the Sanders amendment to make sure that companies that leave do not receive this subsidy, but, at the same time, I would hope that we pay close attention to our taxation and regulation policies that make it profitable or make the businessmen who are making these decisions feel it is profitable for them to leave this country.

We should want businesses to come here and do business because it is profitable, our taxes and regulations make it profitable for them to be here, create jobs, et cetera. In the meantime, let us not do the travesty of giving people subsidies who are not paying into the system and have gone overseas and changed their status in order to escape their tax obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, the author of the amendment, and I am a coauthor of it, mentioned that it has a broad spectrum of individuals supporting it. He mentioned progressives and liberals and conservatives and moderates, but he forgot the libertarians.

Libertarians support this as well and for a precise reason. A free market libertarian does not believe in welfare for anybody, let alone the rich, and it is particularly gnawing to see the subsidies go to the very wealthy.

I am in strong support of this amendment, but, like the gentleman from California, I do not support this for the purpose of collecting more taxes, but I do think it is a message to us here that if we do not revise our tax system and our regulatory system we will prompt more and more business to leave this country.

So there are two issues here, but corporate welfare and subsidies should have no part in this. There is no room for it. It is wrong.

Also, the beneficiaries outside the corporations we should not forget either, because the biggest country that benefits from this is China. Why do we subsidize China? People who receive the goods get a benefit as well as the people who get to sell the goods get a benefit? China is on the books right now currently with $5.9 billion in outstanding loans. They receive more than anybody else. So there is something wrong with a system like that.

There are two economic points that I want to make on this. When we do this and we allow tax credit and special deals for some corporations, we assume, and we will hear this in the defense of the Ex-Im Bank, and say look at the good that we do. But what they fail to ask is, where did it come from, who was denied the credit? The fact that we do not finance it does not mean it would not happen. It would happen.

What it does is it distorts the market and causes people to do the wrong thing, and some individuals do not get the credit is obviously the case, but what we need to do is to have a much more oriented free market. When we direct it this way, even those companies may do more than they ordinarily would, and that participates in the economic bubble that occurs, of course, for other reasons as well. Then there has to be corrections. But if one is in a powerful position in a place where they can qualify, and 80 percent of this goes to the very, very large companies, although there are a lot of companies that receive the big bucks, and big countries like China.

This is corporate welfare. It should be defeated; and, ultimately, if we believe in liberty and freedom, we ought to get rid of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who has actually been one of the leaders on this issue in the Congress.

□ 1930

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to join with this diverse group of Members who may not always agree on many things, but we do agree that taxpayer dollars should never be used to subsidize companies who have incorporated on paper overseas in order to avoid living up to their responsibilities to the United States of America.

Corporate expatriates cost our country $5 billion in lost tax revenue. Any reasonable person might assume that

they would not also continue to benefit from government largess. But they are wrong, because these companies continue to receive billions of dollars in government contracts. I am pleased that the House finally passed, as part of the Homeland Security appropriation bill, my amendment to prevent that Department from contracting with corporate expatriates, one small step in an effort that is far from over.

Today's amendment is another important step in that effort. It will prohibit the Export-Import Bank from approving subsidized loans and loan guarantees to corporate expatriates. Unbelievably, five of the largest recipients of Export-Import Bank assistance since 2003 are corporate expatriates. In 2002, Ingersoll-Rand saved up to $60 million in U.S. taxes by reincorporating in Bermuda. Since that time, they have received over $370 million in subsidized loans, loan guarantees, and other financial assistance from the Export-Import Bank.

Ask any American, whether they be a Democrat, a Republican, an Independent or a Libertarian, they will tell you the same thing. This is an outrage. How can we explain this to the American people? How can we explain it to our constituents? Corporate expatriates put good corporate citizens, who stay in America and pay their taxes, at a permanent competitive disadvantage. In the end, that hurts American companies who do pay their taxes and who employ citizens all across this Nation.

We cannot afford to reward companies who shun their responsibilities of American citizenship at the expense of loyal American businesses and contractors. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Stop government subsidies of corporate expatriates. They have a choice. They can leave this country, and they cannot pay their taxes. We have a choice. We should set the standard, we should set the tone, we should set the obligation that if they are going to do that and not pay taxes in this country, then, in fact, they cannot feed at the public trough and get government contracts.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, while I am a strong supporter of the Ex-Im Bank, I am voting for this amendment to prevent companies that dodge U.S. taxes from receiving U.S. taxpayer assistance. It is simple: we should not be providing taxpayer-funded assistance to corporations that set up shell headquarters offshore for the purpose of avoiding paying their fair share of U.S. taxes.

The Export-Import Bank should be screening companies it funds to prevent this type of abuse. And if it does not, we should. I have consistently been a vigorous backer of the Export-Import Bank's mission to provide funding for exports produced in the United States. The bank's loans have supported American companies and provided jobs in this country, in my district of New York, and in many others. But giving loans to corporations, to expatriates, is an abuse of a good program.

Not only are companies that evade U.S. taxes getting taxpayers' money, but they are taking away dollars that should be spent helping companies that pay their fair share of American taxes. And, of course, if we allow this, we are encouraging other companies to move their so-called headquarters to Bermuda to avoid taxes and abandon the American worker. This is exactly what Senator KERRY meant when he said that we must stop providing tax subsidies to Benedict Arnold CEOs.

Specifically, this amendment would prohibit the Ex-Im Bank from approving subsidized loans or loan guarantees for any company that sets up a sham headquarters offshores to dodge U.S. taxes.

Five of the top recipients of Ex-Im funding are corporations that have set up sham headquarters in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands to avoid paying U.S. taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to cite one example, Ingersoll-Rand. They saved $60 million in 2002 by formally incorporating in Bermuda, but they have received over $370 million since 2003 in Ex-Im financial assistance. This is wrong. It is a gross abuse of a good program.

In the name of American workers and taxpayers, we should put a stop to it. I urge my colleagues to vote for American jobs, for American companies that are responsible, for American companies that pay their fair share, not those that dodge our country and their responsibilities to it. I urge a strong ''yes'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. TIERNEY).

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I stand in strong support of the Sanders amendment in this matter. Our international tax rules provide far too many incentives for United States companies to move jobs and operations offshore.

It is a growing trend. Corporations that have built their successes through the protection of the United States laws and contracts in this country are increasingly giving up their citizenship to move offshore and avoid paying United States taxes. Not only are they doing that, but they are costing hard-working Americans their jobs and are grossly abusing loopholes in the current tax system. These corporations should not then be able to take advantage of the taxpayers' generosity through the Ex-Im Bank.

Particularly at a time when our country is at war and we are running record budget deficits, Congress should take a firm stand and prevent taxpayer money from increasing the bottom line for profitable corporations who shirk their responsibilities here at home.

The Ex-Im Bank is intended to finance American services and products, not the export of American jobs and resources. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Would the Chairman please tell us how much time is remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the fact that the gentleman from Arizona is so silent on this means he is going to jump up and support this amendment, because it makes such abundant sense.

I hear my colleagues saying why do we allow corporations to leave America, avoid paying taxes, and yet still receive all the benefits of being an American. It is because Congress lets them. It is time for Congress to close this door.

Right now there are 140,000 young Americans getting shot at every day in Iraq, paying their dues to be an American; and another 15,000 in Afghanistan paying their dues. As I have said a dozen times on this floor, those of us who are lucky enough not to have to fight this war, ought to be at least willing to pay for it. And those of us who are lucky enough to be Americans and enjoy all the privileges of being an American, such as this program, ought to be willing to pay the dues of being an American. And that is called paying taxes.

These folks cannot have it both ways, I would say to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE). If they want the Jamaican Coast Guard to come rescue them, let them be Jamaicans. If they want the Grand Cayman Navy SEALS to rescue their drilling rigs if they get boarded by terrorists, I say let the Grand Cayman Navy SEALS go rescue them, but not the U.S. Navy. And if they want a loan, a subsidized loan from a government, if they choose to be Jamaican or Bermudan, let them do so. But there is absolutely no reason for the taxpayers of this Nation, who pay their dues, whose kids serve in our military to subsidize these folks who want to play it both ways.

They do not want to pay their dues, but they want all the privileges of being an American. And I commend the gentleman for bringing this to the public's attention.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, to conclude the debate from our side, by asking for support for what really is a very commonsense amendment.

I think the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) said it all. If people want to go to the Cayman Islands, if they want to go to Bermuda, that is their right. No one is questioning their right. But they cannot abandon their country, go abroad, and then say, oh, yeah, by the way, I do not want to pay

my taxes, but I sure do want Washington to subsidize my business.

So I want to urge support for an amendment that has broad tripartisan support, support of the AFLCIO, the U.S. Business and Industry Council, the Teamsters, the United Steel Workers, Taxpayers for Common Sense, and Citizens Works.

This is an amendment that will tell corporate America that if they want the benefits that U.S. taxpayers provide to them, they cannot run away and avoid their taxes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time. This has been an interesting discussion from the other side. But contrary to what the gentleman from Mississippi may have thought I would do, I do, indeed, rise in opposition to this amendment.

First of all, let me begin by saying I do not condone companies relocating overseas for tax purposes, but I will come back to that in a minute.

This is an interesting issue we are dealing with here today. We had this in the full committee not long ago as it related to outsourcing, but here we are talking about supporting U.S. exports and jobs. With this amendment, we are talking about punishing companies that are creating jobs here in the United States. We are going to punish them because they are creating jobs here.

Mr. Chairman, I will not yield. The gentleman from Vermont had 20 minutes. I am not going to use but a fraction of that, so I want to get my thoughts in here and do them all together here.

This is absolutely ridiculous. Why in the world are we talking about punishing companies that are creating high-paying export jobs, and giving that away to foreign competition by eliminating Export-Import Bank financing? But that is exactly what the amendment would do. It hurts workers in this country. It hurts the economy in this country.

And yes, of course, it hurts the shareholders in this country. But most of all it hurts the workers, because this only goes to companies that are exporting. We are talking about companies that are creating jobs here in this country in order to export.

Now, the gentleman named some companies in particular in his argument. Ingersoll-Rand I heard. I think we heard Nabors Industries, Noble Drilling Corporation, Weatherford International. But this amendment would prohibit any Ex-Im Bank loan or guarantee to any U.S. company, any U.S. company that is registered offshore.

Now, I do not have any percentage of how much U.S. Export-Import Bank loans would be affected by this amendment, but characterizing Ex-Im loans as corporate welfare and a giveaway from U.S. taxpayers is certainly not correct. I am not sure why the sponsors of this amendment do not recognize that exports means U.S. jobs. It is the exact opposite of outsourcing.

The fiscal year 2005 funding for the Ex-Im Bank would support U.S. exports valued at $12 billion. For every $1 of taxpayer money invested in Ex-Im's program, there have been historical returns, and this is not just this year, there have been historical returns of $15 in credit support for export transactions. Since Ex-Im Bank supports 85 percent of most transactions, this means that the actual export value is about 15 percent higher, raising the ratio to about $18 in total value of exports supported by every $1 we put into the Ex-Im program.

I do not think this is corporate welfare. The bank has an exceptional, I would say exceptional, repayment record, with losses running at 1.4 percent of disbursements over the 70-year history of the Ex-Im Bank. And while the Ex-Im Bank has done more and more each year for small businesses, even large companies cannot get private bank financing to go to some parts of the world or to compete with aggressive foreign financing.

While businesses may be able to exist without making that extra sale, Ex-Im Bank is here for that very reason, to keep U.S. exports strong, to hopefully grow them, and to help sustain U.S. jobs through exports. Eighty-six percent of the transactions of the Ex-Im Bank directly benefit small businesses, and that is because many small businesses benefit from the larger transactions of the bank.

□ 1945

Let me give a statistic that alone ought to cause Members to give pause about this amendment. Ex-Im Bank's top 13 users have over 35,000 suppliers in this country, most of which are small businesses. The reality is that small businesses benefit directly and indirectly from Ex-Im Bank-financed transactions.

By law, Ex-Im Bank finances only goods and services made here in the United States. Under this bill, if a U.S. company is cut off from using Ex-Im, the company would be confronted with either losing the export sale or being forced to use foreign financing and sourcing. In either case, the impact would be to reduce U.S. exports and jeopardize the jobs that are associated with those sales. Shutting off Ex-Im would remove one of the few government programs to help U.S. exporters and to keep export-related jobs here in the United States.

One more statistic. I have been able to find information on two of the companies that were mentioned.

Ingersoll-Rand has 28,000 employees here in the United States, not overseas. These are employees here in the U.S. Nabors Industries has 14,000 employees here in the United States. This amendment cuts off financing that helps to keep those jobs secure.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which I know is not an organization that perhaps my colleague on the other side would put too much stock in, but I think they made a very important point in the letter that they wrote about this a couple of days ago to the Speaker. They made this statement, and I quote:

Measures such as Representative SANDERS' amendment are poor substitutes for needed reforms of the U.S. Tax Code's archaic international provisions which currently put our corporations at a competitive disadvantage internationally and provide great incentive for them to leave this country.

That brings me back to my final point that I said at the beginning. The real issue here is the archaic Tax Code that the United States has. We are not even talking about 20th century. We are talking about 19th century. We have a Tax Code that is so archaic, we are virtually the only country in the world that taxes all income whether or not it has anything to do with being produced here in the United States. So, of course, it encourages companies to go offshore, to locate offshore their corporate headquarters. They are still paying the taxes on everything they make here in the United States, Ingersoll-Rand, Nabors, all of those pay the taxes on all the income that is made here in the United States, but they do not want to pay the taxes on a subsidiary they may have in South Africa or a subsidiary they may have in Japan or elsewhere, and so they locate their corporate headquarters offshore. It is because of the archaic Tax Code that the United States continues to have.

That is what we really need to be doing. That is what we really need to be reforming, is the Tax Code. We are in the 21st century, not the 19th century. That would make us more competitive in the world. Why do we have DaimlerChrysler and not ChryslerDaimler? We have DaimlerChrysler because of the Tax Codes of the United States. In order to avoid paying taxes on production done in Germany, it was necessary for them to become DaimlerChrysler, not ChryslerDaimler. Otherwise, they would have been paying taxes on everything they produced, every car they produced in Germany.

That is why this is so important that we continue to have Ex-Im Bank. It is a crutch, if you will, but it is something that we can do to help U.S. corporations export, and it helps American workers keep their jobs. Ex-Im Bank only goes to corporations for doing business producing here in the United States.

I urge my colleagues, in conclusion, to oppose this amendment. It hurts U.S. workers. It jeopardizes U.S. jobs. Now is not the time to further cut, to eliminate one of the few tools the U.S. Government has to support exports and export-related manufacturing jobs. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) will be postponed.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I am pleased to yield to my good friend from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) who chooses to comment on a very important area of the bill.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the chairman and ranking member. I appreciate their work in crafting this bill. It is a good bill, and I will support it. I understand that the bill is a delicate balance, negotiated down to the last dollar. It is a good example of bipartisanship and what we can accomplish when Members of both parties work together.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice to those who support increased funding for the Child Survival and Maternal Health programs. Currently, 30,000 children under the age of 5 die every day, more than 10 million per year, from easily preventable or treatable diseases each year. Millions of children die in their first month or even year of life from malnutrition, diarrhea, pneumonia, malaria, and other common childhood diseases. Such high rates of child mortality have a devastating impact on families and communities in countries around the world.

These 10 million deaths are not inevitable. The health conditions that often prove fatal for young children can be treated and prevented with inexpensive interventions that have proven to be effective. Millions of children today are already benefiting from these interventions, many as a result of programs implemented by USAID or the United Nations Children's Fund, using the resources provided by the Child Survival and Maternal Health Fund.

In 2000, the United States joined 188 other member nations of the United Nations pledging to reduce child deaths worldwide by two-thirds and maternal deaths by three-fourths before 2015. An increase in the Child Survival Account will help us get there.

As the chairman and ranking member know, I had considered offering an amendment that would have raised funding for this account. At the request of the gentleman from Arizona and the gentlewoman from New York, I did not offer it, but I want to say that the child survival programs are critical to our Nation's leadership on global health issues, and I would urge them to support the highest possible allocation for child health programs as this bill moves through the rest of the legislative process.

I thank them for the opportunity to engage in this colloquy.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my good colleague from Connecticut for her discussion on this very important subject; and certainly as the chairman and I were crafting this bill, we acknowledge how important these issues are. I want to assure the gentlewoman that if there were more money to distribute, a good deal more would have gone to that very important effort. As we work towards conference, if we can possibly find some additional funds, we certainly will heed her important remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I certainly thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for talking about this issue. As the gentlewoman knows, both the gentlewoman from New York and I feel very strongly about the Child Survival and Health Account and the good work that is done by this account in helping save children's lives and families and the poor people around the world. The vaccination programs, the health programs, the clinics, the education programs that are run through this are extraordinarily important.

I quite agree with the gentlewoman from Connecticut. Everything we can do to increase the amount in this account is certainly something that we intend to do. I appreciate her bringing it to our attention. We will do everything that we can to try to increase this account.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEAL OF GEORGIA

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. 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. DEAL of Georgia:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

GOVERNMENTS THAT HAVE FAILED TO PERMIT CERTAIN EXTRADITIONS

SEC. 576. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide assistance to the government of any country with which the United States has an extradition treaty and which has failed to permit the extradition to the United States, for trial or sentencing in the United States, of individuals accused of committing criminal offenses for which the maximum penalty is life imprisonment without the possibility of parole, or a lesser term of imprisonment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that provides as follows: that none of the funds made available in this act may be used to provide assistance to the government of any country with which the United States has an extradition treaty and which has failed to permit the extradition to the United States for trial or sentencing in the United States of individuals accused of committing criminal offenses for which the maximum penalty is life imprisonment without the possibility of parole or a lesser term of imprisonment.

This is foreign operations appropriations. Normally, most of the discussions that we have relate to activities that occur in other countries and the amount of money that we are going to send from taxpayers in this country to another country. The heart of this amendment, however, relates to things that are happening here in our own country.

The classic example that I would cite to this body to illustrate the magnitude of this problem occurred a little over 2 years ago when Los Angeles County Sheriff's Deputy David March pulled over a Mexican national named Armando Garcia, a twice-deported illegal alien who had been convicted of drug activities and who had currently two outstanding warrants for attempted murder. Garcia knew that if he were arrested, he would probably be deported for a third time and perhaps go to prison. As Officer March approached the automobile, Garcia pulled a handgun and shot Officer March; and as he lay on the ground, Garcia exited his vehicle and shot Officer March again to make sure that he was dead. Garcia then immediately fled to Mexico where he apparently remains free today.

Several months after this incident occurred, the Supreme Court of Mexico ruled that they would not allow extradition for anyone who faced imprisonment of life without the possibility of parole. Most extradition treaties that we have around the world already exclude the extradition of individuals who would face capital punishment. In the State of California in this case, the mandatory or optional sentence would be life without parole or the death penalty for the killing of a police officer in the line of duty. So what we have is a police officer who has been executed by a foreign national in our country who has now fled back to his home country, who cannot be brought back to trial in this country for that murder and who will not be tried in his own country for that murder.

That is an outrage. It is an outrage for this Congress to continue to send the tax dollars of Deputy David March's widow to a country that refuses to bring her husband's murderer to justice. This is an example that has occurred in our relationship with Mexico, but there are numerous similar examples with other countries around the world.

I think it is time that this Congress faced up to this ever-growing problem, because I am told that there are hundreds of other families in this country

whose loved ones have been murdered and who likewise cannot have those murderers brought to justice.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia bringing this amendment tonight. I am a little distressed that it needs to be an amendment, frankly. This is a problem that must and has to be dealt with.

I am happy that this amendment does deal with any country that will not extradite nationals to the U.S., but I am particularly concerned about the one I know of particularly from Mexico, David March, one that a lot of us have been concerned about, frankly, for a long time. We do not really understand why the United States Government does not deal with this.

At the first of the year, we had written the President and asked why in the world do we not deal with a problem like this, the extradition back into our country. We really do have a formal agreement with them for extradition. It was not something that I could understand why you would put a family through this.

The White House sends it to the State Department, the State Department works overnight and gets us an answer back 6 months later to say that, gosh, we're sorry we can't help with that. President Fox is not in the judiciary in Mexico. We couldn't possibly bother him because he is in the executive branch.

None of that makes any sense to me, but what does make sense to me is that we tell any country but in this case and in particular we tell Mexico that if you want to be our friend, act like our friend. If you do not want to be our friend, there has to be some penalties; and in this case and in this bill we simply say that we are not going to fund the Mexican government. Is it $40 million a year, I believe, that we send down there or there is $40 million in this bill? You just do not get that this year.

