United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRSTSESSION

Vol. 151 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 2005 No. 88

# House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JINDAL).

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*June 28, 2005.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable BOBBY JINDAL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

## MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 1 minute.

## ANNOUNCING INTRODUCTION OF CREDIT RATING AGENCIES RELIEF ACT

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, every American remembers the financial hardships they faced when WorldCom and Enron went belly up. I certainly remember the broken investment accounts of my constituents and the people of Pennsylvania's 8th Congressional District. And it is extremely troubling that little known players in this crisis, Moody's and S&P, rated Enron and WorldCom at investment grade just days prior to the filing of their bankruptcies.

Two firms dominate the ratings market with SEC approval and this, Mr. Speaker, creates an uncompetitive marketplace, stifles competition from other rating agencies, lowers the quality of ratings and allows conflicts of interest to go unchecked. It is bad for the market and it is hurtful to individual investors.

Last week, I introduced the Credit Rating Agencies Relief Act of 2005, H.R. 2990, which will inject greater competition, transparency and accountability in the credit rating industry through market-based reform. I encourage my colleagues to review and to cosponsor H.R. 2990.

## WRONG PRIORITIES AT VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, despite the Bush administration finally admitting that veterans' health care is underfunded by $1 billion, yesterday we learned that the VA's main priority has absolutely nothing to do with veterans. Instead, the number one priority surrounds a picture of VA Secretary Jim Nicholson. On May 27, an under secretary at the VA sent a memo out to all veterans' facilities around the Nation voicing concern that a large number of them did not have the most current picture of Secretary Nicholson hanging in their facilities. In the memo, the under secretary writes, ''We are asking that you give this your highest priority. We will continue to ask for daily updates on the status of the picture until we are assured that all of our facilities have a current picture displayed.''

Are they kidding, Mr. Speaker? At a time when the Department of Veterans Affairs is forcing drastic veterans' cuts, do they really want their officials out at their facilities concentrating on the best place to display a picture of the VA Secretary?

Here is the response from an official at one of the VA's facilities, and again I am quoting: ''And here we're trying to figure out where our next patient meal is coming from and what furniture to sell to buy drugs next year.''

Mr. Speaker, while Washington Republicans are willing to support our troops while they are at war, they are unwilling to properly support them when they return from the battlefield as veterans.

Last week, the Bush administration finally released budget information that showed veterans' health care is underfunded over the next year by $1 billion. Many of my Democratic colleagues have long suspected this funding shortfall, but the Bush administration did not come clean with the information until just last week. When Congress learned of the shortfall, House Republicans still refused to support an amendment to the Labor-HHS bill last week that would have restored the $1 billion needed for veterans' health care, including the health care of some 86,000 veterans who have returned from Iraq and Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, while House Republicans refuse to fund veterans' health care, the Veterans' Administration says its top priority is to make sure veterans' facilities have the most current picture of Secretary Nicholson on the wall. Talk about misguided priorities, Mr. Speaker. Rather than worrying about a picture of Secretary Nicholson, should the VA not be focusing on how it is going to continue to provide promised services to our Nation's veterans? At a time when thousands of soldiers are returning from



Printed on recycled paper.

Iraq and Afghanistan as new veterans, you would think House Republicans would be willing to stand behind their promise to provide necessary health care to these new veterans.

Mr. Speaker, it is sad that Washington Republicans are unwilling to give America's veterans the support they deserve. America's veterans should be outraged by the treatment they are now receiving from the Bush administration and the House Republican leadership.

## CAFTA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last year, TOM DELAY, the most powerful Republican in the Congress, promised this House that we would vote on the Central American Free Trade Agreement, so-called CAFTA, before the end of last calendar year, before December 31 of 2004. Then earlier this year he promised we would vote on CAFTA sometime before Memorial Day. Then he promised that we would vote on CAFTA sometime before July 4. The simple question is why has Congress not voted on the Central American Free Trade Agreement? The simple answer is that dozens of Republicans and Democrats, small businesses and manufacturers, farmers, ranchers, workers, environmentalists and food safety advocates all across the board oppose this agreement. There simply are not enough votes in this Congress to pass the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

During this whole period, supporters of CAFTA continued to make the same old, tired promises about trade. They promised that passage of CAFTA would reduce our trade deficit, but it continues the failed trade policy of the last dozen years. In 1992, the year I ran for Congress, we had in this country a $38 billion trade deficit. Last year, a dozen years later, our trade deficit had mushroomed to $618 billion. From $38 billion to $618 billion and the CAFTA supporters say that CAFTA will reduce our trade deficit.

CAFTA supporters say it will increase manufacturing jobs. Again, another broken promise from these trade agreements. The facts are that in the last 5 years, the U.S. has lost more than 2 million manufacturing jobs, more than 200,000 of them in my State of Ohio, another 200,000 in Michigan and Pennsylvania and New York, hundreds of thousands in Texas and California, in the southeast North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, those regions of the country.

Because no one believed these promises that it would cut the trade deficit, that it would increase our exports, the promise that it would raise the standard of living in Central America, they now are bringing out a whole nother round of promises. One promise they have made, CAFTA will stop illegal immigration from Central America. The facts are that based on a report by the Pew Hispanic Center, a quarter million undocumented Mexican-born workers entered the U.S. from 1990 to 1994, prior to NAFTA. Then NAFTA passed, the number of illegals entering the U.S. sharply increased to almost a half million from 2000 to 2004. Free trade agreements are not a solution for illegal immigration.

Another promise they made, another wild, unsubstantiated promise, is that CAFTA will stop illegal drugs from entering the U.S. However, all you have got to do is look at what happened with NAFTA. Despite the passage of NAFTA, the State Department says Mexico is the principal transit country for South American cocaine entering the U.S. The report says that Mexican drug traffickers have steadily increased operations in all illicit drug sectors in the U.S. during the period after NAFTA.

Another wild, unsubstantiated claim is that CAFTA will stop al Qaeda from utilizing our southern border to enter the U.S. Geography 101, Mr. Speaker, shows that our southern border is with Mexico, not Central America, and despite claims made about NAFTA, border security remains low. CAFTA supporters fail to argue how passage of the Central American Free Trade Agreement will fix the Mexico border problem.