I know we are going to hear a lot of concerns about that. I really need to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question or two, if I may, about the effects of this bill and the $40 million. I am told, and I think I am told correctly, that Mexico, that country, sends more illegal drugs into this country than any other. Of course, that does not sound very friendly to me, as if they are real friends, but the fact that they do send so many drugs into our country, we have to send them $40 million or we cannot possibly stop. That may not be the best use of $40 million, but I would like to hear your response to that, the maker of the amendment, why this is or is not such a bad thing.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. In response to the gentleman's inquiry, I think it is certainly an appropriate inquiry. I would suggest that if we really want to stop the flow of drugs from Mexico, rather than sending that $40 million there, we could use it on our border to beef up our DEA, our Customs and others to try to stop it here.

The real irony of the argument that we cannot deal with the lack of extradition is that, first of all, if we really want to deal with Mexican drug problems, under the current status of affairs if a Mexican drug dealer comes to our country and in the process of his illegal activity of selling drugs in our country he kills either an officer or a private citizen and then returns back to his own country, a drug dealer cannot be brought to justice because Mexico will not allow it.

□ 2000

That to me is the greatest irony of all. I would suggest that if we really want to do something about the Mexican drug traffic, I understand their cartels are the leading distributors and manufacturers of drugs in our own country. So I would suggest that we can use the money better here at home.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, so the gentleman is telling me that when Mexico does not cooperate with us on a treaty that we have with them, we are not going to send them that $40 million to try to stop the illicit drug trade, but we could use that $40 million, for example, in other places to stop that illicit drug trade.

Does the gentleman have any idea, and I do not know, the 40 millions of dollars we were sending down to Mexico in the past to work with International Narcotics Control, are they doing any good? Do we have any proof that that money is working?

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I am sure there are arguments that can be made that it does some good, but Mexico continues to be the main source of illegal drugs into this country. And if we are doing something, it has not been as effective as it should have been.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if, in fact, Mexico was sending us 5,000 metric tons of marijuana, 50 metric tons of amphetamine, and 10 metric tons of heroin, we are not doing really good stopping it with that $40 million. I will tell the gentleman that. Maybe we need to tell them if they do not want to work with us in sending murderers back to our justice system, perhaps we need to keep our $40 million and put it in American hands to stop the illegal traffic.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is left on my side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I believe that Mexico is making very tiny progress, but a little progress. But there are not very many ways to address this. And the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), both as vice chairman of the Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources Subcommittee and in general, has been very active in bringing awareness to this subject.

We held a hearing, and we need to understand that it was not just Deputy Sheriff March who was killed. The Los Angeles County District Attorney told us at that hearing over 200 murder suspects in Los Angeles County alone have fled to Mexico.

We have to address this question. It is tough enough with the death penalty; but if we cannot even do life imprisonment, how in the world are we going to enforce our law in the United States, and how can we not have a double standard, actually a triple standard, on our citizens? They can get the death penalty. They can get life in prison. But if they can get across the border, there will be no penalty. It is a travesty, and we have to figure out some way to make this stick.

And I appreciate the gentleman's leadership. We need to continue to work at this and make sure that the government of Mexico understands this cannot stand. This has to change, or we will be out of control on our borders as we see murderers flee across and we cannot get them back.

I rise in support of the Deal Amendment. On October 1 of last year, the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources addressed the status of the extradition process, an area of growing concern for lawmakers and law enforcement officials throughout the U.S.

The most significant problem with the extradition process today is the conditions imposed by foreign nations on extradition. This problem is not new. For many decades now, certain nations that ban the death penalty within their own borders have refused to extradite any criminal who could face the death penalty in the U.S. Other countries refuse to extradite any fugitive who was convicted in absentia. Prosecutors in the U.S. have generally dealt with this problem by agreeing to seek life imprisonment instead of the death penalty, or by agreeing to hold a retrial.

In October 2001, however, the Mexican Supreme Court issued a decision banning the extradition of anyone facing life imprisonment without the possibility of parole, on the grounds that the Mexican constitution gives all criminals the right to be rehabilitated and reintegrated into society. Thus, no matter how heinous the crime or how dangerous the criminal, Mexico will refuse to extradite anyone facing life imprisonment—which in most of our states is the minimum punishment for first degree murder. If Mexican authorities officially refuse an extradition request, they will then proceed to prosecute the fugitive under their own law—which often results in much lesser penalties. American prosecutors thus face a

dilemma. They must either agree to charge a murderer with manslaughter or another lesser offense that does not match the seriousness of the crime; or they must trust to the Mexican justice system. Many prosecutors have simply refused to request extradition under such conditions preferring to hope that the fugitive will sneak back into the U.S. and be apprehended.

The case of Deputy Sheriff David March illustrates this problem. Deputy March, a seven-year veteran of the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, was murdered while making a routine traffic stop in April 2002. His suspected killer, Armando Garcia, a Mexican national and violent drug dealer who had been deported three times from the U.S., immediately fled to Mexico. Mexican authorities have refused to extradite Garcia, on the grounds that he faces, at a minimum, life imprisonment.

This is indeed not an isolated case; the Los Angeles district attorney's office estimates that over 200 murder suspects in Los Angeles County alone have fled to Mexico. In response, several Members of Congress have offered legislation calling for changes to the existing extradition treaty.

Other issues surrounding the extradition process must also be examined by Congress. For example, in March 2002 the Justice Department's Inspector General released a report criticizing the Criminal Division's Office of International Affairs, the main Justice Department agency responsible for extradition matters, for its management of extradition cases. Questions have also been raised about how vigorously other federal agencies with potential influence are pursuing extradition cases.

It is important the concerns Mr. DEAL raises be addressed at the highest level of the government. We need to send a signal to the Government of Mexico and other nations that cop-killing drug dealers must be extradited to the United States for prosecution.

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

I certainly will not take the 10 minutes. Let me just quickly make a couple of comments.

I appreciate the comments that have been made here by the gentleman from Georgia, the other gentleman from Georgia, and the gentleman from Indiana here. I share the outrage that people feel about somebody who is a murderer of a law enforcement officer in this country getting away to a country like Mexico and then being able to escape justice. That should not happen. We have extradition treaties with a number of countries; and almost all of them in many cases, I should say, since most other countries prohibit death penalties, they do prohibit extradition if death is an option as a penalty.

But this is a new wrinkle. This is a new wrinkle that was put in by the supreme court in Mexico, which ruled that if an individual faces life in prison without possibility of parole, that is equivalent, apparently is what the supreme court said, and I have not read the complete ruling. I am a little sympathetic to the government of Mexico, which I do not think anticipated this. They certainly did not suggest to us or to the State Department that they anticipated this ruling by the supreme court, and I think they are willing and trying to work with us to resolve that.

We want to see that all crimes that are committed on our soil are brought to justice. We want to see them brought to justice particularly when it is a law enforcement officer who is the victim of this kind of terrible crime. So I intend to work with the gentleman to encourage the State Department to make every possible effort in these cases.

But before I close, let me just make one other comment, that is, I think there is a danger here of mixing some apples and oranges here when we talk about this punishment of Mexico and then we talk about whether or not they are having any effect in solving the drug problem. I would point out that this bill also contains $731 million for the Andean Counter-Drug Initiative, that is, Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador. Those are the countries where most of the raw materials for our drugs that are consumed in this country come from. But I am sure that the three gentlemen that have spoken here would not suggest we would today cut off that money because we have not been effective. That argument has been made by some on this floor, and I do not think it is a good argument. We should do that. The $40 million that we provide to INL, the international narcotics force that we have overseas, goes largely in Mexico to support the helicopter program, that is, to maintain and supply the helicopters that are used both in chasing down drug smugglers, that is, in small planes, and in eradication efforts.

So I think it is money that is probably well spent, and I would suggest it is not money we would really want to cut off here. And with that I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I will tell the chairman I am prepared to withdraw the amendment. I will, however, say that even though I do support our efforts to interdict drugs overseas, that until those governments recognize that when someone comes into our country either legally or illegally, kills a law enforcement officer or any other citizen, or engages in major drug trafficking in our own country that under the provisions of their own laws or constitutions it prohibits them from being prosecuted for it that they have to understand if they want to be a partner in these efforts, that is the first step they should begin to take to show their good faith.

I would suggest if they want to show good faith, they should allow the murderer of Officer March to be brought to justice in the United States.

I do thank the gentleman for his indulgence. I would urge him to press this issue forward as we go forward with further funding issues. And I, quite frankly, would urge our administration to reexamine the extradition treaty not only with Mexico but with any other country that throws up these impediments. It is a double insult to the American public to have someone come into our country, kill our law enforcement officers or our citizens, and then be able to escape back to their own country and not be brought to justice.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I appreciate the opportunity to spend 5 minutes on an issue that I wanted to bring up in the form of an amendment, and that deals with the $300 million that will be going to Pakistan. And I call this to attention because I think it is a very unwise expenditure. But I want to make my case for this in the context of overall foreign policy.

Essentially for 100 years, we have accepted the foreign policy of Woodrow Wilson. It is a flawed idealism that we should, and it is our responsibility to, make the world safe for democracy. That did not just exist for World War I, which led to a peace treaty which caused a lot of problems leading up to World War II; but those notions are well engrained in the current neoconservative approach to foreign policy and the policy that this administration follows. But I do not think it is in the best interests of our country to follow this.

The advice of the Founders was that we should be more balanced in our approach and not favoring special nations, not giving money or weapons or getting involved in any alliances with the different nations of the world and we would all be better off for it.

I believe that this policy is a failure and has been very costly. If we think about the last 100 years how many lives were lost, how much blood has been spilled, how many dollars have been spent in this effort to make the world safe for democracy, the world is probably as unsafe now as it has ever been. And here we are. We are proposing that we send $300 million under this policy to Pakistan.

We are in Iraq to promote democracy, but here we send money to a military dictator who overthrew an elected government. And there just seems to be a tremendous inconsistency here. There was a military coup in 1999. There is the strong possibility that Osama bin Laden may well be in Pakistan. And to actually send money there, we are prohibited from really

going in there and looking for Osama bin Laden; so we give the government of Pakistan money in the hopes that they will be helpful to us.

There is quite a bit of difference between the foreign policy of neutrality and friendship with everyone versus giving money and support to everyone. And if we look at our history, it has not worked very well. We have in the past given money to both sides of a lot of wars, and right now we try to be friends and we give money in support to both India and Pakistan. I do not bring this amendment up here to be pro either one or anti either one. I want to have a pro-American foreign policy and not say, well, I want to punish Pakistan and help India or vice versa.

We have helped people who have been arch enemies for years. Take Greece and Turkey. We helped both sides. But not only do we help both sides of a lot of these fights that have been going on for a long time, we literally help our enemies. Just think of the support we gave Osama bin Laden when he was fighting the Russians in Afghanistan and just think of our alliance with Saddam Hussein in the 1980s when we did provide him with a lot of destructive weapons. That type of policy does not add up. It does not make a lot of sense. It is not in our best interests, and my suggestion here is hopefully somewhere along the way, we will take a serious look at this and redirect our foreign policy.

But, specifically, is it a wise expenditure to put $300 million into the government of Pakistan with the pretense that we are promoting democracy by supporting a military dictator at the same time our young men are dying in Iraq promoting democracy? It does not add up, and it suggests that there are other motives for some of these expenditures and some of our motivations around the world.

In the past we have been arch enemies of Libya, but now we have decided they will be our friends. And I am not against that in particular, but I am against giving them subsidies and helping them out.

There is such a difference between neutrality and friendship and that of giving weapons and arms and promoting antagonisms.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 6 offered by Mr. NETHERCUTT:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS THAT ARE PARTIES TO THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act in title II under the heading ''ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND'' may be used to provide assistance to the government of a country that is a party to the International Criminal Court and has not entered into an agreement with the United States pursuant to Article 98 of the Rome Statute preventing the International Criminal Court from proceeding against United States personnel present in such country.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

□ 2015

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

Mr. Chairman, I also want to say congratulations to the chairman of the subcommittee. He has done a fine job and has worked very hard to get this bill through. As a Member of the Committee on Appropriations, I will support this bill.

I do want to have a discussion about this amendment, because, 2 years ago, we enacted the Armed Service Members Protection Act as part of the fiscal year 2002 Supplemental Appropriations Act. ASPA was a response to the International Criminal Court entering into force, creating the very real possibility of unconstitutional, extraterritorial and politically motivated prosecutions against military service members. The U.S. is not a party to the ICC, but our troops could face prosecution under the treaty.

As a result, the administration has understandably been very concerned about committing troops to support U.N. peacekeeping operations around the world without some assurance that our troops would not face ICC prosecution. For the last 2 years, we have operated under Security Council resolutions blocking ICC prosecutions.

Unfortunately, 3 weeks ago, lacking the support of the Security Council, the U.S. was forced to drop its request for a third extension of this waiver, meaning that our troops are now subject to ICC jurisdiction. At the end of June, the administration pulled out of two small peacekeeping missions because of this concern.

ASPA created a powerful tool for protecting our troops by prohibiting military assistance to countries that had not signed bilateral Article 98 agreements with the United States, agreeing not to surrender U.S. nationals to the ICC. The Act also included all of the necessary waivers to protect the President's foreign policy prerogatives.

My amendment today would simply give the President an additional tool to protect our troops by prohibiting Economic Support Funding as well as military assistance to the government of countries that are both parties to the ICC and have not signed Article 98 agreements.

This distinction is important because traditional development assistance through ESF typically is administered by a USAID contract to an NGO. Such assistance would not be restricted. Similarly, funding for the international Fund for Ireland and the Walsh Visa Program could continue, as funding goes to non-governmental entities.

I want to see the U.S. engaged around the world supporting international efforts to keep the peace. That is our responsibility and obligation as a superpower. But we should not have to risk the unconstitutional prosecution of our troops in the process.

A vote for my amendment is a vote for continued U.S. engagement and the continued protection of our personnel deployed around the world in support of multilateral peacekeeping efforts.

Signing an Article 98 agreement, as 90 other nations have done, is not too much to expect from nations receiving millions of dollars in U.S. assistance. We have an obligation to protect our Armed Forces from unconstitutional extraterritorial prosecution.

Moreover, this amendment sends a powerful message to the world community that when we commit U.S. troops overseas we will insist that they be protected by Article 98 agreements, if the Security Council will not do its part.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) claim the time in opposition?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I agree with the motivations of this amendment, but I absolutely have to oppose the substance of it. The reason I do so is because I think it is going to accomplish exactly the opposite of the intent of this amendment.

Proponents of this amendment are, as the gentleman suggested, upset at opposition the U.S. faced at the United Nations Security Council in getting an extension of a U.S. exemption under the jurisdiction of the ICC. We were successful for some time in getting that, but now it has failed because we have faced a public relations nightmare in the United Nations and elsewhere around the world.

Do we have a right to be angry and upset and outraged that we have not gotten this extension? Yes, I think we should be; and we should continue to press for an extension.

Many times this Chamber has supported the American Servicemembers Protections Act, and I have been among its strongest supporters. I believe it is crucial that the U.S. negotiate Article 98 agreements with as many countries as possible to prevent the possibility that they may be tried in an international criminal court, with little or no political accountability.

However, conditioning ESF assistance and cutting it off to nations that do not sign Article 98 agreements is not, in my opinion, the right response. It is a very, very heavy hand to the problem.

We have conditioned foreign assistance through FMF and IMF accounts to encourage countries to sign Article 98 agreements. The result of this amendment, if it were to pass, would be to cut off all aid to some of these countries: Jordan, at $250 million; Kenya, at $25 million; Lebanon, at $32 million; Ecuador, at $13 million; Cyprus, at $13.5 million.

I believe most of us believe trying to get a Cyprus agreement is very important. I think all of us believe that Jordan is extraordinarily important in our war against terrorism. But it would cut off our ESF assistance and I think it would do extraordinary damage to our relationship with Jordan. How are we going to explain to them what we are really trying to do in getting them to cooperate in the war on terrorism?

At a time when we are fighting the war on terrorism, reducing this tool of diplomatic influence is not a good idea. Nothing would make the opponents of the U.S. in the Security Council and the U.N. General Assembly happier than if we were to do that. They do not like us using foreign assistance to support U.S. strategic interests. So if we were to cut it off, it makes them happy on two accounts: It will have denied the U.S. the exemption in the first instance, and it will have reduced our influence around the world.

So I urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment. If we accept it, the U.S. will be hamstringing itself, placing a straitjacket on its diplomatic tools, when we have a lot of U.S. national security objectives that must carry the same or equal weight as securing Article 98 agreements. I urge a ''no'' vote on this.

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to point out that ASPA exempts Jordan, and my argument to the chairman would be that we can exempt Jordan in conference. If this amendment passes, we can exempt Jordan in conference, as I would agree we should.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Let me see if I have got this straight: The United Nations has created an International Criminal Court, a shady amalgam of every bad idea ever cooked up for world government.

The United States, its President, this Congress and the American people has categorically, unequivocally and completely rejected the ICC and its insistence on threatening the American people with prosecution. We reject its laughable legitimacy, we reject its U.N.-American denial of civil rights, and we reject its anti-American politics. And yet the ICC still asserts jurisdiction over the American people, including American soldiers fighting the war on terror and still salivates at the prospect of prosecuting one of us for anything the U.N. does not like.

Now, some nations who receive economic support from the United States may use the money we give them to arrest and hand over American citizens to the U.N.'s kangaroo court?

I do not think so.

President Bush has shown great leadership by removing the United States from the treaty creating the ICC, and Congress has passed legislation, the American Servicemembers Protection Act, to ensure our soldiers and peacekeepers around the world are protected from prosecution in it. Federal law now requires all countries who seek American military assistance sign an agreement assuring us they will not hand over our soldiers to the ICC; and, since its enactment, more than 90 countries have signed such an agreement.

The ASPA has proven to be a valuable tool in the war on terror, and the Nethercutt amendment takes that leverage to the next step, making American economic support contingent on a promise not to turn over our troops to the ICC. The Nethercutt amendment will forestall any attempt by a foreign country that receives American economic aid to arrest and extradite American soldiers to Kofi Annan's kangaroo court.

Now, let us be real clear: The ICC presents a clear and present danger to the war on terror and Americans who are fighting it all over the world. The United Nations just last month refused to extend protection from the ICC to American troops abroad. This was at once an ominous sign of things to come and an urgent call for Congress to do its duty and protect our men and women in uniform.

That is exactly what this vote is. If you want to go home to your constituents and tell them that you think that their tax dollars should go to foreign countries who allow American soldiers to be imprisoned and shipped off to Brussels without their constitutional rights, then, by all means, vote no on the Nethercutt amendment.

If, however, you think American troops should retain their human and constitutional rights even when they step on foreign soil and if you think American economic support should only go to countries who guarantee such protection for our soldiers, then stand with the American people, the President and the men and women winning the war on terror and vote yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) has 30 seconds remaining and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman's amendment and all the discussion may sound good, but it would have a sweeping and potentially devastating impact. It would cut off, and I want to make it clear, if you read this amendment, it would cut off economic assistance to a long list of countries in the Middle East and Asia of vital strategic importance to the United States in fighting the war on terrorism, and that includes Jordan, Indonesia, Turkey and Cyprus. It would end economic assistance to South Africa, as well as a number of other African countries such as Angola, Ethiopia, Kenya and Sudan. The amendment would also cut assistance to Peru, Mexico and Ecuador, where U.S. counter-drug programs are attempting to stem the flow of narcotics to our country.

I could go on. But, in conclusion, I would like to make one final point: The American Servicemembers Protection Act of 2002 prohibits military assistance to countries that have not entered into Article 98 agreements with the United States. Although I opposed the bill, it became a law. But that bill, however, gave the President waiver authority for national security reasons. He has exercised that waiver for at least 16 countries so far. The Nethercutt amendment does not even allow the President that waiver authority and would result in the immediate cessation of economic assistance to many of the important allies to which I referred.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the arguments on both sides. I think the most compelling argument is that if these countries want to receive money from the United States, it is simple: Sign an Article 98 agreement, and then you can receive the money.

But in these very dangerous times in which we find ourselves, I think the bottom line is we have to protect our American servicemen and women overseas on peacekeeping missions.

It worked in one case. I am informed Eritrea has agreed to sign an Article 98 agreement as we decided to remove our peacekeeping force from that country. So it works, and this is a logical and appropriate conclusion for us to take as a country.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, let me, in conclusion, just say that the majority leader made the point that we should be protecting our servicemen, and he is absolutely correct. And he made the point that we have provisions in the law that says countries cannot get military financing or military support if they do not give us an exemption to Article 98. But he also pointed out that we have an exemption in there. We have an ability that the President can have a waive for those countries.

This takes it, as the majority leader said, another step to economic support, and there is no waiver in there. This

means one of our key allies, and I keep coming back to Jordan, because I think Jordan is absolutely one of our key allies in this fight against terrorism, that we would have to cut off all the economic assistance to Jordan, because, for whatever reason, they have seen it in a different way and they have chosen, at least at this point, not to give us this exemption. I do not see how that helps us in the war against terrorism.