Another wild, unsubstantiated claim is that Central American presidents support labor unions. The facts are very different from that. In every one of these CAFTA countries, Dominican Republic and the five countries in Central America, these nations are not compliant with internationally recognized labor standards today as defined by the International Labor Organization. Most CAFTA nations have inadequate protection for workers who try to join unions in violation of ILO Convention 98's right to organize and bargain collectively. They maintain onerous strike requirements in violation of the right to associate under ILO Convention 87. In Honduras, not a single one of the 8,000 workers in the Porvenir Export Processing Zone has the right of freedom of association. One worker in that zone said, ''Look, there's a whole mountain of workers who have been fired over the last few years for trying to organize in the industrial park. They simply don't allow it.'' In other words, these nations, one after another, continue to violate International Labor Organization standards.

CAFTA would lock in those lower wage standards, lower worker safety standards, right to organize, bargain collectively, prohibition on child labor, all of those things that we hold dear as our moral values in this country, human rights issues, protecting workers, protecting children, protecting against forced labor.

Mr. Speaker, the answer is, defeat this CAFTA. It has been promised that it would come to the floor week after week, month after month. Defeat this CAFTA and renegotiate a Central American Free Trade Agreement that workers and small businesses and farmers and manufacturers and environmentalists and food safety advocates and businesses can support.

## ON SUPREME COURT RULING REGARDING PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, in ancient days of kingdoms and fiefdoms, those in authority would sometimes arbitrarily and sometimes capriciously order the transfer of property from one owner to another person who was in greater favor with the ruler at that particular moment. The owner from whom the property was taken had no recourse once the king or ruler had made the decision to transfer the property. To back up the transfer, the tyrannical despot would make clear that the full weight of his military or local law enforcement could be brought to bear against anyone who attempted to stand in the way of the transfer.

In the recent Supreme Court case of Kelo et al. v. City of New London et al., the elaborate 20-page majority opinion of the United States Supreme Court is one of the most eloquent, articulate, intellectual efforts to ever rationalize or try to cerebrally legitimize the forced transfer from the legal, legitimate owner of nonblighted property to someone who is in greater favor with the ruler of that area. It is something that our high court can point to with pride that they almost make it sound fair that private property can be taken from one legitimate owner and forcibly transferred to one who offers greater financial rewards to the ruler of that area.

What a great day for the intellectual superiority of the highest court of the land as it gets a 10 rating in the field of mental gymnastics, even from the Russian judge. But what a very, very sad day for truth, justice and what used to be the American way.

## UPPER MISSISSIPPI PROJECT TO BE CONSIDERED IN WRDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, the House Water Resources Development Act is on its way to the floor this week, perhaps as early as Thursday. In that bill, there is authorized a $1.8 billion expansion of lock work on the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers, despite three National Academy of Science reports concluding that realistic projections of the traffic that it is meant to

deal with do not justify it. This project epitomizes the need for reform and modernization of the Corps and for Congress to exercise its oversight role.

In the year 2000, Corps economist Donald Sweeney filed for whistleblower protection after Corps leaders fired him when he claimed that Corps officials had ordered him to underestimate how much grain would be shipped to alternatives on the river. Two generals and a colonel ultimately lost their jobs after the Army Inspector General concluded that the Corps had indeed ''cooked the books''. Yet we have the project before us here today, an example still of the continuing problems of the Corps planning system where nonstructural alternatives such as congestion fees, scheduling and switch boats are ignored. This project demonstrates the need for independent review of huge Corps projects. If outside independent review had been applied in the beginning, we would have saved millions of dollars and decades on studies and we would not be arguing about it today.

Make no mistake, every Member of Congress has a stake in this argument, because if we pass this project, it will take up 10 to 15 percent of the entire Corps construction project for years to come. It will delay or eliminate funding for many worthwhile projects around the country when we currently have a $58 billion backlog of unfinished Corps projects and less than $2 billion a year to construct them.

Each Member of Congress should ask, Is there a demand for this project? Is it worth the money? Are there cheaper alternatives?

That demand issue is particularly important because this is a project to reduce river congestion on the upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. But according to the Corps' own data, barge traffic has declined 23 percent from 1992 to 2003. Last year it dropped 19 percent. Lock delays have significantly declined as well in recent years.

The cost justification according to three National Academy of Sciences studies over the last 4 years and the Office of Management and Budget have questioned the methodology used in this project. In 2001, an NAS panel concluded the Corps had relied on overly optimistic barge forecasts for traffic. In December 2003, a second NAS panel reviewed the revised study and renewed their objections. Yet another NAS report came out in 2004 and concluded that, and I quote, the Corps has made substantial progress on the study in the past 3 years but the study contains serious flaws, serious enough to limit its credibility and value within the policymaking process.

There are, in fact, cheaper alternatives. The National Academy of Science concluded in its 2004 report that nonstructural approaches for managing waterway traffic appear not to have been considered at all. Why should we go forward with a project on this scale until we have examined all the inexpensive, small scale congestion management measures that could be just as effective and make a much greater difference much quicker?

Last but not least, it should be pointed out that we have been pouring money into the area for years. Over the last 15 years, the Corps has rehabilitated many of the locks they now plan to replace. They have spent over $900 million extending the productive lives of the existing locks and dams.

People ought to take a very close look at this before it comes to the floor. As I mentioned, every Member has a stake in it. When you compare this to our overall water construction projects, it is actually five or six times larger than the ''Big Dig'' road project in Boston compared to our highway system.

I plan to offer amendments with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) to make sure that if we go forward, that we do so with the proper assessment. We should not have political decisions take the place of economic analysis. We have to make sure we are funding legitimate projects, not politicizing the Corps.

## NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National Homeownership Month. I am a strong advocate of homeownership, not only because it is a key component of the American dream but also because it is vital to America's economic security. Statistics show that higher levels of homeownership translate into safer and stronger communities, communities in which people feel more rooted and engaged, in which they feel stronger stakes in their local schools, civic organizations, businesses as well as their churches and synagogues. Additionally, children who are raised in families that own their own homes have shown greater academic success as well as greater levels of self-esteem.

Two years ago, we passed the American Dream Downpayment Act which I introduced to help more American families enter the market for quality, affordable housing. This was an important step on the way toward making homeownership available to everyone, but it was only a first step. We still have much more work to do.

I am proud to have been a cosponsor of the resolution we passed yesterday in honor of National Homeownership Month and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to bring the American dream of homeownership to more families across this country.

## COMMEMORATING THE ANNIVERSARY OF IRAQ'S SOVEREIGNTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 1 minute.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the Iraqi people on the anniversary of the establishment of Iraqi sovereignty. A year ago today, Iraq took the first crucial step toward establishing a democracy and rejoining the international community as a free nation. In January, as all of us know, the Iraqi people took another step forward. In defiance of an insurgency threatening to ''make the streets run with blood,'' 8.5 million Iraqis cast their ballots.

Now, the political and administrative duties of government are run almost entirely by Iraqis. With the help of U.S. and coalition troops, Iraq's security forces now number approximately 170,000. The people of Iraq deal a crushing blow to the insurgency each and every day through the spirit and courage that they demonstrate. The American people stand firmly beside the people of Iraq in their efforts to establish full democratic rule for themselves.

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 10 a.m.

## PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Ruffin Snow, Senior Pastor, Tri-City Baptist Church, Conover, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, we bow humbly before You, for You have told us in Your word that You ''resist the proud and give grace to the humble.'' Without You we can do nothing of good consequence. We embrace our place in history and our responsibility. With the psalmist we recognize that promotion comes from God: ''He puts down one and sets up another.''

We thank You, Lord, for this Nation. We beg forgiveness for our sins. May we become the Nation You intend.

We pray for all those in authority including the Members of this Congress, their staffs, and families in their pressurized lives. Please give our troops and their families strength, protection, and encouragement. Bring confusion to the forces of evil and terrorism.

Lord, we love You. You are the way, the truth, and the life. Help us lead others to know You and Your peace. We proclaim to all that Jesus is Lord, in whose name 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 Florida (Mr. SHAW) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SHAW 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 bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 260. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide technical and financial assistance to private landowners to restore, enhance, and manage private land to improve fish and wildlife habitats through the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program.

S. 1316. An act to authorize the Small Business Administration to provide emergency relief to shellfish growers affected by toxic red tide losses.

## WELCOMING DR. RUFFIN SNOW

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a great American from my district who is here this morning. Dr. Ruffin Snow, who is the pastor of Tri-City Baptist Church in Conover, North Carolina, gave the morning prayer here on the House floor this morning.

Dr. Snow is one of the strongest men of faith that I have come to know in western North Carolina. For 7 years he has headed the Tri-City Baptist Church and has worked in ministry since 1963. He has both a Master's of Divinity and a Doctorate of Ministry. I have been to Pastor Snow's church. It truly embodies what he strives for his flock to be, and that is an Acts 1:8 church, telling people about Jesus in Jerusalem, Judea, Samaria, and the uttermost parts of the world, essentially taking the message of Jesus to the world, not just to the community, but to the whole world.

As part of that tradition, he is here today sharing his words with the Speaker and the Members of Congress.

Over 3,000 people come to worship every week at Tri-City Baptist, and the Holy Spirit is doing wonders there in that body of believers. I thank Pastor Snow and his family for being here today to be a part of this and for serving as our guest chaplain.

## A FISCAL FIRST STEP

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will complete its constitutionally mandated initial round of work on the annual appropriations bills that fund our national government.

This spring and summer, the House's restructured Committee on Appropriations and its staff have worked under an accelerated schedule and within an extremely disciplined fiscal budget environment, and they have produced bills that are worthy of the needs and values of the American people.

When the final two of the House's 11 spending bills are passed this week, Foreign Operations and the Transportation, Treasury and Housing and Urban Development bills, the House will have put us on track to hold domestic discretionary spending next year below this year's level.

If we hold to these levels, the Federal Government will realize a real cut in domestic discretionary spending in 2006 for the first time since the Reagan administration. By the end of this week, we will have targeted more than 100 low-priority government programs for termination, more than even President Bush proposed in his austere budget.

These difficult, but necessary, reductions will tighten the Federal Government's belt to the tune of $4.6 billion. In these bills, the House has met our Nation's pressing needs here at home and around the world, but at the same time has held every program accountable to the American people. Passage of these bills puts us on a path to deficit reduction, just as Republicans promised at the beginning of this Congress.

As we showed in the 1990s, the best, and indeed the only, way to cut the deficit is to hold down government spending while creating an environment for greater economic growth through tax relief. That is exactly what is happening now.

With Federal revenues up and spending checked and even reduced, the Congressional Budget Office has lowered its projected deficit for the year. We are finally on that glide-path to balance. The gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) deserves an enormous amount of credit for this achievement, and I would be remiss if I did not also thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for his work, especially given this year's accelerated schedule and restructured committee.

The House has taken the first step toward reaffirming fiscal accountability again in 2006; but with the process only half over, you can bet, Mr. Speaker, it will not be our last.

## SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY FIRST

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues have unveiled a new proposal to privatize the Social Security surplus. Maybe I am a little confused, but was President Bush not just in West Virginia saying the Social Security trust fund and its surplus did not exist? In West Virginia the President said, There is no Social Security trust fund, just IOUs stacked in an old filing cabinet.

In Washington, D.C., this discovery of the surplus counts as progress. I welcome the Republicans' discovery of the Social Security surplus. The problem is in the last 5 years they have spent $630 billion of the Social Security surplus on everything under the sun but Social Security.

Privatization of Social Security is the poison pill to progress. Our first priority should be to save Social Security first. That is the position of the American people, and that is the position of the Democratic Party. Before we create private accounts or do anything else to fundamentally alter Social Security, we must guarantee its future. The goal is to strengthen Social Security for the future, something privatization fails to do. The American people have rejected the President's privatization proposal of Social Security, and they will undoubtedly reject this unbaked new idea.

## SUPREME COURT COURTS CONFUSION

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, yesterday in the Supreme Court it was the Ten Commandments versus the Ten Commandments. The score: one for the Ten Commandments and one against the Ten Commandments.

The Supreme Court ruled in a Kentucky courthouse they have to take down those Ten Commandments. The Supreme Court ruled the same day, yesterday, that the Ten Commandments on the Texas capitol grounds, they can leave them up. This was a 5–4 decision, and the Supreme Court has created confusion to legal minds throughout the country and to citizens of this Republic.

Stephen Breyer voted one way in one case, and the other way in the other. He is the swing vote. So what do we do in the future when we want to address the Ten Commandments and where they should be placed? Do we call him

on the phone and ask permission and wait for him to deny it or grant it?