I hope we will defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) will be postponed.

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:

Page 12, line 10, insert after the dollar figure the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 18, line 22, insert after the dollar figure the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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, as I start, I want to acknowledge the very hard work and I believe a commitment of the chairman of this committee to the point that I am about to make, as well as the historic commitment of the ranking member, because I have worked with her over the years on this question of sustainable development, the opportunity for many who are undernourished and struck by famine to sustain themselves.

□ 2030

Many of my colleagues are aware of the relationship of my congressional district to Congressman Mickey Leland. Many of my colleagues knew of his passion and commitment to Ethiopia and the famines that occurred in the 1980s. In fact, Mickey Leland lost his life in 1989 when he died on the side of an Ethiopian mountain trying to carry food resources to the famine-stricken individuals in Ethiopia. Ethiopia, along with other sub-Saharan nations in Africa, have suffered famine now for many, many cycles since his tragic death.

What we see here is an example of a farmer in sub-Saharan Africa trying to survive. He is not asking for food; but as we look at this arid background, he is working with a sickle, if you will, dealing with lack of irrigation, all representing the crisis of famine in sub-Saharan Africa.

So each time we have a cycle of a drought, lack of water, what we will find is teams and teams of teeming groups of Ethiopians and others going to feeding stations simply to survive.

In my most recent visit to Ethiopia, the cycle of drought and famine were again very present. We went into many parts of the country and visited enormous, large sites of families who had left their farming sites because they could not farm, there was no water, there were no tools, and they were not able to survive. They simply were in sickness-infested feeding camps with volunteers and USAID workers and others doing the very best that they could; but they kept coming, because we have not been able to provide the necessary resources for sustainable development.

This amendment is small in nature, but it is $5 million being put into the development assistance to help those in sub-Saharan Africa. It is to help them with small-scale irrigation, water and drainage, postharvest storage, crop intensification, crop and livestock diversification, and rural infrastructure such as in the special program for food security of the food and agriculture organization of the United States.

It is shameful that we have not authorized the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 since 1987. So these dollars will simply help put life, water in the ground, irrigation resources, so that we can follow that old admonition that if we give a person a fish, they eat for a day; if we give them a rod, a fishing rod, they eat for a very long time.

We realize that through the FAO our distinguished colleague, Eva Clayton, has been working with the FAO now, and we realize that part of the problem is a lack of infrastructure. Constraints to agricultural development in Africa, says the President, and the continent's poor agriculture performance is water. Africa uses only 4 percent of its renewable water reserve for irrigation as compared to 17 percent in Asia. Only 7 percent of Africa's arable land is irrigated, against 37 percent in Asia. We need to have USAID have a separate and enhanced resource for food security. It is important to note that we can make a difference, and this amendment simply attempts to do so.

So I would ask my colleagues to take a hard look at this farmer in this picture. He represents and is symbolic of many others throughout the various countries in sub-Saharan Africa. My colleagues will find out that famine goes hand in hand with the drastic conditions of drought. Drought comes in a very frequent time frame in this area.

In speaking with the President of Ethiopia, speaking with USAID, they declared that Ethiopia, for example, only had $4 million set aside to help a farmer farm better, to get more enhanced farming skills and tools, to irrigate the water. So I believe that this mere attempt to respond to FAO, the works of Tony Hill, the chairman and president, and our colleague, Eva Clayton, and in the memory of Mickey Leland to realize that sustaining the farmers will help to stamp out hunger.

I would hope that we would be prepared to support such an amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by simply saying Ethiopia's famine threat continues to increase. I simply hope that we will find in our hearts the ability to support this amendment in order to save lives.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the current bill and to applaud Chairman KOLBE and Ranking Member LOWEY for their hard work and leadership in crafting an effective piece of legislation. However, in making appropriations for the entire Nation, it is virtually impossible to have a complete assessment or to profess a complete breadth of knowledge of the regions that need the most assistance—because this is an ever-changing issue.

I have an amendment at the desk. Again, I rise to support the current bill and offer an amendment that speaks to the problems of sustainable development and subsistence farming in Africa and other needy regions. I urge that $5 million be appropriated for agricultural development in sub-Saharan Africa and taken from the Economic Support Fund found in Title II.

Funds requested in this amendment to be administered by USAID are clearly authorized under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

This money would not only provide assistance to needy farmers and villages, but it would also strengthen infrastructure and encourage sustainable growth.

Mr. Chairman, developing and developed countries around the world are experiencing food shortages. There are an estimated 842 million undernourished persons, 798 million of which live in developing countries, 34 million of which live in countries in transition and 10 million of which live in industrialized countries.

Africa is undeniably the hardest hit of all continents, which claims 24 of the 34 countries experiencing food emergencies. The sub-Saharan African region, though, is facing the brunt of this crisis with some 207 million people in 1999–2001. That amounts to nearly 26 percent of the population facing inadequate access to nutritious food supplies.

Those living in poor, rural areas are the most vulnerable. They comprise 70 percent of the continent's population and are the most in need of agricultural development because their livelihoods are depending on agriculture.

Small farmers produce the food that feeds the men, women, babies, and the elders living in the small villages scattered across the arid landscape of Africa. If we neglect Africa's rural population, we neglect Africa's backbone. If we provide these farmers with the necessary resources to shore up inefficient and antiquated infrastructure we open the door to alleviating a host of other problems that plague almost ¾ of Africa's population.

My proposal would allow for the development of small-scale irrigation, water and drainage, post-harvest storage, crop intensification,

crop and livestock diversification, and rural infrastructure. Such improvements to infrastructure would encourage sustainable development and lead to a decrease in food shortage in the short and long run.

Right now, only 7 percent of arable land is irrigated, and groups like FAO is working with governments and U.N. and NGO partners to protect and restore agriculture-based livelihoods in crisis countries through the supply of essential inputs, including improved seeds, tools, fertilizer, veterinary medicines and vaccines, livestock feeds and irrigation, fishing and agro-processing equipment, as well as through crop and livestock pest and disease control campaigns, the immediate rehabilitation of essential agricultural infrastructure, and putting in place natural disaster prevention mechanisms.

In addition, members of the House International Relations Subcommittee on Africa have recognized the importance of the issues to be addressed by this proposal.

We must help these people whose lives depend on the fruits of subsistence farming. Furthermore, these farmers are severely undertrained and lack proper irrigation technologies and other resources to create more arable land options. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, for the reasons stated above, I ask that my colleagues support the Jackson-Lee Amendment.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add the following for the RECORD:

BACKGROUND ON ETHIOPIA

Over 80 percent of Ethiopia's 57 million people live in rural areas, where most of them are engaged in subsistence farming or pastoralism. Altitudes in Ethiopia vary greatly. The lowlands are characterized by dry, sometimes drought-stricken, areas occupied mainly by nomadic or semi-nomadic pastoralists. In the mid-altitude areas such crops as maize, cotton, sorghum and legumes grow. The high-altitude areas are most suited to wheat, barley and coffee cultivation. The staple cereal crop in Ethiopia—teff—grows in mid- to high-altitude areas as does chat which is grown for commercial as well as domestic use. Ethiopia has the highest cattle population in Africa, with large herds providing status to their owners.

Since the 1970s, Ethiopia has been periodically struck by drought, and many areas consistently suffer from erratic and unpredictable rainfall. Pressure on the land is very high, with an average landholding per household in mid- to high-altitude areas of only about 0.2 to 0.6 hectares. Households are typically large with an average of seven members. The use of family planning is not yet widespread in the country, and in rural areas, especially in Muslim communities, early marriage is very common. Girls are often married or committed to marriage at between eight and 12 years of age. Health facilities are limited and sparse and many people die of preventable diseases such as malaria, cholera and typhoid as well as malnutrition.

PRESENTATION BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS (FAO) TO THE U.S. CONGRESSIONAL BLACK CAUCUS, CONGRESSIONAL HUNGER CENTRE, HUMAN RIGHTS CAUCUS, INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE ON AFRICA, JUNE 16, 2004

FOOD SECURITY, WATER AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY IN AFRICA

I wish to thank you all for your interest in Africa's food security. I am especially grateful to the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Hunger Centre for organizing this Roundtable discussion, and for inviting me to give this presentation. I am greatly honoured to be here.

Honourable Members of the House, Ladies and Gentlemen

1. Current food security situation in Africa

FAO estimates that there are about 842 million persons in the world today that are undernourished, 798 million in the developing countries, 34 million in countries in transition and 10 million in industrialized countries. Progress in cutting the incidence of hunger remains painfully slow. At the current rate of progress, the World Food Summit's objective of halving the number of hungry by 2015 will only be achieved in 2150.

While Asia is home to the largest number of the hungry people in the world, it is Africa that has the highest prevalence of hunger—26 percent, some 207 million people in 1999–2001.

In Africa, agriculture accounts for 17 percent of GDP, 57 percent of employment and 10 percent of export earnings. Over 70 percent of the continent's poor live in rural areas, and are primarily dependent upon agriculture for their livelihoods. And yet Africa is the only region in the world in which average per capita food production has been constantly falling for the past 40 years. If current trends persist, the number of undernourished persons on the continent will increase between now and 2015, in contrast to the other developing regions.

In the coming decades, Africa will have to feed a population that is expected to increase from 832 million people in 2002 to over 1800 million in 2050. Because hunger is concentrated mostly in rural areas, growth in small-farm agriculture must be a central element of any effective food security programme. It will have to raise agricultural productivity if it is to meet this challenge.

2. Constraints to agricultural development in Africa

The continent's countries suffer the consequences of variability of output, relatively low yields and heavy dependence on the export of primary commodities, in a context of low elasticity of supply and high volatility of price. Africa's agriculture is undercapitalized, underperforming and uncompetitive. There are many reasons for this. There is, for example, the insignificant use of modern inputs, with only 22 kg of fertilizer applied to each hectare of arable land compared to 144 kg in Asia. The level is even lower in sub-Saharan Africa, which uses 10 kg per hectare.

The seeds that spurred the success of the Green Revolution in Asia and in Latin America are barely used in Africa.

Another factor strongly influencing the continent's poor agricultural performance is water. Africa uses only 4 percent of its renewable water reserves for irrigation as compared to 17 percent in Asia. Only 7 percent of Africa's arable land is irrigated against 37 percent in Asia. Yields from irrigated crops are three times higher than yields from rainfed crops, but agricultural activity on 93 percent of Africa's arable land is dependent on extremely erratic rainfall and therefore seriously exposed to the risk of drought. Eighty percent of food emergencies are linked to water, especially water stress.

The serious shortage of rural infrastructure (rural roads, storage, processing and transport facilities and markets) place present-day Africa on a par with India in the 1950s. This inadequacy of water control and lack of infrastructure constitute the structural limitations that largely explain why Africa's agriculture is unproductive and uncompetitive.

During the past ten years, Africa's fish production has stalled and per capita fish supply has only diminished. Apparent supply has dropped from 9 to 7 kg per person per year. At the world level, fish supplies are increasingly sourced from aquaculture, which now accounts for almost 30 percent of global output, but in Africa aquaculture's contribution is insignificant.

Diseases (in particular malaria and HIV/AIDS) and natural disasters, such as droughts, floods, windstorms, earthquakes, livestock epidemics and locust outbreaks exacerbate the food insecurity.

Conflicts and food insecurity are closely related. The proportion of food emergencies that are man-made has increased over time. Indeed, conflict and economic problems were cited as the main cause of more than 35 percent of food emergencies between 1992 and 2003, as compared to around 15 percent in the period from 1986 to 1991. More than half of the countries where undernourishment is most prevalent experienced conflict during the 1990s.

3. Spotlight on the crisis countries

As I speak, 35 countries in the world are experiencing serious food emergencies, 24 in Africa, where a large number of people depend on food assistance.

The food situation in Eritrea, Somalia and pastoral areas of Ethiopia and Kenya is of particular concern. In Southern Africa, prospects for the 2004 cereal crops are generally unfavourable due to prevailing drought conditions. In Sudan, the civil conflict in Darfur has resulted in the displacement of over a million people, and access to food has been sharply curtailed. In West Africa, internally displaced people and refugees continue to need food assistance in Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone where.

FAO is working with governments and UN and NGO partners to protect and restore agriculture-based livelihoods in crisis countries through the supply of essential inputs, including improved seeds, tools, fertilizer, veterinary medicines and vaccines, livestock feeds and irrigation, fishing and agro-processing equipment, as well as through crop and livestock pest and disease control campaigns, the immediate rehabilitation of essential agricultural infrastructure, and putting in place natural disaster prevention mechanisms.

FAO, in collaboration with UNICEF and WFP, has embarked upon an innovative global programme starting in selected countries in Africa to protect and improve food and nutrition security among populations heavily affected by the HIV/AIDS epidemic. In the vast majority of cases, good nutrition is the only treatment available to people living with HIV/AIDS; even when anti-retroviral medicine is available, a good diet is essential for making the drugs most effective.

4. Water and infrastructure development: key elements

Getting rid of hunger in Africa and elsewhere in the world does not depend on any leap in technology. In the short-term, the focus must be on solutions which lie largely within the reach of Africa's small-scale farmers, including small-scale irrigation, water harvesting, soil conservation and tillage practices which cut rainfall run-off and maximize moisture retention in the soil and short-maturing crop varieties which fit well within the rainy season.

Successful examples exist in countries implementing the FAO's Special Programme for Food Security, an initiative launched in 1994 and now operational in 101 countries (42 in Africa), which aims at assisting mainly low-income food-deficit countries to improve their household and national food security through reduction of year-to-year variability in agricultural production and improvement of people's income and employment, and thus access to food.

It is estimated that the WFS objective cannot be attained without new water control over 16 million hectares and an upgrading of 4 million hectares distributed throughout all African countries. With an average cost of US$ 2,500 per hectare, it should be possible to rapidly double the irrigated area to 14 percent.

The programme of water control and management needs to be supplemented with a package of investment covering also other areas of rural infrastructure. Mobilizing local labour for these infrastructural works should make it possible to cover 40 percent of the cost.

5. Agriculture and food security under NEPAD and AGOA

Africa has the capacity to enhance agriculture and ensure food security. But this requires that political commitment translates into coherent and effective programmes. Agriculture is one of the priorities of the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), a vision and strategic framework for Africa's renewal, conceived and led by African countries. At their Summit in July 2003, the Heads of State and Government of the African Union adopted the Maputo Declaration on Agriculture and Food Security in Africa, under which they called for the urgent implementation of the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), prepared by the NEPAD Secretariat with FAO assistance of FAO; and agreed to allocate at least 10 percent of their national budgets, within five years, to agriculture and rural development.

African governments must now implement this decision; they also need to see that agriculture receives an appropriate allocation of resources from poverty reduction and debt alleviation programmes and programmes of the 9th and successive European Development Funds, as well as from the concessional funds of the World Bank and the African Development Bank, in particular.

Apart from the formulation of the CAADP, FAO has also assisted African countries in updating national strategies for food security and agricultural development towards 2015, and preparing National Medium-Term Investment Programmes and bankable projects. The CAADP foresees a total investment of US$ 251 billion for the period up to 2015. While the resources must come primarily from the national budgets, the developed countries and the international development community must invest in and support these countries.

As African countries make the required agricultural development investment and appropriate policy reforms, fair and open trade opportunities are essential. The value of African agricultural products, including forestry products, entering the US market duty-free under the (US) African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) amounted to US$ 122 million in 2003 up from $60 million in 2001, corresponding to about 10 percent of total African agricultural exports to the US in 2003.

Although the value of African agricultural exports to the US under AGOA is small and has grown only modestly, it is reported to have significant impact in certain parts of Africa and holds promise for other areas.

6. The International Alliance Against Hunger

The right of everyone to have access to safe and nutritious food is affirmed in the opening statement of the Rome Declaration on World Food Security. We do not have an excuse for delaying action; off-the-shelf technologies to increase food and agricultural production under different agroecological systems are widely available. The WFS Plan of Action has provided the road map for reducing and eventually eradicating hunger. What is needed most is political commitment, especially at the national level, to give the problem the priority it deserves supported by a vibrant and strong International Alliance Against Hunger (IAAH), as called for by the World Food Summit: five years later (WFS.fyl) in 2002. World leaders explicitly recognised at both World Food Summit in 1996 and the WFS.fyl that, while the responsibility for national food security lies with the national governments, the battle against hunger and poverty can only be won in partnership with civil society, the NGOs, the private sector, bilateral donors and international organizations.

The International Alliance Against Hunger builds on the many existing initiatives and institutions that are already successfully engaged within their respective mandates in the fight against hunger and poverty and offers a framework for all of them to join forces in giving the hungry a stronger voice and responding to it. One of the objectives of the IAAH is to advocate greater resource flows into developing countries' agriculture. In the context of the Anti-Hunger Programme, unveiled at the World Food Summit: five years later, FAO estimates that, world-wide, some USD 24 billion per year is required to achieve the World Food Summit goal of halving the number of hungry people by 2015: USD 8 billion for food aid and commercial loans, USD 8 billion from developing countries, and another USD 8 billion through concessional loans from international financing institutions and bilateral assistance from developed countries, which themselves provided US$ 318 billion to support their farmers in 2002.

On the occasion of World Food Day 2003, the Rome-based food and agriculture agencies—FAO, IFAD, WFP and IPGRI—together with NGOs, issued an important joint statement to promote the International Alliance Against Hunger. We agreed to join forces, and to bring on board other partners, to eliminate the scourge of hunger. So far, about 78 countries have created or indicated their interest in creating national alliances. The United States ''Alliance to End Hunger'', bringing together Bread for the World, Second Harvest, advocacy groups, foundations and the private sector, was among the first alliances to be organized internationally. The US Alliance is reportedly ready to assist National Alliances in Africa.

In Africa, there are 26 National Alliances Against Hunger. Burkina Faso and Cameroon, for example, have very vibrant alliances.

7. What the US Congress and National Parliaments can do to address world hunger

Both developed and developing countries have a stake and self-interest in ensuring that the world is free of hunger. Hunger has moral, economic and security dimensions. While hunger reduction alone will not eradicate terrorism, enhancing human dignity, ensuring better health and enabling people to have greater freedom of choice will reduce risks of extremism. Greater global stability is clearly in the interest of all people, rich and poor alike.

What can the US Congress and Parliaments do to address world hunger?

First, understand the breadth of issues affecting hunger; there is no silver bullet, but there are several affordable tools available that can make a huge difference to the scale of the global hunger problem.

Secondly, ensure that there is a generous response by the US Government, National Governments and civil society to the calls for assistance of developing countries which are strongly committed to eradicating hunger by allowing them to produce food efficiently for their own consumption and for export.

Thirdly, create better trading conditions by opening up markets for farm produce from developing countries, especially for commodities which depend on heavy labour inputs, such as cotton and sugar.

Fourthly, help African countries build their capacity to improve the quality and safety of their food products, thus allowing them to be more competitive.

The problem of hunger in Africa is immense and deeply rooted in history, but it is also soluble within our lifetime if we put our collective minds to it. We know what to do to end hunger. Many positive examples exist throughout Africa which show how rural livelihoods and nutrition can be improved. Countries like Mozambique have succeeded in turning the tide against hunger. In May 2002, President Alhaji Kabba of Sierra Leone pledged to eradicate hunger within his current 5-year term of office, and set in motion a comprehensive food security programme providing very practical training to farmers, with assistance from FAO and major donors.

What is needed now is to move with boldness from successful pilot programmes to broader food security programmes on a scale commensurate with the size of the food insecurity problem.

I appreciate this opportunity to begin a dialogue on this important subject and look forward to your comments and observation.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to this amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. Let me just say that the substance of the amendment really does not accomplish, as I think the gentlewoman knows, does not accomplish what she would hope to do, because if we read the amendment, it adds money in one spot and takes it out of the other spot. So it really has no impact at all on the amount of funding that would go to sub-Saharan Africa.

The gentlewoman wants to increase the amount of money from development assistance for sub-Saharan Africa. I think by and large we do very well in this bill on sub-Saharan Africa. It is a balanced bill. I think we have some very good increases there. Many of the things that the gentlewoman talks about that I fully subscribe to about the need for greater water resources, for helping farming in those areas, those are the things that we support and that are done in our legislation.

But I think that this would not be the right amendment, since it simply does not do what the gentlewoman would try to accomplish. So I would hope that she would withdraw her amendment; if not, I hope that we will defeat this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this does place $5 million into developmental assistance, and I think that with the statement on the record, it makes it very clear that it can be used for sustainable development.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would just point out that the $5 million that goes into development assistance comes out of

ESF, which also does the same kinds of things. So the Economic Stabilization Fund does the same kinds of things. So it really is just transferring it from one hand to the other, doing the same kinds of programs.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

Mr. WEINER. 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. WEINER:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR SAUDI ARABIA

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance any assistance to Saudi Arabia.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

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

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

My amendment is a simple one. It simply says that no money in this bill shall go to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. To many of those watching this debate, they would be surprised to learn that any money goes to Saudi Arabia at all. It should not, and there are reasons it should not.