Madam Speaker, the first amendment of the Constitution is very simple. It says Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion. But there is a second phrase: or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. We have a Nation with a long religious history. Contrary to France whose Constitution states that it is a secular republic, in France religion and government never meet.

We are not that way. Congress starts with a prayer. We have In God We Trust above the flag. We have Moses in the back. The Supreme Court has the Ten Commandments above it in its Chambers.

The Supreme Court's ruling is confusing and defies predictability. The Supreme Court has created a hostility towards religion. The Supreme Court has become a court of confusion.

## FUTURE CONGRESSES WILL ASK

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, the President will address the Nation tonight on Iraq.

At some point in the future, Members of a future Congress will look back at the war in Iraq and ask how we could have let it happen. They will ask why did our leaders try hard to convince the American people that Iraq had something to do with 9/11 when it did not. They will ask why did our government use awesome destructive power against the people of Iraq who posed no imminent threat to our Nation, and did not attack us.

They will ask how our leaders were able to convince us to stay in Iraq for so many years at the cost of so many lives. They will ask why there was no discussion about the countless deaths of innocent Iraqi civilians. They will ask why our leaders talked us into spending money for an unnecessary war when so many real needs for education and health care were unmet. They will ask how did we let fear so penetrate our hearts and our psyches that we forgot who we were, that we forgot our duty to justice, that we forgot our duty to liberty, that we forgot our duty to truth.

## GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARDS

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate 10 Girl Scouts from the Sixth Congressional District of Georgia for earning the highly coveted Girl Scout Gold Award.

Through hard work, dedication and perseverance, Kathryn Cook, Kristen Crawford, Aimee Jarvis, Amy Kroeger, Tera Lekan, Elizabeth Roddy, Brittany Scott, Michelle Teplis, Kelly Watson, and Jordan Wynn, with their community service projects, have positively affected, literally, the world.

Collecting school supplies to donate to young Iraqi students, sewing and stuffing 250 teddy bears for pediatric and emergency ward patients, collecting and donating essentials to foster care children, and writing books for children in both English and Spanish. These are just some of the many projects taken on by these girls.

The Girl Scout program is based on four fundamental goals that encourage girls to develop to their full potential, relate to others with increasing understanding, skill and respect, develop a meaningful set of values to guide their actions and contribute to the improvement of society.

Congratulations to each of these young American girls for their accomplishments and for embracing worthy principles. We look forward to their continued excellent example and for their future leadership.

## NO SECURITY IN PRIVATIZATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to give voice to the youth of my district. I recently had a Social Security e-town hall where young adults joined me online to discuss this important issue.

Billy, a constituent of mine from Long Beach, is currently a student at the University of Southern California. He questioned the wisdom and the solvency of the President's plan. He specifically asked me what would the worst case scenario consequences of the President's plan be.

My answer to him was simple. It is clear that Republicans have no desire to strengthen Social Security for future generations.

□ 1015

Instead, their only intention is to privatize this guaranteed retirement program.

Privatization is a first step on the road to the worst case scenario. Privatization proposals hurt everyone, including today's beneficiaries. But it especially hurts young workers who end up paying for the administrative costs of privatization on the front end and then end up paying for it twice with large benefit cuts on the back end. Privatization does absolutely nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security.

If we really wanted to save Social Security, let us work to ensure its solvency. Let us not dismantle guaranteed benefits, especially for young workers like Billy.

## EMINENT DOMAIN DECISION

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

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today against this recent Supreme Court decision in Kelo v. New London, which grossly misrepresents the intent and historical precedent regarding government taking of private property. Our Founding Fathers intended to protect private property by limiting government authority.

One would expect that private property taken by eminent domain would become land available for public use such as parks and roads. Unfortunately, this decision creates a loophole for government to manipulate the definition of public use simply to generate greater tax revenue.

Protection of private property is a fundamental right protected in a strong democracy. The Supreme Court's ruling is an insult to all Americans who have worked hard to have a home to call their own. It is a ruling that encourages the strong to take from the weak and flies in the face of what government is intended to do, that is, to protect the lives and property of all American citizens.

## THE REPUBLICANS' SOCIAL SECURITY PLAN

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, every working day, every salary and wage-earning American will pay 6.2 percent, or 12.4 if they are self-employed, of their salary to Social Security, that is, up to the first $90,000. That is creating a $168 billion surplus, which is being borrowed and spent by this administration, some of it to give tax breaks to the wealthiest among us.

Now the Republicans have a new plan. Here is what Congressional Quarterly says: ''The House version essentially counts the Social Security surplus twice. First, the government would borrow the surplus from Social Security's trust funds in exchange for special Treasury bonds, as it does now. It would then direct the surplus into individual accounts, but then borrow it back again in exchange for more bonds. But only the debt to the individual accounts would appear in the government's budget; the debt to Social Security's trust funds would remain 'off budget,' as is now. The surplus itself would be spent as part of the regular budget.''

Huh? That is the solution to the problems of Social Security? That is making the future retirement of Americans more secure? That is dealing with the fact that you are stealing money from working people and giving it to people who invest for a living? Give me a break.

## SUPREME COURT'S RULING ON THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I rise to voice my strong disapproval with the Supreme Court's ruling yesterday that barred individual States from displaying the Ten Commandments in courthouses. The five justices who voted for this ruling displayed extreme hypocrisy. As they outlawed this practice, they sat directly underneath our Ten Commandments.

In 1950, the Florida Supreme Court stated: ''A people unschooled in the sovereignty of God, the Ten Commandments, and the ethics of Jesus could never have evolved the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution. There is not one solitary fundamental principle of our democratic policy that did not stem directly from the basic moral concepts of the Ten Commandments . . . ''

The Ten Commandments are found more often in public buildings than in individual churches, demonstrating that Americans from all faiths and walks of life recognize their impact on our laws and culture.

Yesterday's ruling sets a dangerous precedent. What is next? Are we going to remove references to God from our pledge, remove the Bible from our court proceedings, and so forth?

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to look into ways to prevent this type of abusive judicial power. I also encourage the five justices to exercise better judgment in the future.

## WE NEED A NEW TRADE POLICY

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Madam Speaker, this Bush administration keeps setting records, only they are the wrong kinds of records.