First of all, the Saudis are shielding known terrorists. This is not a theory of mine; this is a fact. Just yesterday, the person who was standing to the right of Osama bin Laden as he presented a chilling videotape shot after September 11 showed up at a Saudi airport and gave credit to the Saudi Government for taking him in and offering him amnesty for his crimes. ''Thank God, thank God,'' he said. ''I called the embassy and we were very well received.''

Saudi security forces allowed kidnappers to escape after killing 16 Westerners at a Khobar residential compound on May 29 of this year. Al Qaeda terrorists who kidnapped and killed American contractor Paul Johnson say they used official police uniforms and vehicles received from sympathetic Saudi police. Saudi Prince Abdullah responded with a 1-month amnesty for any terrorist who surrendered voluntarily.

In an October of last year interview in ''The Voice of Jihad,'' Abu Hajjer, an al Qaeda member ranking high on Saudi Arabia's most wanted list, commented with the following quote: ''It is true that we must use the country of Saudi Arabia, because it is the primary source of funds for most Jihad movements. It has some degree of security and freedom of movement.'' This is what members of al Qaeda say about Saudi Arabia.

The Saudis have famously also failed to crack down on terror. Last October when I offered a similar amendment, I heard some of the opponents say, oh, they are getting their act together. As of last month, not a single arrest or prosecution had come from the U.S.-Saudi Joint Terrorist Financing Task Force, which is supposed to cut down on the financing of terror coming out of Saudi; not a single one.

Since September 11, not a single Saudi donor of funds to terrorist groups has been publicly punished, despite Ambassador Bandar's assertion that Saudi Arabia would ''prosecute the guilty to the fullest extent of the law.'' Since September 11, not a single one.

Last month's report by the Council of Foreign Relations on Terrorist Financing says: ''Saudi Arabia has not fully implemented its new laws and regulations and, because of that, opportunities for the witting or unwitting financing of terrorism persists.''

This is not some fringe element of Congress; this is the Council on Foreign Relations.

The Saudis finally are exploiting Wahabism. This is not even a question that the Saudis dispute. In March of 2002, an official Saudi magazine, Ain al-Yaqueen, wrote that the royal family wholly or partly funded some 210 Islamic centers, 1,500 mosques, 202 colleges, and 2,000 schools in countries without Muslim majorities to spread Wahabism.

So why is there any money in this bill going to the Saudis at all? Why is this amendment even necessary?

The most telling is from the President's own budget request. In the President's budget request, they explain why it is necessary to keep a small amount of money for the Saudis in our budget, with taxpayer dollars. Here is what it says. The modest amount of IMET funds requested permit the Saudi Government to purchase military training in the United States at a considerably lower cost than is charged countries that are not eligible. And get this: it says, the President, while Saudi Arabia controls the world's largest oil reserve, it faces increasing budget pressure.

This is why the United States taxpayer is providing funds to Saudi Arabia. Well, they are not going to after tonight if we vote ''yes'' on the Crowley-Israel-Berkley-Weiner amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 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 want to thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), for being one of the leaders on this most critical issue.

For too long, the United States has been sending foreign assistance and aid to a country that, quite frankly, has not been honest or trustworthy. Time and again, the Saudis have shown that they are not our allies in the war on terror. In fact, they are soft on al Qaeda terrorists operating in Saudi Arabia. Their efforts to prosecute terrorists have been fruitless and devious, and their financing of terror groups has been all but well documented.

Saudi blood money does not only threaten the United States, but it also threatens our good friend and ally, the State of Israel. More than 50 percent, 50 percent of Hamas funding comes from Saudi Arabia, as Ambassador Dore Gold testified in the House Committee on International Relations.

The Saudis impede American efforts in fighting our war on terror. They have denied U.S. officials access to several suspects in custody, including one Saudi who had knowledge of extensive plans to inject poison gas into the New York City subway system.

The Saudi connection to al Qaeda is undeniable. In fact, al Qaeda has an implicit deal, an implicit deal with the Saudi royal family to desist from violence in the kingdom in exchange for Saudi financing.

These inexcusable actions by the Saudi Government make them unworthy of any foreign assistance or aid from our country. As the U.S. is deeply engaged in this global war on terror, we need all the honest allies we can get; and, quite frankly, we simply are not getting that out of this government in Saudi Arabia.

I thank the gentleman from New York for offering this amendment on keeping the foreign aid from Saudi Arabia.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I especially want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for introducing this amendment which I have supported year after year. I rise in strong support of this amendment.

The very idea that we are giving any funding to the Saudi kingdom with all of its oil, with all of its wealth, is nothing short of astounding. It boggles my mind. Not only is this a regime that allows terrorism to exist, they have exploited it worldwide. Not only have they exploited terrorism, they are the leading financiers of terrorism. The thought that one cent of American money is being spent in Saudi Arabia is an insult to the memory of those who

died in the attack on this Nation of 9/11.

□ 2045

Let us never forget that 15 of the 19 hijackers were Saudi nationals. Knowing this, knowing this fact, did the Saudi Government express one word of remorse, of regret to the families of the 9/11 victims? Not one word.

The Saudis are constantly declaring to the United States that they are our partners in peace. Partners in peace? Are we talking about the same Saudis that support and encourage and finance terrorism, the same Saudis that exude racist and antiSemitic hatred, the same Saudis that allowed terrorists to escape after killing 16 westerners at a Khobar resident tower compound, the same that have the worst record on the planet when it comes to religious intolerance and discrimination? These are our partners in peace?

The Saudis claim that they are vigorously prosecuting and persecuting terrorists. Who are they kidding? Saudi efforts to prosecute terrorists are inept at best and, more accurately, practically nonexistent.

Since 9/11 not a single Saudi donor of funds to terrorist groups has been punished, not a single one. Is supporting the Saudi royal family the best use of American taxpayer dollars? Absolutely not. I do not want my taxpayer dollars going to the Saudis, and I do not want anyone else's. Let us pass this and send a strong message to our so-called partners in peace that they are with us, or they are against us.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am the only speaker on this side, so I will speak at the end.

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this vitally important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, after 9/11, the President of the United States came to this Chamber, stood behind where I am standing now, and said that there is a line in the sand. He said the line divides democracy and dictatorship, liberty and tyranny, education, indoctrination, schools that teach kids how to put things together and schools that teach kids how to blow things up, ballots versus bullets.

This amendment, very simply, enforces that line in the sand. It is absolutely unfathomable to me, Mr. Chairman, that we would even contemplate rewarding a regime with U.S. tax dollars that blame Zionists for the May 1 attacks on a Saudi oil facility that killed two Americans, that blame the West for the attacks on our country on 9/11 and that went so far as to blame the Barbie doll for undermining values around the world, calling the Barbie doll a Zionist conspiracy.

Mr. Chairman, now faced with a terrorist threat in Saudi Arabia, a terrorist threat that confronts all of us around the world, the Saudi regime's response to that threat is to boldly say we will offer a one-month pass, we will offer a one-month amnesty to those people who are plotting and planning our demise, a regime that continues to fund madrassahs around the world that teach the most virulent hatred without any sense of modernity.

Mr. Chairman, it was the President who drew that line in the sand. This amendment enforces that line in the sand. We should not be giving U.S. tax dollars to a regime that has not demonstrated consistently and credibly that they are with us in the global war on terror, and that is why I support and urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, as I conclude, and the hour is getting late and there are no further speakers on my side, I just want to once again clarify the record of the Saudis.

Every time we have this discussion in this Chamber, we hear about how the Saudis have changed their ways, that they finally decided they do not want to fund terror, they do not want to export terror, they do not want to be terrorists themselves, that if only we in the House of Representatives allow them a few more years of funding, a few more years chasing the fantasy that there are moderate friends in that region, that maybe things would turn around.

Well, the gentleman that is sitting here talking to Osama bin Laden shortly after September 11, it would be just great if somehow we can capture that guy, that guy who is laughing on the tape while Osama bin Laden took credit for the heinous acts of September 11.

Well, this is a picture from yesterday's newspaper at a Saudi Arabian airport of that fellow being wheeled into Saudi Arabia under an amnesty program by the Saudis.

If we think for a moment that U.S. authorities are going to have a chance to interview this person, think again. We learned from the explosion at the Khobar Towers years ago, when to this day the FBI has not been granted access to the crime scene, that we do not get Saudi cooperation. We learned from the Council of Foreign Relations, who just put out a report, that we do not get cooperation cutting down on the funding that the Saudis provide for terror.

So this person, the right hand to Osama bin Laden, is now somewhere in Saudi Arabia, our so-called ally that we with taxpayer dollars are funding in this bill.

Frankly, it is inexplicable. It is inexplicable. You can no longer live by the fantasy that somehow they are going to be helpful, that we are going to solve the problems of the Middle East if only we embrace the Saudis. We can no longer follow that fantasy thinking.

Every year when I bring this amendment up, I hear the same protests from the distinguished chairman and those that support the Saudi regime. They say, this is the wrong time, things are getting better, things are getting better. Sure it has been hundreds of years of exporting terrorism, but now it is getting better. We are right on the precipice. If only we give them a few more dollars in taxpayer funds, things will get a little bit better. It is not happening.

According to the United States Government, not a single arrest has come as a result of this vaunted U.S.-Saudi task force on the financing of terrorism; and this person, who is no doubt involved in the attacks of my city on September 11, the attacks in Pennsylvania and here in Washington, is now in the possession of what he calls his family in Saudi Arabia.

It is not a coincidence that 15 of the 19 hijackers on September 11 came from Saudi Arabia. It is not a coincidence that, according to the State Department, more than half of every single dollar for terrorists comes from Saudi Arabia. It is not a coincidence, because that is what the Saudi government is all about.

What is remarkable is that we keep going along with it. We provide funding, we embrace them, and we do not seem to learn.

Let us make this the year that we finally say not a single taxpayer dollar will go to Saudi Arabia in this bill. Let us take the explanation in the budget request that this will allow them to save money on military training, because, ''While Saudi Arabia controls the world's largest oil reserve, it faces increasing budget pressure.''

It is hard to even read with a straight face. Vote yes on the Weiner-Crowley-Israel-Berkley amendment. Finally end funding of U.S. tax dollars to Saudi Arabia.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not use the full time, but I do rise in opposition to the pending amendment. It is the wrong amendment. Especially, it is the wrong amendment at the wrong time.

I am a little bit reminded of the earlier amendment that we had by the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), where I rose to say the timing could not be worse for this sort of amendment, and I think in this case the timing is very bad for this amendment.

There is no question that elements of the Saudi government in the past have not been helpful to the United States in the global war on terrorism, but I do not think anyone can deny that, with the targeting of the Saudi Government by Osama bin Laden, it now knows and understands that it is a prime target of international terrorism as well.

The government of Saudi Arabia has greatly increased its efforts to root out

terrorism. It has greatly increased its cooperation in intelligence matters and others with the United States.

During the current fiscal year, the United States has been involved in training security services of Saudi Arabia to meet the threat to both them and to us, and that gets us to the heart of what we are talking about. By declaring them a terrorist state, we cut off the aid. The gentleman from New York has said, let us cut off every single dollar. Well, it is precious few dollars we provide here. It is $1 million in one account and $25,000 in another. A million dollars is spent through the Antiterrorism Assistance Program funded in this bill to provide courses in such areas as terrorist crime scene investigation, explosive incident countermeasures, investigation of terrorist organizations.

These are the things that our law enforcement specialties do and do very well, and we are in Saudi Arabia helping to train them or to bring them here in order to train them in just exactly these kinds of techniques, of how to go after a bomb investigation, how to do the counterintelligence kinds of work that has to be done.

It seems to me, given the targeting that has been done in Saudi Arabia of some Americans, as well as other European individuals and assets, that it is in our interest to have a Saudi Arabian police force, law enforcement agencies that are trained in these very special kinds of techniques.

I would argue that these small sums are well spent. The more that we can engage the security services of Saudi Arabia, the more that we can build a relationship between our antiterrorist organizations and those of the Saudi Government.

Now, the other amount that we provide is a very small sum of $25,000 through the International Military Education and Training Program, or IMET as it is called, to help train and increase military contacts with the Saudi military. Some would say, why not charge the Saudi government for this training? But, in fact, that is precisely what we do. By providing the relatively modest sum of $25,000, which allows for the training of one single officer in this country for one program, we allow them access to the program. The results in Saudi Arabia is that Saudi Arabia has spent $13 million of its own funds here in the United States to train over 400 students at U.S. military schools. This is training that exposes Saudi officers to U.S. military doctrines, to training regimes, to assistance and most importantly, yes, to U.S. values.

In the global war on terrorism, now is not the time for us to turn away from the cooperation and the efforts that we are getting with the government of Saudi Arabia. Yes, albeit belatedly, but they have turned to us for assistance and cooperation, and I think we all understand we need all of the friends and allies that we can get.

This may not be the perfect ally. I would acknowledge freely that it is not. But I do think in these areas where this funding is involved we are getting some very substantial cooperation from the Saudis. To reduce or eliminate this funding by putting them on the list of terrorist states seems to be absolutely counterproductive to everything that we are trying to do.

I would acknowledge that the Saudi Arabian government has been remiss in the past in its commitment to combating terrorism, but I think, as I said a moment ago, that is changing, and I think we need to encourage that change, not discourage it.

The administration does strongly oppose this amendment, and I would ask that a letter from Assistant Secretary William Burns in opposition to this amendment be placed in the RECORD at this point.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, DC.

Hon. JIM KOLBE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is our understanding that the United States House of Representatives is considering a provision to the fiscal year 2005 Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations bill which would add the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to Section 507, the list of countries prohibited from receiving direct assistance from the United States.

Saudi Arabia was among the first countries to condemn the September 2001 attacks and has worked closely with the United States since then in the global war against terrorism. Since the May 2003 al-Qaeda bombings in Riyadh, our cooperation with Saudi law enforcement and intelligence agencies has been increasingly effective and mutually beneficial. Saudi Arabia is now taking aggressive steps to combat terrorists at home, and to choke off financing for terrorist entities being channeled through charities overseas.

The Administration strongly opposes efforts to add the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to this list of state sponsors of terrorism and urges that the House reject the amendment offered by Representative Weiner, which would severely undermine our counterterrorism cooperation with Saudi Arabia at precisely the moment when it is moving to a new level of effectiveness. This amendment would also undermine our important interests in cooperation with Saudi Arabia on other critical issues in the region, including the stabilization of Iraq and the pursuit of Palestinian-Israeli peace.

We would appreciate your support in defeating Representative Weiner's amendment.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. BURNS,
Assistant Secretary of State.

The adoption of this amendment would only hearten those who seek to drive a wedge between the United States and Arab regimes that are cooperating with us on the war on terrorism, and for that reason alone, I urge the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, it is for the purpose of a question. The gentleman talked about how the cooperation helps us in the war on terror. The Council on Foreign Relations issued a report recently that said that we are not getting that cooperation. The FBI has said that they are not getting cooperation in investigating crimes against U.S. citizens. Where does the gentleman derive the idea that we are getting cooperation with this money?

Mr. KOLBE. Well, I think if one talks to U.S. law enforcement agencies they will find that we are getting cooperation. We are not getting as full cooperation as we would like, it is not perfect cooperation, but that could certainly be said of a lot of other countries that we are providing assistance to.

I think there is no doubt that we have been getting cooperation, particularly on sharing of intelligence information with the Saudi Arabian government. So I do believe that we are getting that kind of cooperation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) will be postponed.

□ 2100

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS) for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this appropriations bill includes an authorizing provision that would allow the inspector general from the Coalition Provisional Authority to continue to oversee the rebuilding effort in Iraq. This provision is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Government Reform, and I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his interest in this issue.

The Committee on Government Reform will hold its fourth hearing overseeing the rebuilding of Iraq next Thursday. My committee has made this oversight a priority. As part of the overall oversight of the $18.6 billion of the supplemental funds, we created the CPA Inspector General. I have met with the CPA IG. I believe with his help, we can expect the thorough oversight we need from his office.

My committee has jurisdiction over inspectors general, and because of our

staff expertise we work closely with other committees and the executive branch to make sure that the various IGs have the tools to conduct the mission that the public expects of them. The inspectors general for DOD, USAID, the Department of State and the CPA, with the help of the Office of Management and Budget and my committee's oversight, have negotiated a memorandum of agreement to maintain appropriate oversight over the rebuilding efforts in Iraq. There is also a similar provision in the Senate Defense authorization bill that addresses the continuing oversight of the Iraqi rebuilding effort.

I will work with all involved to address the issue from the authorization side. I would ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) if he would work with the Committee on Government Reform, the Committee on International Relations, and the Committee on Armed Services to ensure that our efforts are coordinated and built constructively on the existing agreement.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, for his comments here tonight and for the work that he has done with the inspectors general.

Let me just say that, as he pointed out, the inspector general here for what was then the CPA, or Coalition Provisional Authority, was created as part of the legislation last year which authorized the large expenditure in the supplemental for the rebuilding of Iraq. And what we have done in this legislation is not something new, but simply to move it over as we have moved all the funding, as we moved all the programs from CPA over to the State Department. We have moved this jurisdiction over there.

Now, the gentleman from Virginia is absolutely correct in saying his committee not only has jurisdiction but has done yeoman's work in providing oversight. The hearings they have held have, I think, effectively brought attention to the problems we have had, particularly with the contracting in our rebuilding of Afghanistan and Iraq. And I really appreciate the work his subcommittee has done. So my answer is an unequivocal, yes, to the gentleman from Virginia that we will work with him as we proceed with this bill to make sure that we build constructively on the existing agreement that we have.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I would like to engage in colloquy with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, my good friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

As my colleagues may be aware, the administration is expected to announce soon that for the third year in a row it will deny U.S. funding for the life-saving programs of the United Nations Population Fund. In my view, the administration's justification for this denial is flimsy at best. UNFPA has a long-standing program in China which aims to help introduce voluntary family planning into that country and change China's destructive and coercive one-child policy. The basis of denying UNFPA our support is precisely this: UNFPA is being punished for working within the Chinese government to change a policy we all agree is wrong.

Contrary to assurances from the administration and the leadership of this House since 2002 that the decision to de-fund UNFPA would not negatively affect the U.S. commitment to international family planning programs, the funding Congress originally intended for UNFPA has not all gone to support USAID's bilateral family planning program. A significant portion of it has been diverted to combat trafficking.

While I certainly do not take issue with anti-trafficking programs, I would urge the administration to request adequate funding for this priority instead of relying on transfers of funding that should have gone to UNFPA. It is our understanding that the administration will propose to Congress the UNFPA's fiscal year 2004 funding be diverted for anti-trafficking programs instead of going to support USAID's family planning programs.

I certainly hope that we can include language in the conference report indicating that the FY 2004 money meant for UNFPA can only be used for bilateral family planning programs. I would like to ask the chairman if he agrees with this sentiment, and if he will support such an effort.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Let me say I share the disappointment that the gentlewoman has that we have been unable to reach a resolution of this issue with regards to the funding and the use of funds by the UNFPA. I feel very strongly, as the gentlewoman does herself, that we should continue to invest in multilateral efforts to improve the health of women and families in the developing world. And that is exactly what the programs of UNFPA go for.

I have been a long-time supporter of family planning programs and specifically of the United Nations Family Planning Agency. I feel that the administration's position has hurt our efforts to support valuable life-saving programs. Nonetheless, that is a position that has been taken, and that is the reality of where we are.

As we take this bill to conference, however, if there continues to be no resolution of the U.S. contribution to UNFPA, I want the gentlewoman to know I will be happy to work with her in an effort to make sure that the increased resources that would not be available to UNFPA are set aside for bilateral family planning programs.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank the chairman and I look forward to working with him.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SCHIFF

Mr. SCHIFF. 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. SCHIFF:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES

SEC. 576. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Government of Turkey to engage in contravention of section 1913 of title 18, United States Code, (relating to lobbying with appropriated moneys), with respect to H. Res. 193, Reaffirming support of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide and anticipating the 15th anniversary of the enactment of the Genocide Convention Implementation Act of 1987 (the Proxmire Act) on November 4, 2003.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment, and I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by congratulating the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for their outstanding work on the bill. I think they both have done a great job in advancing America's foreign policy priorities at an especially difficult time in our history.

I was particularly please to see the committee wisely provides $65 million in economic aid for Armenia, $3 million more than the administration's request, and that the committee wisely restored the parity in security assistance between Armenia and Azerbaijan by funding military aid and education assistance to both Armenia and Azerbaijan at $6 million.

Today, I offer a simple amendment that will honor the 1½ million Armenians who perished in the Armenian Genocide of 1915–1923. I consider this a sacred obligation, to ensure that the men, women and children who perished at the hands of the Ottoman Empire are not lost to history and that this Congress not fund shameful efforts to deny that the genocide occurred.

Time is the ally of those who would deny or change history. Such has it been, regrettably, by those who would continue to deny the undeniable facts of the murder of 1½ million people, the first genocide of last century.

My amendment tonight seeks only to prohibit the use of funds to lobby

against H. Res. 193, the resolution which includes a reference to the Armenian Genocide and reaffirms the support of Congress for the genocide convention and commemorates the anniversary of our becoming a party to this landmark legislation. It will not deprive countries of funding that they need for legitimate purposes, but no appropriations under this bill or any other bill should be used by other governments to lobby this Congress against legislation, and particularly legislation that reaffirms our commitment to the convention on genocide and the recognition of the victims of the Armenian Genocide as well as the victims of many other genocides in the history of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

It is time for the United States to properly recognize the Armenian Genocide, which is fully documented in the U.S. Archives and through an overwhelming body of firsthand governmental and diplomatic evidence.

Despite the overwhelming evidence, the Turkish government and its paid lobbyists have through threats and blackmail sought to prevent the United States from properly commemorating the Armenian Genocide. Morally it is wrong for the American people to be complicit in the Turkish government's efforts to deny the suffering and death of 1.5 million people. I would also like to point out that Turkey's recognition of the Armenian Genocide would represent a meaningful step towards its acceptance into the European family of nations.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is time for this body to stop defending and funding a government that continues to deny its own history and refuses to break with the pattern of intolerance established by past Turkish governments which dealt with minority issues by committing genocide against Armenians, massacring and driving Greeks from its shores, restricting the rights of Christians to worship, and denying the existence of its Kurdish citizens.

I would like to add that I am joined in my support of this amendment by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) wish to make his point of order?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I will not make a point of order on the amendment. I will conclude the debate.

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

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) has 2 minutes remaining.

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

Among historians there is no dispute about what happened to the Armenian people. There is no dispute that it was genocide. Thousands of pages of documents sit in our National Archives, newspapers of the day were replete with stories about the murder of Armenians: ''Appeal To Turkey To Stop Massacres,'' headlined the New York Times on April 28, 1915, just as the killing began.

On October 7 of that year, the Times reported that 800,000 Armenians had been slain in cold blood in Asia Minor. In mid-December of 1915, the Times spoke of a million Armenians killed or in exile.

In 1948, in the shadow of the Holocaust, the international community responded to Nazi Germany's methodically orchestrated acts of genocide by approving the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide. It confirms that genocide is a crime under international law and defines genocide as actions committed with intent to destroy a nation, ethnic, racial or religious group.

The United States under President Truman was the first nation to sign the convention. Last year marked the 15th anniversary of President Reagan signing the Genocide Convention Implementation Act.

Just over a year ago, I introduced H. Res. 193 with my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), and other Members of this House. This should have been an easy resolution for all of us now to support on the House floor. Genocide is the most abhorrent crime known to human kind; and, unfortunately, it is happening in the Sudan as we speak.

The reason we have not yet succeeded in passing this resolution is simple. The government of Turkey refuses to acknowledge the genocide, and the strongest nation on Earth fears their reaction if we do.

110 of my colleagues have co-sponsored this resolution, and I expect it would pass overwhelmingly if given the chance. At the very least we should not fund efforts to silence our voices.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is most unfortunate. We have just been handed this amendment. It is a completely new amendment, quite different than the one we had seen before. So we do not really know what the implications of this are. I am trying to read it and think it through.

I am inclined to accept this and deal with its ramifications in the full committee. Looking at it, let me say that it appears by saying relating to lobbying with appropriated monies, but not having any way of making that determination as to what that is, it does not have any real impact. Nonetheless, I understand the symbolism of this, and I am concerned about that in terms of our ally, Turkey. But I am prepared to accept this amendment at this time. And as I said, we will deal with its implications and ramifications at a later time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my friend and colleague from California ADAM SCHIFF.

This is an amendment to ensure that we never forget the struggles of the Armenian people or that we never forget . . .

Ever since I was elected to the State Assembly and now in Congress, I have been a strong supporter of the Armenian American community.

However, my strong support is not only because I represent a large Armenian community in Queens but also because I see the strategic importance of Caucasus region for the United States.

The contributions of the Armenian community to this great city cannot be fully appreciated quantitatively.

It can only be realized by those who walk the streets of New York every day.

I had the opportunity to travel to Armenia last summer.

Through meetings and discussions with elected officials and even regular citizens, I have a clearer understanding of Armenia's needs and challenges.

I believe that as a nation Armenia is growing and with the support of the United States and the Diasporan Armenian community—Armenia will be able to overcome the economic and security challenges in the region.

I have continuously supported and encouraged closer ties between the United States and Armenia because of the strategic position and also because of the similar values of democracy and freedom.

The thorny path to liberty is a concept with which the people of Armenia have been forced to contend for many years.

From the Armenian Genocide, to the republic's absorption into the Soviet Union, to the current struggle for Nagorno (NA–GORE–NO)–Karabakh (KAR–AH–BAH), the path has not always been smooth.

I am pleased to say that the nation of Armenia does not need to travel that thorny path alone.

I am proud to stand alongside them in an effort to reach their goals.

I assure you, it will never be forgotten.

Armenia remains a major focus in American foreign policy.

The United States recognizes the need to cultivate and support the development of Armenia.

The United States has looked to Armenia to take the lead in bringing peace and prosperity to the Caucasus.

The people of Armenia have overcome tremendous obstacles on the path to liberty.

But again we can never forget the genocide and we must commemorate it.

Mr. KOLBE. 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. SCHIFF).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2115

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman I move to strike the last word. I do so for the purposes of yielding to the gentlewoman from New Mexico for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to enter into a colloquy with me, and I wanted to commend him for all his work on funding for global efforts to fight tuberculosis. This bill will allocate $185 million for infectious diseases, including tuberculosis, from the United States Agency For International Development, $46 million more than the President requested. This is in addition to the roughly $68 million for TB in the Global Fund and $17.5 million from other accounts. In a bill where several other programs received cuts in funding, I appreciate the gentleman's efforts to continue our commitment to combat global TB at a level at least equal to last year.

I am concerned about funding for the Global TB Drug Facility. The United States contributed $3 million to the Global TB Drug Facility last year and would do so again next year in this bill. The STOP TB partnership, which includes 50 world organizations, including the WHO, recommended a commitment by the U.S. of $50 million each year to reach the most people possible. The Global TB Drug Facility has successfully treated 3 million people in three years for tuberculosis. Funds from the facility can successfully treat tuberculosis for just $10 per person.

I would ask that the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) who has worked with me so hard on tuberculosis issues work together as this bill goes to conference to try to increase the funding for the Global TB Drug Facility to try to help get vital medicines out to the people who need them most.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico for her statements and concern that she has expressed, along with the gentleman from Ohio, about the impact of tuberculosis worldwide. It is one of the world's worst killers, causing up to 2 million deaths every year.

Our foreign assistance has a strong emphasis on programs to fight this disease. Our bilateral TB programs lead the world in helping developing countries set up treatment and pharmaceutical management systems. Supporting the Global TB Drug Facility is another important component of our strategy. Through the GDF, the U.S. helps populations in need around the world gain access to life-saving tuberculosis drugs.

I would be happy to work with the gentlewoman from New Mexico and other colleagues on this important issue as we move into the conference, and I thank the gentlewoman for bringing this to our attention.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment by Mr. BUYER of Indiana; amendment by Mr. SANDERS of Vermont; amendment No. 6 by Mr. NETHERCUTT of Washington; amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas; amendment by Mr. WEINER of New York.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BUYER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 161, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

AYES—243

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

NOES—161

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baldwin
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dingell
Doyle
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watson
Watt

Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—29

Aderholt
Bonner
Carson (IN)
Collins
Cramer
Crenshaw
Deal (GA)
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Greenwood
Hayes
Houghton
Isakson
Jefferson
Jenkins
Kaptur
Majette
McCarthy (MO)
McInnis
Quinn
Radanovich
Roybal-Allard
Ryun (KS)
Stenholm
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2143

Messrs. TIERNEY, MURTHA and BACA changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. KIRK, Ms. DUNN, and Messrs. ALEXANDER, LEWIS of California, SPRATT, and BEREUTER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 385, the Buyer Amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SANDERS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 270, noes 132, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

AYES—270

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Bass
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Boehlert
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burns
Burton (IN)
Camp
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallegly
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wamp
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOES—132

Aderholt
Akin
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Cole
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, Tom
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Goss
Granger
Graves
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Istook
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas (OK)
McCrery
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Putnam
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Ryan (WI)
Schrock
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—31

Bonner
Capps
Carson (IN)
Collins
Cramer
Deal (GA)
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Ford
Frelinghuysen
Greenwood
Hayes
Houghton
Isakson
Jefferson
Jenkins
Kaptur
Kennedy (MN)
Majette
McCarthy (MO)
McInnis
Meeks (NY)
Quinn
Radanovich
Roybal-Allard
Ryun (KS)
Stenholm
Watson
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2150

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. GINGREY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 386, the Sanders Amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 386, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. NETHERCUTT

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 166, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

AYES—241

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carson (OK)
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Costello
Cox
Crane

Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Emerson
English
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Israel
Issa
Istook
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
LaHood
Langevin
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Lynch
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sandlin
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)

NOES—166

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Case
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Lampson
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Maloney
Markey
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rodriguez
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—26

Bonner
Carson (IN)
Collins
Cramer
Deal (GA)
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Frelinghuysen
Greenwood
Hayes
Houghton
Isakson
Jefferson
Jenkins
Kaptur
Majette
McCarthy (MO)
McInnis
Quinn
Radanovich
Roybal-Allard
Ryun (KS)
Stenholm
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2158

Mr. CALVERT and Mr. ROSS changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 387, the Nethercutt Amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 243, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

AYES—164

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Baca
Baldwin
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Chandler
Clay
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Etheridge
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frost
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kleczka
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ross
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Sandlin
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—243

Aderholt
Akin
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Istook
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCotter
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave

Myrick
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Turner (OH)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—26

Bonner
Carson (IN)
Collins
Cramer
Deal (GA)
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Frelinghuysen
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hayes
Houghton
Isakson
Jenkins
Kaptur
Majette
McCarthy (MO)
McInnis
Quinn
Radanovich
Roybal-Allard
Ryun (KS)
Stenholm
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2204

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 388, the Jackson-Lee amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 191, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—217

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Bell
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Coble
Cooper
Costello
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green (TX)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hostettler
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kirk
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norwood
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Platts
Porter
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Shuster
Simmons
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wu
Wynn

NOES—191

Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Bachus
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bereuter
Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boucher
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Clyburn
Cole
Conyers
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Tom
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
English
Etheridge
Fattah
Feeney
Foley
Fossella
Frost
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Goss
Granger
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
McCrery
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Osborne
Oxley
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Sandlin
Saxton
Schrock
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Spratt
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Upton
Visclosky
Vitter
Walsh
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—25

Bonner
Carson (IN)
Collins
Cramer
Deal (GA)
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Frelinghuysen
Greenwood
Hayes
Houghton
Isakson
Jenkins
Kaptur
Majette
McCarthy (MO)
McInnis
Quinn
Radanovich
Roybal-Allard
Ryun (KS)
Stenholm
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2218

Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. PASCRELL, BLUMENAUER, BOYD and UDALL of Colorado, Ms. WATERS and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote No. 389, the Weiner Amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) 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. 4818) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 715, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 365, nays 41, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

YEAS—365

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Bell
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burns
Burr
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson (OK)
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Clyburn
Coble
Cole
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gephardt
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herseth
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley (OR)
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nethercutt
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Sandlin
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrock
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner (OH)
Turner (TX)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—41

Akin
Bartlett (MD)
Berry
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
DeFazio
Duncan
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Gutknecht
Hefley
Herger
Hostettler
Hulshof
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kucinich
Lucas (OK)
Miller (FL)
Moran (KS)
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pombo
Rahall
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sensenbrenner
Smith (MI)
Stearns
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Toomey
Whitfield

NOT VOTING—27

Bonner
Carson (IN)
Collins
Cramer
Deal (GA)
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart, L.
Doggett
Dooley (CA)
Feeney
Frelinghuysen
Greenwood
Hayes
Houghton
Isakson
Jenkins
Kaptur
Majette
McCarthy (MO)
McInnis
Miller, George
Quinn
Radanovich
Roybal-Allard
Ryun (KS)
Stenholm
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2236

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

So 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:

Ms. McCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 390, the Foreign Operations Appropriations, H.R. 4818, Final Passage, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

REQUESTING THE SENATE TO RETURN TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES H.R. 4766

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 719) requesting the Senate to return to the House of Representatives the bill H.R. 4766, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 719

Resolved, That the Senate is requested to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H.R. 4766) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AGREEING TO REQUEST OF SENATE TO RETURN H.R. 1303

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senate to return the bill (H.R. 1303) to amend the E-Government Act of 2002 with respect to rulemaking authority of the judicial conference is agreed to.

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader, for the purposes of informing us of next week's schedule.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, the House will convene on Monday at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. We will consider several measures under suspension of the rules. A final list of these measures will be sent to Members' offices by the end of the week. Any votes on these measures will be rolled until after 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and the balance of the week, we expect to consider additional legislation under suspension of the rules. We also plan to consider several bills under a rule: the fiscal year 2005 District of Columbia appropriations bill; H.R. 4837, the fiscal year 2005 Military Construction appropriations bill; H.R. 4842, the U.S.-Morocco Free Trade Agreement; H.R. 3574, the Stock Option Accounting Reform Act; and H.R. 3313, the Marriage Protection Act.

Finally, I would like to note that we are expecting a very busy week heading into the August recess. Members should expect to work some late nights and possibly into Friday evening as we resolve these important pieces of legislation.

I thank the gentleman for yielding, and will be happy to answer any questions he may have.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his information.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader mentioned two appropriations bills, the District of Columbia and the Military Construction bill. Can the gentleman give me an estimate, if he knows, of what days those two bills will be considered?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. I would expect to see the stock options bill legislation and the D.C. and Military Construction appropriations bills earlier in the week. The U.S.-Morocco Free Trade Agreement and the Marriage Protection Act would be Thursday or Friday.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said the Morocco Free Trade will be early or later?

Mr. DELAY. Later.

Mr. HOYER. Later.

Mr. DELAY. Thursday or Friday.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman anticipated my two questions, I see.

The conference reports, will we be considering the DOD appropriations conference report next week?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. I have every expectation that the DOD conference will be finished and ready to go and voted on sometime next week, but I am not advised as to when during the week that we might anticipate voting on it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, there has been a lot of discussion, and I have read some things in the newspaper and heard discussions, about the child tax credit bill which has been pending for some time in conference.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there is an intention to move that out of conference; and, if so, what condition will it be in in terms of what will there be in the bill, if the gentleman knows, in addition to the originally passed child tax credit? I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. We have been working to extend the child tax credit, the 10 percent tax bracket, and the marriage penalty tax relief provisions from the 2001 and 2003 tax bills. I would anticipate that the bill, well, I cannot say what else might be in the bill. The conference has yet to be called into a meeting, but in discussions with the other body, it seems to be that most want to keep this bill as simple as possible; and I hope we can find a way to send these tax measures to the President before the August recess.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have a view that if there was some disagreement and an agreement could not be reached on the other matters above and beyond the child tax credit, would the gentleman's expectation be that the child tax credit might be moved independently? Could the gentleman see a scenario that would result in that? I yield to my friend.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, that is speculation and I hate to speculate, but I know that this House has voted several times on these issues, and I know that the House wants to see a 10 percent tax bracket, the marriage penalty, and the child tax credit provisions to be extended and funded; and I would tend to think that the bill would have to come back with at least those provisions in it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3313, what day does the gentleman anticipate we will consider this bill? That is the Defense of Marriage Act. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I expect that that will come on Thursday. As the gentleman knows, sometimes these appropriations bills take longer than we anticipate. If they do, then it could be pushed over into Friday, but our intention is to bring that bill to the floor on Thursday.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would hope that during the consideration of the child tax credit, assuming the conference is going to meet, that our conferees be included in that conference. As the gentleman knows, we feel pretty strongly about the fact that if conferences are held, those Democratic conferees that have been appointed by the Speaker need to be invited and to be able to participate in those. So I would urge that to occur when and if that conference is convened.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HOYER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DELAY. I would have every reason to believe that if we can get the other body to call the meeting, then, surely, the Democrats on the conference committee, along with the Republicans, would all have invitations to that meeting.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 19, 2004

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON RULES ON AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3313, MARRIAGE PROTECTION ACT OF 2004

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may meet the week of July 19, 2004, to grant a rule which could limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 3313, the Marriage Protection Act of 2004. The Committee on the Judiciary ordered H.R. 3313 reported on July 14, 2004, and is expected to file its report with the House on July 19, 2004.

Any Member wishing to offer an amendment to the bill should submit 55 copies of the amendment and one copy of a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules in room H–312 of the Capitol by 10 a.m. on Wednesday, July 21, 2004. Members should draft their amendments to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. Members also are advised that the text should be available for their review on the Web sites of both the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Rules by Friday, July 16, 2004.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are drafted in the most appropriate format. Members are also advised to check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain that their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

UNITED STATES-MOROCCO FREE TRADE AGREEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108–201)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit legislation and supporting documents prepared by my Administration to implement the United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement (the ''Agreement'' or the ''FTA''). This Agreement enhances our bilateral relationship with a longstanding partnership in the North Africa and Middle East region. The Agreement will benefit the people of the United States and Morocco, illustrating to other developing countries the advantage of open markets.

This Agreement is a strong demonstration of my Administration's commitment to opening markets, leveling the playing field, and expanding opportunities for American workers, manufacturers, businesses, farmers, and consumers. In negotiating this

Agreement, my Administration was guided by the negotiating objectives set out in the Trade Act of 2002. The Agreement will expand Morocco's market for U.S. manufactured goods, agricultural products, services, and investment. As soon as this Agreement enters into force, tariffs will be eliminated on virtually all manufactured goods traded between our countries.

The Agreement provides U.S. producers of beef, poultry, wheat, corn, soybeans, and other agriculture products with increased access to Morocco's market, while complementing Morocco's agriculture reform program. In addition, the Agreement provides the opportunity for U.S. producers to adjust to increased imports from Morocco, if necessary.

New opportunities for U.S. services firms will be opened, U.S. investment will be protected, and U.S. companies will be able to participate in government procurement opportunities on the same basis as Moroccan firms. This Agreement has some of the strongest intellectual property protections ever contained in a U.S. trade agreement with a developing country.

The United States and Morocco have agreed to cooperate on environment and Labor issues and to establish mechanisms supporting those efforts. Negotiation of this Agreement has promoted adoption of a new labor law in Morocco. This Agreement has also helped lead to improved domestic environmental laws in Morocco, and a number of additional cooperative projects have been identified for future work.

The approval of this Agreement will be another important step in implementing our plan for a broader Middle East Free Trade Area. Indeed, this Agreement offers the United States an opportunity to encourage economic reform in a moderate Muslim nation, as we have done with the Jordan FTA and the recently concluded Bahrain FTA. Leaders in Morocco support a reformist and tolerant vision that includes free parliamentary elections, the sale of state-owned businesses, the encouragement of foreign investment that can be connected to broad-based development, and better protection of the rights of women and workers. It is strongly in the interests of the United States to embrace these reforms and do what we can to encourage them. Passing this Agreement is a critical step in that direction.

GEORGE W. BUSH.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 15, 2004*.

□ 2245

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Votes on H.R. 1587, S. Con. Res 114 and S. 2264 will be taken on Monday.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks wil appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

STATEMENT ON SMART SECURITY AND LETTER TO SECRETARY TOM RIDGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week Deforest Soaries, chairman of the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, asked Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge to consider seeking the authority to postpone a Federal election.

In response, I have composed a letter to Secretary Ridge expressing dismay at the very possibility of postponing an election. The letter has been signed by 90 other Members of Congress. Ninety percent of the Democrats have signed this letter and one Republican.

Mr. Speaker, the leader reads, ''Dear Secretary Ridge, we are deeply troubled by reports that the Department of Homeland Security has asked the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel to analyze what steps would need to be taken to postpone the Presidential election in November of this year.

''We are also concerned that this important issue was not raised last week when Homeland Security Under Secretary Asa Hutchison, FBI Director Robert Mueller and Terrorist Threat and Interrogation Center Director John Brennan briefed Members of the Congress on the possibility of terrorist attacks affecting the upcoming elections.