We have a record debt of over $7 trillion that breaks down to each citizen's share being over $26,000. And now they have a new record, a new record debt on our trade deficit. It set a new record of $195 billion in the first 3 months of this year. That is 6.4 percent of GDP on an annual basis, the largest such trade deficit ever in our history. This deficit has been created by the irresponsible trade policies of the Bush administration, and it is also being supported by the willingness at least so far of foreign investors and governments to keep extending us credit.

The administration cannot continue to ignore this problem. Even if we avoid a sudden flight from the dollar and an international financial collapse, the burden of paying off our mounting international debt will be a drag on our future standard of living. It will be a drag on the lives of our children and grandchildren. We need a new trade policy.

## SOLDIERS AT GUANTANAMO SERVE WITH DISTINCTION

(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. Madam Speaker, this weekend I joined a bipartisan delegation to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba led by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), House Committee on Armed Services chairman. We were all impressed by the professionals serving at Guantanamo and their commitment to maintaining a humane detention facility for hard core killers.

The patriotic U.S. soldiers protecting America's families are successors to the 132nd Military Police Company of the South Carolina Army National Guard. Commanded by Major Brian Pitts, the 132nd served with distinction from September, 2002, through September, 2003.

Upon their return, the media reported that Major Pitts summarized his service when he stated: ''Our goal was to treat the detainees well, and hope that if we were detained, that we would be treated as well.''

Guantanamo should be kept open as a symbol of America's resolve to win the war on terrorism. Ten released detainees have already resumed their horrific efforts to kill Americans, and further releases must be subject to administrative review.

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

## MIKE GORDON: A CALIFORNIA LEADER LOST TOO SOON

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HARMAN. Madam Speaker, the seaside community of El Segundo in my congressional district, rich in so many ways, is a great deal poorer following the death on Saturday of its longtime Mayor and State assembly representative Mike Gordon. Those of us who knew Mike well and the countless others whose lives he touched are devastated by his unexpected and untimely passing.

In the course of my public career, few people have had a more profound impact on me and the policies I pursue than Mike Gordon. He was a natural politician, drawn to people, and driven to solve their problems, no matter how big or small.

Mike Gordon was a big thinker, one who could see around corners, anticipating the needs of his community and forging, in a strong but sensitive way, its future. He was a mayor, an assembly member, a baseball coach, community activist, party leader, good husband, father, and friend. And when he succumbed to brain cancer in the early morning hours of June 25, he was just 47 years old.

When Mike received his dire diagnosis 3 months ago, the broader world of California politics was just opening to him. Years of consensus building and goodwill and enormous potential were cut cruelly short.

I grieve for his family: his devoted wife, Denise; and four children; Ryan, Erika, Amanda, and Gordy; and for our larger loss.

Madam Speaker, Gordy Gordon designed a rubber bracelet which said ''I am helping Mike fight.'' Though Mike lost that physical fight, we who survive him will carry on the fight for the beliefs we share.

## CAFTA

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

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the United States-Dominican Republic-Central American Free Trade Agreement, which will benefit American farmers, manufacturers, and businesses both small and large. Last year alone, the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic imported nearly $15 billion worth of United States agriculture and manufactured goods.

The DR-CAFTA countries combined represent our 13th largest export partner. That is larger than Brazil. As these numbers show, there already exists a strong relationship between the United States and Central America, and this relationship is destined to grow substantially.

With the agreement in place, more than 80 percent of the United States industrial and consumer products will become duty free immediately. The agreement also levels the playing field for United States manufacturers who are at a disadvantage to other countries that already have free trade agreements with the DR-CAFTA countries. This translates into increased exports and earnings for American farmers and manufacturers and more jobs.

I urge my colleagues to support this very important piece of legislation.

## REPUBLICAN SOCIAL SECURITY SHAM; QUIT RAIDING SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Speaker, congressional Republicans unveiled their own Social Security privatization plan last week, stating repeatedly that their proposal would protect the Social Security trust fund.

It is an interesting comment considering the fact that Republicans have raided $670 billion from the Social Security trust fund over the last 4 years alone to help pay for their giant tax breaks for the wealthiest elite. The majority party seems to forget that during the Clinton years, we ensured Social Security trust funds were locked away so they could not be used by the

Federal Government. That quickly changed after President Bush came to town, and now congressional Republicans are being disingenuous by attempting to sell their Social Security proposal as a way to prevent the trust fund from being raided in the future.

Republicans are simply misrepresenting their proposal. When asked last week how the government would fund the programs now being funded by the Social Security trust fund money, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. McCRERY), Social Security Subcommittee chairman, said that the cash can still be used the way it is now. In other words, despite their rhetoric, Republicans would continue to raid the Social Security trust fund.

Americans should not be fooled by this latest privatization proposal. If the President and Republicans are serious about saving Social Security, let us pay back what we owe on Social Security now.

## TEN COMMANDMENTS

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, above the Speaker's chair in the people's house are boldly written the words ''In God we trust.'' God. We, the House of Representatives, acknowledge God and have for over 200 years.

Why should it be any other way? Our Declaration of Independence states that we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights. Thomas Jefferson wrote, ''Can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis, a belief in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God?''

Now, Madam Speaker, the Supreme Court has ruled that we Texans can gaze upon the Ten Commandments at our statehouse, but the people of Kentucky cannot gaze upon them in their courthouses. This is not helpful. The establishment clause of our Constitution was written to ensure that the State respects all religions, not to declare hostility upon each.

We can and must acknowledge God in public life and in a way that equally respects the Muslim, the Jew, the Christian, the Buddhist, and all people of faith. For when we do, God will continue to bless America.

## THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH ON IRAQ

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, President Bush has a golden opportunity to level with the American people tonight about Iraq. The question is: Will he?

The President stands at a crossroads. His credibility and the integrity of the entire administration is on the line. The American people have had enough of administration rhetoric. For a sitting Vice President to dismiss reality and proclaim the insurgency in its ''last throes'' grossly understates the threat to U.S. soldiers in Iraq and seriously undermines any shred of credibility that the administration has left with the American people. They know that U.S. involvement in Iraq is going badly. Republican Senator CHUCK HAGEL summed it up last week when he said, ''The White House is completely disconnected with reality . . . The reality is that we are losing in Iraq.''

The American people want the President to deliver a straight story and a realistic plan, something he has been unwilling to do up to now. We will see if we hear it tonight.

## WE MUST NOT INDEFINITELY SUBSIDIZE TYRANNY

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, today we will debate whether to keep pouring money into Egypt just to subsidize its military expansion. For the last 25 years we poured billions of dollars into Egypt. Each year we give that country about $1.3 billion just in military aid in addition to economic aid.

But all the money seems to do is reinforce a regime that refuses change and excuses oppression. It oppresses religious minorities, it obstructs democratic reforms, it censors the media. I think that money can be better spent elsewhere.

□ 1030

Today, I will offer an amendment redirecting some of this military aid to fighting malaria in Africa, a preventable disease that kills as many as 3 million people a year. Poor nations are most at risk, some 40 million in Africa.

While we have a strategic responsibility to support allies, we have a responsibility to help fight disease where we can, and reducing Egypt's military funding will serve as a wake-up call to a country that votes against the United States over 91 percent of the time in the U.N. We will not indefinitely subsidize tyranny.

Congress has the authority to determine what we subsidize. Today we will make that clear.

## MISMANAGING NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION AND THE POLITICS OF IRAQ

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

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, the President had a historic opportunity in 2003. He had the support of the Congress. He had the support of the United Nations. We had inspectors in Iraq. It was determined that they had no weapons of mass destruction, and yet the President decided to invade.

Just think what would have happened if instead of on that day an invasion began, the President said, Let's keep this international coalition together. Let's move to Iran with the coalition. Let's ensure that they do not have a nuclear weapon.

Now the new President of Iran is stating that the United States and the world will not get in the way of Iran and nuclear weapons. The United States is more in danger, Israel is more in danger, the world is more in danger, because of the bad decision President Bush made on that day in 2003 when he invaded Iraq.

Instead, we are on the brink of a nuclear Iran and North Korea, and we are in a quagmire in Iraq as we referee an insurgency that will breakout into civil war as soon as the United States leaves.

This is a historic mess. The President had a chance for a Nobel Peace Prize. Instead, he is going to go down in history as someone who completely mismanaged nuclear nonproliferation and the politics of Iraq.

## TONING DOWN RHETORIC WITH REGARD TO CONFLICT IN IRAQ

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

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, a year ago today, sovereignty was returned to the country of Iraq and the Coalition Provisional Authority left. But, Madam Speaker, over the past several weeks, the negative press over our progress and polls here at home seem to have undermined a lot of the good activity that has occurred there.

The goal of the attackers, the goal of the insurgents, is to discourage Iraqis from participating in their own government. A second goal, of course, is to weaken our resolve here at home. Ironically, they seem to be failing in the first choice, but succeeding in the second.

Madam Speaker, every time I have traveled to Iraq, I have been struck by the disparity between what I see on my television here at home in the United States and what is actually happening on the ground in Iraq. Our soldiers should not have to look over their shoulders to see if we support them in their mission.

I urge my colleagues in this House on both sides to carefully consider their rhetoric when they use words like ''quagmire'' and ''civil war'' in respect to the conflict in Iraq.

## THE SITUATION IN IRAQ

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, last year William F. Buckley, Jr., said if he

had known in 2002 what he had since learned, he would have opposed the war in Iraq. A few weeks ago, he wrote that it is now time for the U.S. to get out and leave Iraq to the Iraqis. This is a man who has been described as the ''godfather of conservatism.''

On June 17, Mr. Buckley wrote that opposition to the war was mounting and summed up his feelings in this way: ''A respect for the power of the United States is engendered by our success in engagements in which we take part. A point is reached when tenacity conveys not steadfastness of purpose, but misapplication of pride. It can't reasonably be disputed that if in the year ahead the situation in Iraq continues about as it has done in the past year, we will have suffered more than another 500 soldiers killed. Where there had been skepticism about our venture, there will be contempt.''

We should heed these words of this very respected conservative leader. The American people do not want this war to continue for another 10 or 12 years, or even another 5 or 6 more years.

## FIXING SOCIAL SECURITY IN A BIPARTISAN MANNER

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I want to talk about the issue of Social Security. Social Security is an important issue that affects every one of us in this country, yet it has become a partisan issue. It should not have to be a partisan issue. We are hearing comments from the other side that basically say do nothing at all to fix and address Social Security.

What we are proposing today is to try to come up with a consensus plan to at the very least take the surplus Social Security taxes that we are paying and spending on other government programs and apply that surplus to help workers prepare for their Social Security retirement benefit.

At the very least, let us make sure that the surplus taxpayers are paying today and for the next 12 years is dedicated toward preserving their Social Security retirement benefit. That is what we are hoping to accomplish here by trying to have an olive branch of consensus and bipartisanship. That is what we hope to accomplish with this latest plan we have introduced.

But more importantly, Madam Speaker, every year we delay fixing Social Security is another year where we add another $600 billion of debt to the Social Security problem. That is according to the trustees.

Congress needs to be serious about this. We need to stop being partisan, and we need to fix this very important program.

## ALLOW SGT. CARLOS LAZO INTO CUBA

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

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the case of Carlos Lazo. Sergeant Lazo has served our country honorably in Iraq. There has been a lot of talk about our soldiers in Iraq today. This sergeant returned from Iraq a while ago and wanted to visit his two children in Cuba. Carlos is a Cuban American who escaped that country on a raft several years ago.

He would like to go back, but our government will not let him. You see, he has visited Cuba once in the past 3 years, and that is all you are allowed under current policy. So this soldier, who received a Bronze Star in Iraq for his service and many other accolades, is not trusted by our government to visit his own family in Cuba.

This policy is wrong. The same policy prohibits a child with parents in Cuba from visiting them more than once every 3 years. So if your father dies one year, you go to his funeral. If your mother dies the next year, you cannot go to hers. How is that fair? Why is our government doing this?

We need to change this policy, Madam Speaker, and this week we may have an opportunity to do so. I would encourage my colleagues to join me in this endeavor.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken later today.

## JUNK FAX PREVENTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 714) to amend section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) relating to the prohibition on junk fax transmissions.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 714

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005''.

**SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON FAX TRANSMISSIONS CONTAINING UNSOLICITED ADVERTISEMENTS.**

(a) PROHIBITION.—Section 227(b)(1)(C) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(1)(C)) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) to use any telephone facsimile machine, computer, or other device to send, to a telephone facsimile machine, an unsolicited advertisement, unless—

''(i) the unsolicited advertisement is from a sender with an established business relationship with the recipient;

''(ii) the sender obtained the number of the telephone facsimile machine through—

''(I) the voluntary communication of such number, within the context of such established business relationship, from the recipient of the unsolicited advertisement, or

''(II) a directory, advertisement, or site on the Internet to which the recipient voluntarily agreed to make available its facsimile number for public distribution,

except that this clause shall not apply in the case of an unsolicited advertisement that is sent based on an established business relationship with the recipient that was in existence before the date of enactment of the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005 if the sender possessed the facsimile machine number of the recipient before such date of enactment; and

''(iii) the unsolicited advertisement contains a notice meeting the requirements under paragraph (2)(D),

except that the exception under clauses (i) and (ii) shall not apply with respect to an unsolicited advertisement sent to a telephone facsimile machine by a sender to whom a request has been made not to send future unsolicited advertisements to such telephone facsimile machine that complies with the requirements under paragraph (2)(E); or''.

(b) DEFINITION OF ESTABLISHED BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP.—Section 227(a) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) The term 'established business relationship', for purposes only of subsection (b)(1)(C)(i), shall have the meaning given the term in section 64.1200 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on January 1, 2003, except that—

''(A) such term shall include a relationship between a person or entity and a business subscriber subject to the same terms applicable under such section to a relationship between a person or entity and a residential subscriber; and

''(B) an established business relationship shall be subject to any time limitation established pursuant to paragraph (2)(G)).''.

(c) REQUIRED NOTICE OF OPT-OUT OPPORTUNITY.—Section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(D) shall provide that a notice contained in an unsolicited advertisement complies with the requirements under this subparagraph only if—

''(i) the notice is clear and conspicuous and on the first page of the unsolicited advertisement;

''(ii) the notice states that the recipient may make a request to the sender of the unsolicited advertisement not to send any future unsolicited advertisements to a telephone facsimile machine or machines and that failure to comply, within the shortest reasonable time, as determined by the Commission, with such a request meeting the requirements under subparagraph (E) is unlawful;

''(iii) the notice sets forth the requirements for a request under subparagraph (E);

''(iv) the notice includes—

''(I) a domestic contact telephone and facsimile machine number for the recipient to transmit such a request to the sender; and

''(II) a cost-free mechanism for a recipient to transmit a request pursuant to such notice to the sender of the unsolicited advertisement; the Commission shall by rule require the sender to provide such a mechanism and may, in the discretion of the Commission and subject to such conditions as the Commission may prescribe, exempt certain classes of small business senders, but only if the Commission determines that the costs to such class are unduly burdensome given the revenues generated by such small businesses;

''(v) the telephone and facsimile machine numbers and the cost-free mechanism set forth pursuant to clause (iv) permit an individual or business to make such a request at any time on any day of the week; and

''(vi) the notice complies with the requirements of subsection (d);''.

(d) REQUEST TO OPT-OUT OF FUTURE UNSOLICITED ADVERTISEMENTS.—Section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)), as amended by subsection (c), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(E) shall provide, by rule, that a request not to send future unsolicited advertisements to a telephone facsimile machine complies with the requirements under this subparagraph only if—

''(i) the request identifies the telephone number or numbers of the telephone facsimile machine or machines to which the request relates;

''(ii) the request is made to the telephone or facsimile number of the sender of such an unsolicited advertisement provided pursuant to subparagraph (D)(iv) or by any other method of communication as determined by the Commission; and

''(iii) the person making the request has not, subsequent to such request, provided express invitation or permission to the sender, in writing or otherwise, to send such advertisements to such person at such telephone facsimile machine;''.

(e) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH NONPROFIT EXCEPTION.—Section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)), as amended by subsections (c) and (d), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(F) may, in the discretion of the Commission and subject to such conditions as the Commission may prescribe, allow professional or trade associations that are tax-exempt nonprofit organizations to send unsolicited advertisements to their members in furtherance of the association's tax-exempt purpose that do not contain the notice required by paragraph (1)(C)(iii), except that the Commission may take action under this subparagraph only—

''(i) by regulation issued after public notice and opportunity for public comment; and

''(ii) if the Commission determines that such notice required by paragraph (1)(C)(iii) is not necessary to protect the ability of the members of such associations to stop such associations from sending any future unsolicited advertisements; and''.

(f) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH TIME LIMIT ON ESTABLISHED BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP EXCEPTION.—Section 227(b)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(b)(2)), as amended by subsections (c), (d), and (e) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(G)(i) may, consistent with clause (ii), limit the duration of the existence of an established business relationship, however, before establishing any such limits, the Commission shall—

''(I) determine whether the existence of the exception under paragraph (1)(C) relating to an established business relationship has resulted in a significant number of complaints to the Commission regarding the sending of unsolicited advertisements to telephone facsimile machines;

''(II) determine whether a significant number of any such complaints involve unsolicited advertisements that were sent on the basis of an established business relationship that was longer in duration than the Commission believes is consistent with the reasonable expectations of consumers;

''(III) evaluate the costs to senders of demonstrating the existence of an established business relationship within a specified period of time and the benefits to recipients of establishing a limitation on such established business relationship; and

''(IV) determine whether with respect to small businesses, the costs would not be unduly burdensome; and

''(ii) may not commence a proceeding to determine whether to limit the duration of the existence of an established business relationship before the expiration of the 3-month period that begins on the date of the enactment of the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005.''.

(g) UNSOLICITED ADVERTISEMENT.—Section 227(a)(5) of the Communications Act of 1934, as so redesignated by subsection (b)(1), is amended by inserting '', in writing or otherwise'' before the period at the end.

(h) REGULATIONS.—Except as provided in section 227(b)(2)(G)(ii) of the Communications Act of 1934 (as added by subsection (f)), not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall issue regulations to implement the amendments made by this section.