''Any action taken by the Department of Homeland Security to postpone a Federal election, including requesting an informal review by the Justice Department, would present the greatest threat to date of our democratic process and would invite terrorists to disrupt the selection of our highest leader.

''The mere consideration of postponing an election, the very basis upon which our American democracy is founded, is a capitulation to terrorism. Wars, droughts, floods and hurricanes have not stopped elections, and the possibility of a terrorist attack must not stop one either.

''This move would be unprecedented for a Presidential election. Not even the Civil War stopped the 1864 Presidential election. In 1864, President Lincoln stated,'' and I quote President Lincoln in my letter, '''We cannot have free government without elections, and if the rebellion could force us to forego or postpone a national election, it might already fairly claim to have conquered or ruined us.'''

The letter continues, ''Moreover, such a proposal suggests that State officials responsible for elections in their region are incapable of deciding for themselves what steps to take in the event of a catastrophe. The legislative branch of the government has always held the authority to regulate elections. Now is not the time to transfer this authority to the executive branch. In the event of a terrorist attack, we trust that the respective legislatures across the Nation will make the right decisions to ensure that our democratic process remains intact.

''Fighting terrorism and preventing terrorists from changing our democratic process is the greatest fight we face in America today, but postponing an election due to the possibility of a terrorist attack, or even in the event of an actual terrorist attack, would represent the greatest possible loss for democracy and victory for terrorism.

''Let us make sure that in the fight against terrorism we do not sacrifice the very values we are fighting for in the first place. We urge you to take no further steps to postpone this year's Presidential election.''

Mr. Speaker, this letter is signed by 190 other Members of Congress. Each of these Members realizes there must be a way to both fight terrorism and hold onto the democratic ideals that make our country great. And there is.

I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, the SMART Security Resolution, which provides a better way to address the threat of terrorism. SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism.

SMART would prevent future acts of terrorism. It is more vigilant than the President on fighting terror. Instead of emphasizing military force, SMART focuses on multilateral partnerships and stronger intelligence capabilities to track and detain terrorists.

Mr. Speaker, after hearing about our letter in the House, DeForest Soaries revised his previous remarks. He claimed he could not conceive of any circumstances under which a Presidential election could be postponed or cancelled. Apparently, our message has gotten through. We must be smart about how we react to terrorist threats, and that means never sacrificing the democratic principles that make this country great.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

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

There was no objection.

A LEADER'S RESPONSIBILITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, in London yesterday Prime Minister Tony Blair did something that leaders do. Speaking to the House of Commons, Mr. Blair said, ''I accept full responsibility for the way the issue was presented and, therefore, for any errors made.''

Leaders lead, and leaders know the buck stops with them. Leaders lead, and leaders accept responsibility when things go wrong.

An independent report in England blamed its intelligence community for massive intelligence failures before the Iraq war. What did Tony Blair do? The Prime Minister got up in front of his nation and the world and accepted personal responsibility.

That did not happen when a similar report was released to the United States. The President did not accept responsibility. The President assigned blame.

In 1961, President John F. Kennedy accepted full responsibility for the Bay of Pigs fiasco. It did not matter that the planning for the Bay of Pigs had started in the Eisenhower administration. It did not matter that the intelligence failures directly led to the foreign policy disaster that was the Bay of Pigs. President Kennedy stood before the Nation and the world and accepted personal responsibility.

At one news conference not long afterward, President Kennedy used his legendary wit and intelligence to sum it up. ''There is an old saying,'' Kennedy said, ''that victory has a hundred fathers and defeat is an orphan.''

The buck stops at the President's desk, except in this administration. Since the release of the U.S. report on pre-Iraqi intelligence failures, this President has done everything possible to pass the buck.

During the administration of President Ronald Reagan, the Iran-Contra scandal was a crisis that shook the Nation to its core and the White House to its foundation. President Reagan was given ample opportunity to assign the blame to Oliver North. What did Ronald Reagan do? When asked directly about Mr. North, Ronald Reagan said, ''I do not feel betrayed. He has a fine record.''

Leaders lead. Whatever your politics, you have to acknowledge that President Reagan was a leader. When our country faces a crisis, people look to the President for leadership.

Not long ago, America faced a moral crisis. America faced an ethical crisis. America faced a military and political crisis. When pictures of prison abuse stunned the world, the world looked to America, to our President, for a response. The President did not stand up and accept responsibility.

Outside the White House and then in an interview broadcast throughout the Middle East, the President did not or could not or would not tell the world he accepts responsibilities for the failures of the Americans under his command. He could not utter the words that the world needed to hear and that Americans needed to say.

Over the last half century, Presidents from both political parties have braved grave crises. They did what leaders do. They did not pass the buck. They stood and accepted responsibility, until now.

In little over 110 days, the American people will elect a new President, and leadership is fundamental to that choice.

The British historian Arnold Toynbee once said, ''As human beings, we are endowed with freedom of choice, and we cannot shuffle off our responsibility upon the shoulders of God or nature. We must shoulder it ourselves. It is up to us.''

Martin Luther King Junior once said, ''The ultimate measure of a man is not where he stands in moments of comfort and convenience but where he stands at times of challenge and controversy.''

In just over 110 days, this Nation will make the most important political decision of the next 4 years. Democrats and Republicans will argue issues, and that is expected, but fundamental to the selection of the person who leads the free world for the next 4 years is the quality of leadership. Leadership is more than a commercial or a campaign brochure. Leadership is one of the most important qualities the President must have. There is a record of what America expects and what Americans demand of their President. Leadership is at the top of the list.

The President had to be taken out twice from the White House to finally say that he was sorry for what had happened to the Arab prisoners that were held in Iraq. You have to ask yourself, does this President believe that the requirement of his job is to accept the responsibility, Mr. Speaker? Because he has not shown it yet. He never has said, ''I accept responsibility.''

One hundred and ten more days, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENOCIDE IN SUDAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we have just had a very vigorous debate on the foreign policy of America. There are many issues that drew the attention of Members. Many of those issues centered around the issues of human rights and even genocide. But as we end this week I think it is important to remind Americans again that genocide does exist, and it is actively being implemented in the nation of Sudan in Africa.

Many of us have been meeting over a series of days and weeks to find an immediate resolution to this horrible and horrific crisis. I am gratified that a resolution sponsored by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) have now been offered in the Senate by Senators BROWNBACK and CORZINE.

□ 2300

The other body is speaking, and we are likewise seeking an immediate response in the House. But even these actions are not enough, and I would hope next week that my colleagues would have the opportunity to vote on a resolution that declares that the government of Sudan is implementing and perpetrating genocide.

What is the crux of the crisis, and why do I come to the floor of the House to continuously remind Members along with others who have been in the leadership role on this issue that we cannot

forget? Why? Because just a few short years ago we are reminded of the million-plus that died in Rwanda while the world simply watched. So many of us have said, ''Not on my clock.''

With every fabric of our bodies, we are refusing to allow the murderous act of the Janjaweed in Sudan and the Khartoum government to continue without impunity. People are dying, and we must cease and have them cease and desist.

Allow me to share some of the words of John Prendergast, who was formerly with African affairs in the Clinton administration and now with the International Crisis Group. He had a unique experience. Making note of the fact that many Members of Congress have gone to Sudan, others will be going. Secretary of State Powell has gone. Secretary General Kofi Annan has gone, but they along with others have been in areas controlled by the government. Mr. Prendergast was able to cross over to areas not controlled by the government, and this is what he saw.

He said, ''Indeed, I saw numbing evidence of such a campaign in this Muslim region of Sudan which is populated by Arabs and non-Arabs. Burned villages confirmed harrowing stories we heard from Darfurians who were lucky enough to make it to the refugee camps in Chad. About 1.5 million people have been left homeless and as many as 300,000 may be dead by year's end. In village after village that I visited, the painstakingly accumulated wealth of the non-Arab population of Darfur, their livestock, their homes, their grain stock, have been destroyed in a matter of minutes. I was not prepared for the far more sinister scene that I encountered in a ravine deep in the Darfur desert. Bodies of young men were lined up in ditches, eerily preserved by the 130 degree desert heat. The story the rebels told us seemed plausible. The dead were civilians who had been marched up a hill and executed by the Arab-led government before its troops abandoned the area the previous month. The rebels assert that there were many, many other such scenes.''

The government's deadly portfolio in Darfur already includes the wanton burning and bombing of villages, the raping of women and girls, and denial of humanitarian aid. We know this is government and this is Arab Muslims against non-Arab Muslims, black Africans.

We realize that it is, plain and simple, genocide. And so we ask that there be more than tough talk. There has to be tough action. The United Nations Security Council must pass a resolution that has teeth. It must demand the immediate disarming of those Muslims or those Arab Muslims and others who are fostering this deadly attack on the black Muslims in Sudan.

The settlement of the previous actions between the West should not counter what is going on here in Darfur. It is important to note that, though we are visiting camps and refugees, we must understand that there are areas that have not yet been viewed and violence continues. We must ensure that this resolution calls for peacekeeping troops, and we must ensure that the humanitarian aid begins to flow. We must protect the humanitarian workers. We must stop the raping and killing of women, young men and boys.

We must have these individuals returned to their villages. They are frightened and refusing to return because they believe they will not be provided for. Hundreds of thousands of survivors have fallen through the cracks. Some of them say they are afraid to travel to government-controlled camps and unable to make it to the border. They are running out of food.

We can imagine 300,000 today; 400,000 tomorrow; 500,000 next month; and a million in a couple of months.

Mr. Speaker, this is now a crisis beyond our appreciation, apprehension, and maybe even recognition. But we do have a backdrop to compare this to. We have the deadly silence of Rwanda. The speechlessness, the wonderment of what to do.

We can do something now. We look forward, hopefully, with great hope, meeting with the administration to craft out the advocacy before the United Nations Security Council and all nations that sit on the Security Council, that have the privilege of sitting. None of them will be given a pass on this vote. They must join with us who believe in a civilized world to stamp out the genocide occurring in Sudan. We must do it now. The resolution must be passed, and we must stand up and send in the kind of help to provide the safety necessary to protect the people in Sudan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

30–SOMETHING DEMOCRATS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for half the time until midnight as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I will not quite take our whole half hour. It has been a very long week; and we know everyone wants to get home here, especially the staff, so we will be brief.

There are a couple of issues that I want to touch upon this evening as we have wrapped up legislative business for the week. This is our normal 30–Something hour where the gentleman from Florida and I and Members of the 30–Something Caucus on the Democratic side will talk about issues. Unfortunately, I am flying solo tonight, and I am missing my wing man from Florida who is not here with me. But I am going to persevere.

There are a couple of issues that I would just like to touch upon here in the next couple of minutes. One of the issues that we have been talking about over the past few weeks and almost a few months now is the issue of voter suppression for college students. This is a major issue throughout the country, regardless of what State you live in, regarding voter suppression for these college students. And in a lot of counties, the boards of elections and the people who work at the boards of elections will tell college students that they cannot vote where they live if they are away at school. They are saying that is not a permanent residence.

The Supreme Court established in 1979 under Federal law that students who reside in dorms are allowed to vote where they live. And there have been thousands of students throughout the country who have been denied their franchise because the local boards of election said that they cannot vote there by saying that they are not permanent residents. But both Federal and State courts have clearly established that students have the right to vote where they go to school, even if they live in a dorm.

So a lot of workers would say, well, you live in a dorm. Well, you cannot vote here; or you live out of State, you cannot vote here and you are not allowed. A lot of this has to do with the local politics. But the bottom line is that if you are away at school, whether it is in your State or outside of your State, you can register to vote where you go to school. And that is very important.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) and I are working on this with Rock the Vote, with the different Secretary of States organizations, and this

is something that should be a bipartisan issue. This is not a Democratic issue. It is not a Republican issue.

We hear a lot of complaints about why young people will not engage in the political process; but if we as legislators are not taking issue with the fact that a lot of these young students are denied their right to vote, we cannot expect them to vote. We cannot expect them to want to participate in this system.

I want to share just a couple of stories here tonight: one from Texas, one from Arkansas, and I think the last one is from Maine regarding this issue. Also in Florida. Let me share one from Texas.

□ 2310

Prairie View A&M, a predominantly black university in a white county. The local district attorney threatened to prosecute students for fraud if they voted. So the local DA is telling these students that they cannot vote and threatening them with charges of fraud.

The students organized a march on Martin Luther King Day, sued the district attorney for voter intimidation. The Secretary of State issued a statement upholding the students' right to vote, and now the students are fighting to get a polling place on campus and to have early voting. The battle continues. That was in the Houston Chronicle on January 23 of this year.

Same kind of situation in Arkansas. Students with the support of the ACLU filed an injunction that would protect their right to register their college residency, and they won the appeal. Same situation at Florida A&M, and also the same situation in Maine.

So what we want to do tonight is just let these students know across the country, contact your Secretary of State's office. Demand that they issue you a copy of this Supreme Court decision. Tell them to contact the local board of elections. Contact the board of elections where your school is now so that they have time to get the information. We cannot wait until the last few days when you cannot even register to vote and the local board of election is still denying you your right to vote.

So this is major issue. I want to share with the people at home, give us an e-mail, 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. Send us an e-mail.

Unfortunately, we are getting stories left and right about the voter suppression, and it is something we really need to talk about and keep touching upon, but also, contact your State Secretary of State who is handling the elections because this is an issue that I think we need to engage, not only as young people but as people who are citizens of the United States of America because it is such an important issue.

I think it is an important issue for a variety of reasons. One is obviously the constitutional issue and the protection of each citizen's franchise, but another issue I think is this.

We are in a time of dramatic change in our country, and we are creating a new system. We are creating a new economic system. In many ways, we are creating a new political system and the way it should be run. Young people are vital to this process of creating a new economy, and we have talked here for many, many weeks about the importance of education, the importance of funding education, the importance of funding the Pell grants, the importance of making sure that students have access to student loans, the $25 billion that the Democratic proposal says we want to give to the States to reduce tuition costs across the country. That is vital and those programs are vital because we need to educate these kids and let them go out and create the new economy.

So, again, it is the 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. Send us an e-mail if you have any issues regarding voter suppression at your campus. Write your local Secretary of State.

Again, this is a bipartisan issue. This is not an issue that we want to be partisan, Democrat or Republican. This is an issue about protecting, because quite frankly there are universities out there that are Republican universities, and those students should have the right there as well.

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, if it is a bipartisan issue, I would point out to the gentleman, since he referenced the Texas case, for those students who wish to vote in their college town, it is going to be necessary to change their legal residence to their college dormitory. It is done all the time. You can live in a college dorm, you can live in a tent, you can live in a van by the river, but you do need to change your legal residence. Many people elect not to do that because their residence changes frequently during their college years and they stay at their parents' residence. If they do that and their parents live in Houston and they live at Prairie View, they are not going to be able to vote in that town, but if you change your legal residence in Texas 30 days before the election, you can vote, no problem. Thank you.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. He is absolutely right; you are allowed by law to vote. The problem is you get, in this case, a local district attorney, or in many, many instances that we have, you have people who work at the board of elections who just say, no, you are not allowed because they just do not understand the ruling.

So we are trying to get, and I hope the gentleman will help me, we are trying to get people to contact the Secretary of State offices all around the country and let them send a copy of this 1979 Supreme Court decision to the local boards and allow them to just have the knowledge, just have the information because the Supreme Court has already ruled. I agree, if you are not willing to live and make it a residency, maybe that is another issue, but these are kids who have established permanent residency at the college campus and have been denied their franchise.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman yield, let us not make the process more complicated than it need be. We do not need to involve the Secretary of State. They simply need to change their residence.

At the University of North Texas in my district in Denton, Texas, the NAACP organized a voter drive, and it was called ''Sleep Here, Vote Here.'' They received an award from the NAACP for their efforts. They have had no problem instituting it.

The difficulty comes if you have not changed your residence 30 days before the election. People do not realize that, and then they feel they are unfairly disenfranchised.

Again, to go to the Secretary of State to do a simple change of address is unnecessarily complicating the process, and I am afraid the gentleman will drive more people out of the process by making them call Austin or whatever the capital of Ohio is, I do not even know, but making them call the State capital to talk to the Secretary of State.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, Columbus is the capital of the State of Ohio, and the point I want to make, and the gentleman reiterated the point, absolutely, if you are not a permanent resident, that is one thing. But we have kids, students around the country who want to be registered as permanent residents, they want to vote at the college campus, and the local DA is saying we are going to charge you with fraud or you are not a permanent resident.

So we are saying, given those facts, you should be able to register at that college campus and vote at that college campus, and all we want to do is not complicate the process. We want the Secretary of States to issue the 1979 Supreme Court ruling to the local boards so that they know firsthand that if a college kid comes in and establishes permanent residency that they would be able to vote.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Ohio for coming forward, along with his caucus, for a very excellent presentation.

Let me just quickly say, you could not be more right, and this could not be a more vital and timely effort on behalf of college students around the Nation.

I am going to put on a lawyer's hat just for a little bit. That case came out of Prairie View A&M, Prairie View, Texas, and believe it or not, just a few short months ago, we had to march with 7,000 students and community leaders to make the very point again, because the students in Prairie View, Texas, were being denied the right to vote by the district attorney of that county.

We had to then solicit the assistance of the Secretary of State, the Department of Justice, and the governor of the State of Texas to pronounce the rights of those students, and thereby, the rights of students in Denton, Texas, and those in Corpus and those in San Antonio, maybe in Columbus, Ohio; New York City, to have the right to vote, register to vote in your place of residence.

I do not like the term ''permanent residence,'' and the reason why I do not like that is because it suggests an onerous burden that is not true. If you declare that you are a resident of that community, for that framework, that you are not voting in another location, meaning that you have left the residency of your parents or wherever you live and you have taken up residence, because the distinguished gentleman, someone may move from where they graduate from school and become a resident of New York, but as long as they are not voting in New York and Texas then they have taken up residency in New York.

□ 2320

And they have the right to vote.

This is an election year of the greatest moment, if you will. And that means that we are trying to encourage our young people to participate in the democratic process of elections. And what happened in Prairie View, Texas, in this year on the date of the birthday of Martin Luther King, which was the date of that particular decision, January 15, 1979, was the reason we had to march again January 15, 2004, to declare the rights of those young people to be able to vote.

So I think that the gentleman's plea today, the gentleman's request today is paramount. And all of the Secretaries of State, and it may be the Secretary of State in one State, it may be the Attorney General or it may be the Governor. But what the gentleman is suggesting is that there has to be the pronouncement that if you have taken up residence, if you have an address, if you have left the residency of your past location, family, etc., if you are not voting in two places, which none of us are arguing for. Then you have the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I will close on this. Intimidation is real. It has occurred. I am a living witness to listening to students who were intimidated from not only voting but even registering. There is a suggestion that in towns where you might think there is conflict between town and gown that this creates an agitation. I believe if we create an atmosphere that eliminates intimidation, we will find that our students on college campuses will be the best community citizens in various parts of communities that we could ever find.

These are young people who are vital, they are vibrant, and they simply want to participate. Many of them are volunteers, many of them participate in helping in humanitarian efforts in the community. They are good community citizens.

I would simply argue that the gentleman has an excellent point that is being made, and I want to thank the gentleman on behalf of the students of Prairie View A&M, because the gentleman is using them symbolically for the troubles we had in Texas that we had to fix, not by a simple request. And since many of us were physically meeting with that district attorney, it was not just a simple request.

We thanked that district attorney's office for conceding getting an opinion from the Attorney General and from the Secretary of State and from the Governor of the State of Texas. Because I can assure my colleague that no one would want to have every single college town have to have a march of 7,000 people to get their votes.

So I hope what the gentleman has offered today will be heard by many of our colleagues, and that we will check on our college campuses, check on our students and ensure that our election officials are very much aware of this very worthy decision and the gentleman's great leadership on this issue.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for sharing her personal experience with us. It was obviously just something that had to be done.

Let me share so there is no confusion here. The case we were just talking about, the local district attorney threatened to prosecute students for fraud if they voted. I already mentioned this school in Arkansas.

At Florida A&M, during the 2000 general election, 5,000 students were turned away from polling locations at the Historically Black University. Students have also reported receiving two voter registration cards with different polling locations. Others were turned away and told to vote at off-campus polling sites, while more students were informed that they had never been registered.

In Maine, the same kind of situation. The town registrar of Brunswick, Maine, turned students away from the polls by using misleading questions regarding residency. Students were informed if they registered in the county of their college or university, now listen to this, that they would risk losing financial aid, health care, driver's license and/or car registration. The students began campaigning and eventually protested. They gained national media coverage, defeated the legislation with a unanimous vote because they tried to manipulate the legislative process there.

So this is really happening. It is happening in Maine, Arkansas, Texas; and it is probably happening all over the country. Send us an e-mail, let us know, contact your local Secretary of State or whoever in your State is in charge of the voting. This is a very important issue.

We are not saying we want anybody to be able, as the gentlewoman from Texas said, to be able to vote in a couple of different places; but these are students. They have the right to vote. They qualify and they should be able to participate in the political process.

So that wraps it up for the 30–Something 20 minutes this week, Mr. Speaker.

FLIPFLOPS ON IRAQ AND AL QAEDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I would assume that is eastern time midnight and not time in my district midnight. We could always hope, but I will make the assumption that is eastern time.

Mr. Speaker, before I start into the text of my discussion tonight, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for her comment that the U.N. Security Council must pass a resolution that has teeth. That was exactly the position many of the Members on this side of the aisle felt like 1441 should have been, a resolution that had teeth in it. But, actually, it turned out not to be, and that is unfortunate. But her point is well made that the Security Council lacks the ability to enforce things that should be enforced.

Mr. Speaker, I am joined tonight by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MCCOTTER), and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP). We want to talk about Iraq and al Qaeda.

It is one thing when politicians flipflop, and we have an example now. One of the Presidential candidates, Senator KERRY, has shown a willingness to flipflop and play both sides of an issue. But it is especially reprehensible when our media begins to flipflop. As we discuss this issue tonight on Iraq and al Qaeda, we are going to show instances where the media, in 1999, 2000, and beyond, were perfectly content, under the Clinton administration, to acknowledge the ties between al Qaeda and Iraq. Yet under President Bush, they have decided that they will disaffirm that; that instead of the truth, their agenda is more important. They have elected to now say that there is no connection, when the facts clearly show that there has been a strong connection between al Qaeda and Iraq.

In reviewing this, I am reminded of the New York Times scandal where the

writer from the New York Times was just simply making up stories and writing things without facts. CNN produced even an eye witness, a teenage boy, that they declared was talking about how the President had coerced him into denying pressure. When the young man was actually talked to, he explained that, no, the White House had never contacted him at all. The CNN reporter simply made up the story and was allowed to do that by her superiors.

It is this manipulation of the truth, it is this flipflopping on the issues that makes it very difficult for Americans to understand exactly what is happening.

For the first section on tonight's discussion, I would like for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) to discuss an account that occurred today when Iraqi women visited in this Capitol and visited with Members of Congress. The Iraqi women were being asked, should America have come to Iraq, and was the war the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman to discuss the responses that were given today.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I also thank him for putting this hour together this evening.

I think this is extremely important. Some of these things that we will not ever read of in the newspapers get reported here on the floor of the House because they do not seem to come out anywhere else.

Today, on Capitol Hill, in our Subcommittee on Health Policy, we were joined by about 25 women from the country of Iraq. They had been here for about a week studying various Federal agencies and how democracy works and how the business of our government runs. And, in fact, after our policy meeting today, several of the Members of Congress had one of the Iraqi women go with them for the remainder of the morning. I took one of the participants to the Committee on Science, where we were talking about space exploration.

It was kind of ironic, because we were talking about the bravery involved in space exploration, but these women showed great bravery in coming to this country to learn about democracy, to learn how disparate peoples work together to gain a common good. They took a big chance in doing that. In fact, some of them were too concerned to come out of the briefing room, where there were television cameras, because they did not want their faces filmed, for fear that they or their families would suffer back in Iraq.

□ 2330

Surely these women showed a lot of bravery by coming here today and they shared a lot of stories with us.

There was, of course, some question about can all of the various different groups exist in the country of Iraq. One of the spokeswomen from the group said that truly religious imbalance in that country is, in fact, propaganda. They are a tightly interwoven and interconnected country, and they have been for years. They said playing politics with ethnicity is wrong, not only in Iraq but in this country, I believe, but certainly that was the message they wanted to give us.

They were generally happy with the new Prime Minister, Dr. Alawi. Several of them said it is too early to tell a lot about that administration, but the consensus of the women was that this is an Iraqi government and, therefore, it is good.

There is a big distinction between what is Iraqi and what comes from abroad, even to the point that the situation in Fallujah, a lot of the problems that have occurred in Fallujah, according to the women, were caused by people who came from abroad, that is, people who came from other countries.

One of the ladies there who was from the city of Fallujah said, ''In so many ways Iraq is much more beautiful now. For the first time in years I have the freedom to drive in a car. The situation is getting better daily.''

But Fallujah remains the magnet for terrorists and for outsiders seeking to influence the outcome in Iraq. She was very emphatic about Fallujah. She said, ''Please finish the job.''

I promised that I would relay that information to the Secretary of Defense, so, Mr. Rumsfeld, I hope you are paying attention this evening.

They went on to say, why give them a chance? Why should we give the foreign fighters a chance in Fallujah? It should have been stopped at the beginning. We are only giving them increased determination to do what they came there to do, which is to cause trouble for the country of Iraq. Unfortunately, from Fallujah on to Karbala and Najaf, the terrorists have moved.

One of the city leaders from Karbala was very well spoken and emotional in her talk. She said no one from Karbala was involved in the insurgency in that town. In fact, all of the victims of the fighting, all of the fighters who fell in that siege taken to the hospitals, none had identification on them that identified them as natives of the city of Karbala. They were all from outside the city. Unfortunately, now the city has been destroyed.

She wound up to say that she felt that women are the best ally that civilization has in dealing with extremism. I would agree with her about that. She said that Iraqi women have suffered a lot. Discrimination was common in Iraq for the past many years. There have been over 120 Assyrian villages that are just gone, destroyed. No one knows where the people have gone. Liberation for that individual was really one of the best things that had ever happened.

In response to a question that perhaps this country went into Iraq under false pretenses and perhaps we should not have gone, a woman stood up, and really this brought out a lot of participation from the ladies in the audience. The first woman stood up and quite accusatively said, ''Why did you delay?''

Again, the city leader from the city of Karbala said, ''Forty-eight people in my family are gone, and I don't know where they are. I don't know whether they're dead or alive. If they're dead, I don't know where they're buried. Why would you even ask this question?''

Another woman stood up and said, ''Chemical warfare was used on my family. So many have been lost. Again, we don't know where they have gone. The liberation should have begun in 1991.''

''Liberation was late,'' another woman said, ''and we were left to be tortured.''

Another woman told a very touching story of having to hear on the telephone from a relative who had been in prison, had his tongue cut out and his hand cut off and he was telephoning to try to tell them what had happened to him and her story was very, very difficult to listen to, I promise you.

So did we do the right thing in Iraq? History will judge. History will tell. Certainly these women who will do a lot to restore civil society in Iraq, in this group of women today, the answer was a resounding, yes, we did the right thing. Perhaps we took too long to get it done.

Mr. PEARCE. I thank the gentleman from Texas for those comments. Liberating Iraq was the right thing to do, and these women had the courage to come here to the United States Congress and to testify about the evils that have occurred under terrorism, under Saddam Hussein.

I think the compelling question that I heard from people who attended the event was, why did the world take so long? Why did you watch millions tortured and hundreds of thousands die before we came? Forty-eight members of one woman's family just cannot be found. She does not even know where they are buried. And we in this country have a press who is trying to indicate that there was no reason to be there.

I was especially ashamed when former Vice President Al Gore was quoted as saying, ''The President convinced the country with a mixture of documents that turned out to be forged and blatantly false assertions that Saddam Hussein was in league with al Qaeda.'' I am sorry, but Mr. Gore must not have read the comments from the 9/11 Commission Chairman Thomas Kean, the comments made on the News Hour with Jim Lehrer, June 16, this year.

Mr. Kean said, ''Yes, there were contacts between Iraq and al Qaeda, a number of them, some of them a little shadowy. They were definitely there.''

Richard Clarke was quoted as saying, ''There's absolutely no evidence that Iraq was ever supporting al Qaeda. Ever.'' Mr. Clarke was the head terrorism expert under President Clinton. It appears that he is covering his own trail because, again, the Vice Chairman

of the 9/11 Commission says, ''I don't think there's any doubt that there were contacts between Saddam Hussein's government and al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden's people.''

Lee Hamilton, the Vice Chairman, also spoke on the News Hour with Jim Lehrer on June 16, 2004. Keep in mind that Mr. Hamilton is a former Democratic Congressman from Indiana who served for 34 years in this institution, and he is the one who is saying, ''I don't think there's any doubt that there were contacts between Saddam Hussein's government and al Qaeda, Osama bin Laden's people.''

And so we have members of the other party who are out on the stump every day accusing the U.S. and accusing President Bush of manufacturing documents when the 9/11 Commission has been very clear that there does not seem to be any doubt that there was cooperation between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein.

The 9/11 Commission staff statement 15 says, ''Bin Laden also explored possible cooperation with Iraq during his time in Sudan, despite his opposition to Hussein's secular regime. A senior Iraqi intelligence officer reportedly made three visits to Sudan, finally meeting with bin Laden in 1994. Bin Laden is said to have requested space to establish training camps as well as assistance in procuring weapons, but Iraq apparently never responded. There have been reports that contacts between Iraq and al Qaeda also occurred after bin Laden had returned to Afghanistan, but they do not appear to have resulted in a collaborative relationship.''

We have many, many examples of the cooperation and the attempted cooperation between al Qaeda and bin Laden.

The Butler report on British intelligence affirms many of the same things, just in case there are those who believe that only the U.S. 9/11 Commission is finding the cooperation. The Butler report on British intelligence says, ''We have reached the conclusion that, prior to the war, the Iraqi regime, A, had the strategic intention of resuming the pursuit of prohibited weapons; B, in support of that goal was carrying out illicit research and development and procurement activities to seek to sustain its indigenous capabilities; and, C, was developing ballistic missiles with a range longer than that permitted under relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions.''

The Butler report continues, ''We conclude that on the basis of the intelligence assessments at the time covering both Nigeria and the Democratic Republic of Congo, the statements on Iraqi attempts to buy uranium from Africa in the government's dossier, and by the Prime Minister in the House of Commons, were well-founded. By extension, we conclude also that the statement in President Bush's State of the Union address of 28 January, 2003, where the President stated that the British government has learned that Saddam Hussein recently sought significant quantities of uranium from Africa was well-founded,'' the Butler Commission concludes.

Before I go on, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. McCOTTER) to address this issue if he would.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, the timing was impeccable tonight, to have heard the previous speaker from Ohio talking about the 30-something Democratic Caucus.

□ 2340

As a 38-year-old Republican, I am disappointed his bipartisan effort has not reached this far across the aisle to include some of the rest of us. Especially people my age, we are not baby boomers. We are Generation X. We grew up through the malaise of the Carter years. We grew up watching America internationally impotent in the world. We watched friends, neighbors, family lose their jobs under stagflation.

And then we watched Ronald Reagan's administration come in. We watched America be truly respected throughout the world. We watched free market economies grow and expand to provide opportunities for us as we left our college years, and we were blessed enough to see the fall of Godless communism throughout Eastern Europe.

But then we are also very practical opinion people for another reason, because shortly after that, we got to see our generation quoting Thomas Jefferson and James Madison on the streets of Tiananmen Square being gunned down by yet another totalitarian government, and we realized early on in life that life is a struggle between good and evil and in many ways it is a perpetual one.

My generation also had some difficult lessons to learn too. We were the first ones to realize that a sexual infection which was once curable could be superseded by sexual infections that could kill people; that we would have to continue to work our lives longer and longer with even the remote chance that we would have Social Security because we were the first generation smaller than the one that went in front of us, which was never part of the plan. We have to watch our parents, who are living longer, come to us for help as we try to watch the soaring cost of tuition for our own children behind us.

And perhaps because of the realistic, practical nature of my generation and perhaps something we have gotten from our grandparents, the Greatest Generation, that I think it is time on Iraq to ask some fundamental questions, and I think they are exceedingly fair questions to ask because no one has answered them and no one has bothered to posit any answers to them.

I want to know what the plan is from the minority party. The multilateral mantra has been disproved by the U.N.'s Oil-for-Food scandal, their inability to stop genocide in the Sudan or in Rwanda prior to that, and their abject anti-Americanism in so many of their member states.

Would we like to see multilateralism work and the reconstruction of Iraq? Absolutely. But I do not think we the American taxpayers should hold our breath until the governmental entity where we pay 22 percent of their core funding decides that they do not dislike us as much as they do.

So multilateralism is also not going to work because the Democratic approach to that has been quite simple. The Democratic Presidential nominee has derided and criticized our allies whose soldiers are fighting and dying next to us in the fields of Iraq as the coalition of the bribed and the coerced, the bought, and the extorted. How do they build an international coalition attacking their allies? Whom are they trying to add? One cannot attack their allies and add their adversaries and call that a true coalition, especially if one is trying to be the Commander in Chief of the United States Armed Forces.

So then we have to ask, what is the plan? We have not heard a plan. We have to ask, on the question of weapons of mass destruction, what constitutes a significant tie with al Qaeda? If one does not believe there were significant enough ties, there were contacts, although the same intelligence which is being derided is also being used to disprove that they were collaborative, which is quite an interesting feat rhetorically. I want to know under what circumstances, what was the threshold the minority party would hold Saddam Hussein to before they would engage in defending the United States of America without a veto from the U.N. When could we unilaterally protect ourselves if necessary?

Ten tons of yellow cake from Niger, which the French Government, the Italian Government, and the British Government still stand by exclusive of the bogus material, the one bogus document. What is the threshold? What is a collaborative link? What is their standard for defending the United States against an external threat from a terrorist-sponsoring state and a terrorist-sheltering state? If they did not like President Bush's, if they do not believe he had enough, then I ask them to tell us what their standard is so as we head into this election we can have a debate on issues, not individuals, because the American people deserve to know what they are going to do to defend this country if they hold public office today and tomorrow and probably for our lifetime in this war on terror. I think those are fair questions to ask.

I think we should also ask the question about the moral equivalency that we used to see between the Soviet Union and the United States and the left in this country, I want to ask the question where did the moral equivalency go? There is more outrage over

Abu Ghraib prison than there is the treatment of American soldiers that are shot and killed by the insurgents and terrorists in Iraq. The actions at Abu Ghraib were horrible, but the purpose behind them was to gather information from people who were shooting at and trying to kill our troops to protect our troops and protect the United States citizens, just as it was at Guantanamo Bay. The goal of the terrorists that are violating every civilized notion of captivity, their goal is to foist terrorism back upon Iraq and back upon the rest of the world.

It is so sad, I would not even settle for moral equivalency from the left these days that would wax nostalgic for it.

Finally, I just find it very difficult to see this debate continue and not to see a plan. I reiterate that. We are sentient human beings. We have the gift of reason if we so choose to use it. And as we head into this troubled time for our country, deeper and deeper we go, the longer and longer it takes us to come to each other with ideas to debate and discuss for the common good that can be objectively analyzed and assessed by the electorate and by each other, the worse off we are going to be.

So in the future I would just ask a simple question of anyone who has any opinion on this, on Iraqi reconstruction, on weapons of mass destruction, on the role of the United Nations in this world. It is nice to have their protestation and opinion, but show me their plan and perhaps we can proceed together.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments and appreciate his attention to the key questions in this conversation.

I traveled to Iraq at the end of October and the first part of November with the gentleman from Michigan, and we saw the same things each day at noon for 3 days. Each day at noon and in the evening meal we were in chow halls with 6 and 7 and 800 young men and women from America. I would wander throughout giving New Mexico flag lapel pens to young men and women. The constant question I heard from young men and women there was why do my parents not know the truth about this war and why do they not know the truth about what we are doing here, the good that we are doing in reconstruction? Those were random contacts throughout every chow hall from Kirkuk to Baghdad to Tikrit. There is no explanation why the press refuses to tell the accuracies and instead to tell just one side, often not even telling that side with truth.

To address the concepts of why the press might act in such ways, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the State of Utah has the honor of having a higher percentage of our members in the Reserve and the National Guard involved in the Mid East conflict than any other State in the Nation, and we bear that statistic with a great deal of pride.

I have attempted to make sure I was there to visit with every group of returning Reservists and Guardsmen from the State of Utah. And almost inevitably, as those individuals were coming back and we had a chance to talk briefly with their families, the message they were telling us is that what they are seeing or their families are seeing about the situation in the Mid East is not the same thing that they experienced as soldiers serving there. One of the great Utahans, Bob Gross, who has just returned from a year as a special senior adviser to the Iraqi ministry of labor and social services, had the same message to say, that what he experienced in his time there in Baghdad was not the same thing as the message that has been given. The question has to be why is this message seeming to be so garbled. Those experiencing the situation in Iraq and those talking to us who have lived there have a different message than what we may be having over the media.

In my respected opinion, part of that problem rests in our understanding of the purpose that we have there in the media. If the Members would go back with me, when I was a legislator in the State of Utah, one year we came to the State with a total new restructuring of the State retirement system.

□ 2350

I was very excited about this system going in there, because we had come up with a program that would actually enhance the benefits of the individuals on the retirement system and cut the costs to the State at the same time, and I thought we have reached political nirvana. We will be hailed as the conquering heroes. This is going to be the greatest PR coup that could ever happen, because we have done the impossible.

As we started the discussion of that restructuring, I realized it was not being covered by any of the media. Finally, with some courage, I went to one of the senior reporters who covers the legislature and I said why are you not covering anything about our total restructuring of the State retirement system?

He said, ''Rod, you know, you are right. It is probably one of the four major issues before this legislature. But let's face facts, it is retirement issues. They are boring. No one wants to read or talk about retirement.''

I recognized then and there, he was right. Those issues were boring. They were dull. I also recognized that the purpose of the media is not merely to explain events, it is not to tell the truth solely, it is also to sell papers and to attract viewers. And to do so, the emphasis must be on that which is unusual, on that which is a conflict. No one is ever going to report that 100 people safely crossed the street yesterday. They will report the one person who got hit. That is the reality of the situation.

If we expect all the issues, the truth to come out from the media sources by themselves, in all respects we are asking them to do something with which they are not capable, because not necessarily of intent, but because of the situation in which they have to be in a competitive world market to sell papers and attract viewers at the same time.

We always talk about Jefferson who said, ''Were it left to me to decide whether we should have government without newspapers or newspapers without government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.''

That statement was made before he was ever president, before he spent 12 years actually in Washington, eight as president.

After his experience as president, Jefferson said, ''The outright suppression of the press would be no more injurious to the public good than the newspaper's abandoned prostitution to falsehood.''

Later also he later said, ''The man who never looks into the newspaper is better informed than he who reads them.''

Now, I not going to go that far, but I am going to tell you that what I think would be wise to do is look at history as one of the guiding factors in how we view the future and where we are going.

We all know that after World War II, there were American deaths in the effort to stabilize Germany, post-World War II, after the fighting supposedly had ended.

To me the most analogous historical situation is still the Spanish-American War. Then activist Teddy Roosevelt said it was not much of a war, but it was the only one we had. Senator Chandler on the Senate floor said any war with Spain will last between 2 weeks and 90 days, and he was totally accurate, the war lasted 90 days.

As America became giddy with success in the Spanish-American War, with very little bloodshed, we realize then we had the responsibilities of stabilizing the new territory of the Philippines. That stabilization took 6 years. That is where the bitterness was, that is where the deaths took place, that is where the cost was, in an effort for that stabilization, and it did not take place until the capture of the Filipino rebel leader, Emilio Aguinaldo, at which time the now President Teddy Roosevelt declared the stabilization effort successful and the war in the Philippines was over. In fact, the fighting of the insurrection still lasted two more years. But with the capture, then the corner had been turned.

We have done the same thing in Iraq. With the capture of Saddam Hussein, the court hearing of Saddam Hussein, the turning of government control over to the Iraqis themselves, this stabilization effort in Iraq is going forward, and it will be successful.

There are some who say there is no chance whatsoever of actually turning Iraq into a democracy. They said that

same thing after World War II about Japan, another area that had no democratic tradition, that had fought a bitter war. But we were successful in our efforts of reforming that area, changing the system and moving forward.

May I quote with just some words from Mr. Gross, who once again, whose returned and his experience first-hand in Iraq, by saying some people would say, ''Rather than fight in Iraq, we should fight terrorism. Well, terrorism has moved to Iraq. It is the center of that war on terrorism. Iraq is the pivotal point. Terrorists had either tacit or direct support from Saddam, and the U.S. and coalition forces have created a tremendous problem for the terrorists. And now the Jordanians and the Syrians and the Saudis will have to rethink their relationship with terrorists. Iraq is the linchpin.''

We are moving forward in Iraq. It is important as a key element in this fight against the war on terror. It is possible to create a democracy in Iraq, which will have immense effects on assisting the United States in our relationship in the entire Middle East, and it is one of those things that we are going to have to fight and work through looking at history, not necessarily referring only to the mass media, which has different kinds of agendas of their own.

Mr. McCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I am most impressed by the gentleman from Utah's understanding of the Spanish-American War. In fact, I would only add that there were also front page stories about American troops and captured insurgents in that war as well.

The gentleman brings up a very good point that I would welcome the opportunity to address, as my district has many constituents who are Iraqi and Arab American and, more importantly, many of my friends are.

One of the things we have heard repeatedly throughout this debate is the Iraqi people will not take to democracy, that they have suffered too long under a totalitarian yoke.

Well, what country could you not say that about in this world? Half have suffered under totalitarianism with no history of democracy, including up until the fall of the Soviet Union, Russian people themselves? How many Eastern European countries never knew full freedom, only knew serfdom and feudalism?

So I would like to add to my list of requests for plans one final one: Those people who believe that there are some human beings that cannot take to democracy, I would like your test and your complete list of those who you deem unfit for freedom.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank both the gentlemen from Utah and Michigan, and am always compelled to understand that this institution is inhabited by people with great insights and great skills in communicating them, and they are demonstrating that tonight.

Mr. Speaker, as we conclude our time, I would like to mention that not only do we have the 9/11 Commission that has contradicted both Richard Clarke and former Vice President Al Gore, but also the Butler Report and the Senate Intelligence report which just came out had several conclusions, and I will just briefly go through those, because we have so many things to cover in the last 5 minutes.

But Conclusion 1, Iraq was procuring dual use equipment that had potential nuclear applications, this from the U.S. Senate Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence reporting on the U.S. pre-war intelligence assessment on Iraq.

Also the intelligence reporting did support the conclusion that chemical and biological weapons were within Iraq's technological capability, that Iraq was trying to procure dual-use materials.

Conclusion 91, that the CIA assessment that Iraq had maintained ties with Palestinian terrorist groups was supported by intelligence. The CIA was also reasonable in judging that Iraq appeared to have been reaching out to more effective terrorist groups, such as Hizbollah and Hamas.

Conclusion 92, that the indicators of a possible Iraq-al Qaeda relationship was a reasonable and objective approach to the question.

Conclusion 93 was the CIA reasonably assessed that there were several likely instances of contacts between Iraq and al Qaeda throughout the 1990s.

Conclusion 94 supports it.

Conclusion 95 supports it.

But if we go back to the news media, again looking at the news media's flip-flop on this issue, back in 1999, many in the news media were publicly reporting the ties and contacts between Iraq and al Qaeda.

Newsweek Magazine, the January 11, 1999 issue entitled ''Saddam plus bin Laden,'' which read in part, ''Saddam Hussein, who has a long record of supporting terrorism, is trying to rebuild his intelligence network overseas, assets that would allow him to establish a terrorism network. U.S. sources say he is reaching out to Islamic terrorists, including some who may be linked to Osama bin Laden, the wealthy Saudi exile accused of masterminding the bombing of two U.S. embassies in Africa last summer.''

That article from Newsweek, January 11, 1999.

ABC News, on January 15, 1999, reported that intelligence sources say bin Laden's long relationship with the Iraqis began as he helped Saddam's fundamentalist government in their efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction. It continues that ABC News has learned in December an Iraqi intelligence chief named Faruq Hijazi, now Iraq's ambassador to Turkey, made a secret trip to Afghanistan to meet with bin Laden. Three intelligence agencies tell ABC News they cannot be certain what was discussed, but almost certainly they say bin Laden had been told they will be welcome in Baghdad.

NPR reporter Mike Shuster reported in an interview with Vincent Cannistraro, who was the former head of the CIA's counterterrorism center, he says that Iraq's contacts with bin Laden go back some years to at least 1994, according to one U.S. Government source. Hijaz met with him when bin Laden lived in Sudan.

Mr. Speaker, when the news agencies declare these contacts under one President and disaffirm them under another, it makes them appear to have no more credibility than the National Enquirer.

Mr. Speaker, we have got several quotes here from Senators, and I recognize that my time has drawn to a close.

Liberating Iraq was the right thing to do. The war on terror, al Qaeda, have close relationships with Iraq.

We will continue the discussion next week, Mr. Speaker.

CORRECTION TO THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF TUESDAY, JULY 13, 2004, AT PAGE H5617

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3575

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, due to a clerical error, the sponsor of H.R. 3575 inadvertently added my name as cosponsor; and I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3575.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DOGGETT (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 1:00 p.m. on account of a death in the family.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4:00 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

Mr. QUINN (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of family medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PEARCE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, July 22.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, July 19.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, July 19 and 20.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 15. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections and countermeasures against chemical, radiological, or nuclear agents that may be used in a terrorist attack against the United States by giving the National Institutes of Health contracting flexibility, infrastructure improvements, and expediting the scientific peer review process, and streamlining the Food and Drug Administration approval process of countermeasures.

S. 1167. An act to resolve boundary conflicts in Barry and Stone Counties in the State of Missouri.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock midnight), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 19, 2004, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9096. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Wyoming [Docket No. 04-009-2] received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9097. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of User Fees for 2004 Crop Cotton Classification Services to Growers [Doc. No. CN-03-007] (RIN: 0581-AC34) received July 2, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9098. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Lamb Promotion, Research, and Information Program: Rules and Regulations [No. LS-02-05] received July 2, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9099. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Lamb Promotion, Research, and Information Program: Rules and Regulations [No. LS-02-05] received July 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9100. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Milk in the Mideast Marketing Area: Order Amending the Order [Docket No. AO-361-A35; DA-01-04] received July 2, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9101. A letter from the Administrator, AMS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tart Cherries Grown in the States of Michigan, et al.; Revision of Current Procedures for Handlers To Receive Exempt Use/Diversion Credit for New Product and New Market Development Activities [Docket No. FV03-930-5-IFR] received July 2, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9102. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests for FY 2005 budget amendments for the Departments of Agriculture, Health and Human Services, Housing and Urban Development, Justice, and Labor. In addition a FY 2004 language proposal for the Departments of Housing and Urban Development; (H. Doc. No. 108—200); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9103. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Written Assurance of Technical Data Conformity [DFARS Case 2003-D104] received June 23, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

9104. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Use of FAR Part 12 for Performance-Based Contracting for Services [DFARS Case 2003-D111] received June 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

9105. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Designated Countries — New European Union Members [DFARS Case 2004-D006] received June 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

9106. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Firefighting Services Contracts [DFARS Case 2003-D107] received June 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

9107. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Information Assurance [DFARS Case 2002-D020] received June 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

9108. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Regulation BB; Docket No. R-1205] Department of the Treasury, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency [Docket No. 04-17] (RIN: 1557-AC86); Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (RIN: 3064-AC82); Department of the Treasury, Office of Thrift Supervision [No. 2004-28] (RIN: 1550- AB9) received July 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9109. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Investment Advisor Codes of Ethics [Release Nos. IA-2256, IC-26492; File No. S7-04-04] (RIN: 3235-AJ08) received July 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

9110. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Participation in Education Department Programs by Religious Organizations; Providing for Equal Treatment of All Education Program Participants (RIN: 1890-AA11) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9111. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Effective Date of Requirement for Premarket Approval for Three Class III Preamendments Devices [Docket No. 2003N-0468] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9112. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Child Restraint Systems; Anthropomorphic Test Devices; Hybrid III Six-Year-Old Weighted Child Test Dummy [Docket No. NHTSA-04-18075] (RIN: 2127-AI58) received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9113. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rule concerning disclosures regarding energy consumption and water use of certain home appliances and other products required under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (''Appliance Labeling Rule'') — received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9114. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Rules Under the FACT Act (RIN: 3084-AA94) received June 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

9115. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Export Adminsitration Regulations to Remove Certain Regional Stability and Crime Control License Requirements to the New North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Member Countries [Docket No. 040614182-4182-01] (RIN: 0694-AD11) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

9116. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Export and Reexport Restrictions on Cuba [Docket No. 040610179-4179-01] (RIN: 0694-AD17) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

9117. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Posting Regulations (RIN: 3206-AJ73) received June 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9118. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Extended Assignment Incentives (RIN: 3206-AK01) received June 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9119. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States and

in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Managment Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No. 031216314-3314-01; I.D. 062304A] received July 8, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9120. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Bluefin Tuna Catch Limit Adjustments [I.D. 061604A] received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9121. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Amendment 10 [Docket No. 040210050-4166-03; I.D. 011204A] (RIN: 0648-AN16) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9122. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries Regulations; Pacific Tuna Fisheries [Docket No. 040423129-4165-02; I.D. 041404D] (RIN: 0648-AQ22) Recieved June 24, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9123. A letter from the Director, Regulations and Forms Services, Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Authorizing Collections of the Fee Levied on F, J, and M Nonimmigrant Classifications Under Public Law 104-208, SEVIS [ICE No. 2297-03] (RIN: 1653-AA23) received July 6, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9124. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Admission and Orientation Program: Removal From Rules [BOP-1110-F] (RIN: 1120-AB08) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9125. A letter from the Project Counsel, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Penalties for Non-submission of Ballast Water Management Reports [USCG-2002-13147] (RIN: 1625-AA51) received July 1, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9126. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Restricted Area 2938, Horseshoe Beach; FL [Docket No. FAA-2004-17177; Airspace Docket No. 04-ASO-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received June 3, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9127. A letter from the Paralegal Sepcialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modifcation of Class E Airspace; Iowa City, IA. [Docket No. FAA-2004-17143; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-91] received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9128. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Neodesha, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2004-16988; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-6] received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9129. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Paola, KS. [Docket No. FAA-2004-16987; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-5] received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9130. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Charleston, MO. [Docket No. FAA-2004-17146; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-12] received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9131. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30408; Amdt. No. 3092] received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9132. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Restricted Area 2204, Oliktok Point; AK Correction [Docket No. FAA-2003-15410; Airspace Docket No. 03-AAL-1] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9133. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class E Airspace; Chardron, NE. [Docket No. FAA-2004-18012; Airspace Docket No. 04-ACE-41] received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9134. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30409; Amdt. No. 3093] received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9135. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; NARCO Avionics Inc. AT150 Transponders [Docket No. 2002-NE-32-AD; Amendment 39-13586; AD 2004-08-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 9, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9136. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Re-Issuance of NASA FAR Supplement Subchapter E (RIN: 2700-AC68) received July 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

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:

Mr. KNOLLENBERG: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4837. A bill making appropriations for military construction, family housing, and base realignment and closure for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2005, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. S. 741. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with regard to new animal drugs, and for other purposes (Rept. 108–608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OXLEY: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3574. A bill to require the mandatory expensing of stock options granted to executive officers, and for other purposes; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period ending not later than July 16, 2004, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(f), rule X (Rept. 108–609, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. THORNBERRY (for himself, Mr. CARTER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FROST, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HALL, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. REYES, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BELL, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. DELAY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 4836. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Amarillo, Texas, as the ''Thomas E. Creek Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 4838. A bill to establish a Healthy Forest Youth Conservation Corps to provide a means by which young adults can carry out rehabilitation and enhancement projects to prevent fire and suppress fires, rehabilitate public land affected or altered by fires, and provide disaster relief, 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. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. BALLENGER):

H.R. 4839. A bill to authorize the establishment of a program to provide economic and infrastructure reconstruction assistance to the Republic of Haiti, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. AKIN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. ENGLISH):

H.R. 4840. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the taxation of businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNS:

H.R. 4841. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify certain tax rules for individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELAY (for himself and Mr. RANGEL) (both by request):

H.R. 4842. A bill to implement the United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BERRY, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. OTTER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. OSE):

H.R. 4843. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify the jurisdiction of the United States over waters of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia (for herself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 4844. A bill to amend part III of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of programs under which supplemental dental and vision benefits are made available to Federal employees, retirees, and their dependents, to expand the contracting authority of the Office of Personnel Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 4845. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose an excise tax on the termination of retiree prescription drug coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. GRANGER (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. PAUL, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 4846. A bill to reduce the risk of identity theft by limiting the use of Social Security account numbers on certain Government-issued identification cards and Government documents; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Energy and Commerce, and Veterans' Affairs, 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 Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BOYD, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. MICA, Mr. KELLER, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. GOSS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. FEENEY, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 4847. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 560 Bay Isles Road in Longboat Key, Florida, as the ''Lieutenant General James V. Edmundson Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PENCE):

H.R. 4848. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide for the establishment of centers for the treatment of obstetric fistula in developing countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H.R. 4849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage guaranteed lifetime income payments from annuities and similar payments of life insurance proceeds at dates later than death by excluding from income a portion of such payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 474. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not give any Federal agency the power to postpone the date of Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H. Res. 719. A resolution requesting the Senate to return to the House of Representatives the bill H.R. 4766; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COLLINS (for himself, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Res. 720. A resolution expressing the disapproval of the House of Representatives of the Social Security totalization agreement between the United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 721. A resolution encouraging States to establish programs to award high school diplomas to veterans who left high school before receiving diplomas in order to serve in the Armed Forces during a time of war; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STUPAK (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Res. 722. A resolution requesting that the President focus appropriate attention on neighborhood crime prevention and community policing, and coordinate certain Federal efforts to participate in ''National Night Out'', which occurs the first Tuesday of August each year, including by supporting local efforts and community watch groups and by supporting local officials, to promote community safety and help provide homeland security; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 130: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 284: Mr. TURNER of Ohio.

H.R. 299: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 677: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. FORD, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOLT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MORAN of Virgina, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OBEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WATT, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 756: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 779: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 781: Mr. LEACH, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 850: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 852: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 873: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 918: Mr. DAVIS of Florida and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 1002: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 1345: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 1662: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 1701: Mr. REHBERG, Mr. BACA, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 1755: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1800: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1886: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1938: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2032: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2034: Mr. HOUGHTON and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 2053: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 2107: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 2239: Mr. SANDLIN and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2387: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2528: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2699: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 2735: Mr. HILL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2787: Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 2801: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 2932: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2945: Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 2950: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 2974: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 3022: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 3178: Mrs. BIGGERT and Ms. HART.

H.R. 3193: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 3367: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 3369: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 3425: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 3545: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3558: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3574: Mr. HOEKSTRA.

H.R. 3609: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 3767: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3799: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 3831: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 4011: Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 4032: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 4064: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BALLENGER, and Mr. CARTER.

H.R. 4116: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 4169: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 4192: Mr. ANDREWS and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 4209: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 4249: Mr. EHLERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TURNER of Texas, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. HALL, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 4256: Mr. DINGELL.

H.R. 4263: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HONDA, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 4282: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 4304: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 4306: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 4341: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 4367: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 4391: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 4445: Ms. NORTON and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4446: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CASE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KIND, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEACH, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUINN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 4472: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 4474: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 4491: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GERLACH, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 4530: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 4551: Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 4571: Mr. KLINE.

H.R. 4576: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 4578: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FROST, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. NUNES, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 4633: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 4634: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 4636: Mr. FORD, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 4662: Mr. RYUN of Kansas and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 4682: Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 4687: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. FRIST, Mr. CASE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 4694: Mr. SANDLIN, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 4701: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 4706: Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 4711: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ROSS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GILLMOR, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 4724: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.

H.R. 4746: Ms. LEE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 4747: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 4769: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 4772: Ms. NORTON, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. FORD, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CASE, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 4785: Mr. RUSH, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 4793: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 4797: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 4799: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. FORD, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 4822: Mr. HERGER.

H. Con. Res. 99: Ms. LEE.

H. Con. Res. 366: Ms. HERSETH.

H. Con. Res. 467: Mr. CLAY and Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 469: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SHAW, Mr. RENZI, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. BLUNT.

H. Con. Res. 471: Mrs. MALONEY.

H. Res. 689: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. STARK, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Res. 690: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BERRY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. ESHOO.

H. Res. 699: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. STARK, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Res. 700: Mr. CLAY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. STARK, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Res. 709: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Res. 713: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BUYER, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H. Res. 714: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XV, the following discharge petition was filed:

Petition 9, July 13, 2004, by Mr. FROST on House Resolution 696, was signed by the following Members: Martin Frost, John B. Larson, James P. McGovern, Benjamin L. Cardin, Diane E. Watson, Tom Lantos, Michael R. McNulty, John W. Olver, Rodney Alexander, Charles A. Gonzalez, Patrick J. Kennedy, Nick Lampson, Tammy Baldwin, Karen McCarthy, Carolyn McCarthy, Grace F. Napolitano, Gerald D. Kleczka, Dale E. Kildee, Tom Udall, Frank Pallone, Jr., Jim McDermott, Charles W. Stenholm, Michael H. Michaud, Joe Baca, Peter A. DeFazio, John F. Tierney, Robert E. Andrews, Lois Capps, Raul M. Grijalva, Nydia M. Velazquez, Rahm Emanuel, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Lynn C. Woolsey, Solomon P. Ortiz, Diana DeGette, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Steny H. Hoyer, Steve Israel, C.A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Jaunita Millender-McDonald, Lane Evans, James R. Langevin, Gary L. Ackerman, Ed Case, Ben Chandler, Ellen O. Tauscher, Betty McCollum, Artur Davis, Dennis Moore, Hilda L. Solis, Jane Harman, Stephanie Herseth, James P. Moran, Mike Ross, Dennis A. Cardoza, Marcy Kaptur, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Bob Filner, Henry A. Waxman, Robert C. Scott, Elijah E. Cummings, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Sherrod Brown, Mark Udall, Chris Bell, Rick Larsen, Silvestre Reyes, Darlene Hooley, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Bart Gordon, Lincoln Davis, Chet Edwards, Major R. Owens, Timothy H. Bishop, John Lewis, Maxine Waters, Janice D. Schakowsky, Ken Lucas, Sam Farr, Peter Deutsch, Alcee L. Hastings, Adam B. Schiff, Vic Snyder, Baron P. Hill, Albert Russell Wynn, Susan A. Davis, Jim Davis, Jerry F. Costello, William O. Lipinski, Jim Turner, Sheila Jackson-Lee, Carolyn B. Maloney, Jim Marshall, Bennie G. Thompson, James E. Clyburn, Danny K. Davis, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Marion Berry, Linda T. Sanchez, Sander M. Levin, Rosa L. DeLauro, Stephen F. Lynch, Martin T. Meehan, Chris Van Hollen, Ted Strickland, Leonard L. Boswell, John M. Spratt, Jr., Nick J. Rahall II, William D. Delahunt, Edward J. Markey, Tim Ryan, Kendrick B. Meek, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Thomas H. Allen, Robert A. Brady, Paul E. Kanjorski, Bobby L. Rush, Bart Stupak, Ed Pastor, Anna G. Eshoo, Gene Green, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Brad Miller, Maurice D. Hinchey, Alan B. Mollohan, Earl Blumenauer, Joseph Crowley, Nita M. Lowey, Martin Olav Sabo, Ron Kind, Eliot L. Engel, John D. Dingell, Barney Frank, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jose E. Serrano, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Ike Skelton, Gregory W. Meeks, Max Sandlin, Michael F. Doyle, James L. Oberstar, Ruben Hinojosa, Bernard Sanders, Jerrold Nadler, Robert T. Matsui, Brian Baird, Anthony D. Weiner, Luis V. Gutierrez, George Miller, Charles B. Rangel, Loretta Sanchez, Gene Taylor, Joseph M. Hoeffel, Nancy Pelosi, Norman D. Dicks, Barbara Lee, Donald M. Payne, Corrine Brown, Robert Wexler, Edolphus Towns, Richard A. Gephardt, and Harold E. Ford, Jr.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 4818

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 22: In title II, at the end of the item relating to ''CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND'', insert the following:

In addition to the amount provided in the preceding paragraph for a United States contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, $800,000,000 for such purpose, to remain available until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That such amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of S. Con. Res. 95 (108th Congress), as made applicable to the House of Representatives by H. Res. 649 (108th Congress).

H.R. 4818

OFFERED BY: MR. OTTER

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR PALISTINIAN AUTHORITY AND THE PALISTINIAN PEOPLE

SEC. ____. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) of the total amount of funds that are available in this Act for assistance for the Palestinian Authority (or any other Palestinian entity) or for the Palestinian people, not more than 25 percent of such amount may be obligated and expended during each quarter of fiscal year 2005; and

(2) none of the funds made available in this Act may be made available for assistance for the Palestinian Authority (or any other Palestinian entity) or for the Palestinian people during any quarter of fiscal year 2005 unless the Secretary of State determines that the Palestinian Authority has not provided support for acts of international terrorism during the 3-month period preceding the first day of that quarter.

H.R. 4818

OFFERED BY: MR. WEINER

AMENDMENT NO. 24: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

PROHIBITION AGAINST DIRECT FUNDING FOR SAUDI ARABIA

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to finance any assistance to Saudi Arabia.

H.R. 4818

OFFERED BY: MR. GARRETT

AMENDMENT NO. 25: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ATTENDANCE AT CONFERENCES OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 Federal employees at any single conference occurring outside the United States.