**SEC. 3. FCC ANNUAL REPORT REGARDING JUNK FAX ENFORCEMENT.**

Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) JUNK FAX ENFORCEMENT REPORT.—The Commission shall submit an annual report to Congress regarding the enforcement during the past year of the provisions of this section relating to sending of unsolicited advertisements to telephone facsimile machines, which report shall include—

''(1) the number of complaints received by the Commission during such year alleging that a consumer received an unsolicited advertisement via telephone facsimile machine in violation of the Commission's rules;

''(2) the number of citations issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503 during the year to enforce any law, regulation, or policy relating to sending of unsolicited advertisements to telephone facsimile machines;

''(3) the number of notices of apparent liability issued by the Commission pursuant to section 503 during the year to enforce any law, regulation, or policy relating to sending of unsolicited advertisements to telephone facsimile machines;

''(4) for each notice referred to in paragraph (3)—

''(A) the amount of the proposed forfeiture penalty involved;

''(B) the person to whom the notice was issued;

''(C) the length of time between the date on which the complaint was filed and the date on which the notice was issued; and

''(D) the status of the proceeding;

''(5) the number of final orders imposing forfeiture penalties issued pursuant to section 503 during the year to enforce any law, regulation, or policy relating to sending of unsolicited advertisements to telephone facsimile machines;

''(6) for each forfeiture order referred to in paragraph (5)—

''(A) the amount of the penalty imposed by the order;

''(B) the person to whom the order was issued;

''(C) whether the forfeiture penalty has been paid; and

''(D) the amount paid;

''(7) for each case in which a person has failed to pay a forfeiture penalty imposed by such a final order, whether the Commission referred such matter for recovery of the penalty; and

''(8) for each case in which the Commission referred such an order for recovery—

''(A) the number of days from the date the Commission issued such order to the date of such referral;

''(B) whether an action has been commenced to recover the penalty, and if so, the number of days from the date the Commission referred such order for recovery to the date of such commencement; and

''(C) whether the recovery action resulted in collection of any amount, and if so, the amount collected.''.

**SEC. 4. GAO STUDY OF JUNK FAX ENFORCEMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study regarding complaints received by the Federal Communications Commission concerning unsolicited advertisements sent to telephone facsimile machines, which study shall determine—

(1) the mechanisms established by the Commission to receive, investigate, and respond to such complaints;

(2) the level of enforcement success achieved by the Commission regarding such complaints;

(3) whether complainants to the Commission are adequately informed by the Commission of the responses to their complaints; and

(4) whether additional enforcement measures are necessary to protect consumers, including recommendations regarding such additional enforcement measures.

(b) ADDITIONAL ENFORCEMENT REMEDIES.—In conducting the analysis and making the recommendations required under subsection (a)(4), the Comptroller General shall specifically examine—

(1) the adequacy of existing statutory enforcement actions available to the Commission;

(2) the adequacy of existing statutory enforcement actions and remedies available to consumers;

(3) the impact of existing statutory enforcement remedies on senders of facsimiles;

(4) whether increasing the amount of financial penalties is warranted to achieve greater deterrent effect; and

(5) whether establishing penalties and enforcement actions for repeat violators or abusive violations similar to those established under section 1037 of title 18, United States Code, would have a greater deterrent effect.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the results of the study under this section to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Madam 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 S. 714.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 714, the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005, legislation very similar to the bill which this House passed in the last Congress that had been sponsored by me, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL). I want to thank those Members for their hard work and bipartisan cooperation, not only last year, but this year as well.

I also want to thank the House leadership for agreeing to expedite consideration of this very important legislation, because June 30, later this week, is when the sands of the hourglass were about to run out on the current stay of the FCC's new junk fax rules which this legislation fixes. No doubt time is of the essence and passage of this legislation is long overdue, that is for sure.

It is important to note that this bill does not overturn the ban on the faxing of unsolicited advertisements which has been outlawed since the passage of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991. So this bill does not protect the senders of those annoying, unsolicited faxes which so many of our constituents get that advertise purported investment opportunities, mortgage refinancing opportunities, vacation packages, who knows what, always sent by unfamiliar firms with whom our constituents have never done business.

I presume these firms are at best fly-by-night outfits, or at worst scam artists. In all events, they appear to be nuisances and violators of the Federal junk fax law, and this bill does not change that. Rather, the bill would clearly reinstate the FCC's previous rules which permitted businesses and associations to send faxes to those with whom they had ''an established business relationship'' without first having to get written permission slips from them.

If we do not reinstate the FCC's previous rules, the cost of complying with the FCC's new rules will be enormous, and it will severely hamper legitimate fax communications between businesses and their consumers and between associations and their members.

Additionally, and importantly, the bill would establish new opt-out safeguards to provide additional protections for fax recipients. Under the bill, senders of faxes must alert recipients of their right to opt out of future faxes and senders must abide by such requests. That is an additional level of protection that consumers do not have under the current law.

This Junk Fax Prevention Act is commonsense regulatory relief. I want to thank again the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for their bipartisan cooperation on this bill; and I would urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I rise in full support of this legislation. I begin with my congratulations and thanks to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the subcommittee. He and I worked in the last session, along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and other members of our committee, in order to draft legislation, which is very similar to the legislation which we are passing here today.

I would like, if it is permissible within the rules, to also thank the Democrat and Republican Members of the other body for their work on this legislation as well. We truly passed this legislation in a bicameral, bipartisan fashion.

First, let me state that back in ancient, prehistoric political times, back in 1991, that I was the principal House sponsor of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, which contained the original junk fax prohibition. In 1991, that legislation passed this body and this general prohibition against junk faxes became law because of this intrusive form of advertising.

Every time someone junk faxes you, it is your paper that is coming out of the machine. You are paying for that paper. Your machine is tied up. It is just absolutely one of the most irritating things to people, to have to pay for someone else coming into your home or your business when you do not want them there. It is essentially a tax which is paid by the recipient of something that they never asked for in the first place.

This is something that ultimately takes up precious time as well. The machine is tied up, there is too much clutter that is associated with it, and important faxes are lost in the midst of the pile of junk faxes. How many people have just taken a pile of junk faxes, thrown it away, and in the middle of it was a fax you really wanted from someone, but you were just so ticked off by this generally unwanted clutter which has come into your home or your business.

So I think it is important to emphasize that the bill we bring to the House floor today retains the general prohibition against sending junk faxes. In other words, sending an unsolicited facsimile advertisement is against the law. We are not changing the law or the policy with respect to this. Sending a junk fax was illegal, and it remains illegal under this bill.

Neither are we changing any of the statutory enforcement mechanisms available to the Federal Communications Commission or to the individual consumers themselves in this bill. The legislation we are proposing will address certain provisions affecting an exception to the general prohibition against sending junk faxes and will improve the bill in these areas.

□ 1045

I think that it cannot be emphasized enough how this bill is the product, again, of the bipartisan work that both parties have engaged in over the last 2 or 3 years to reach today's final product, and I urge the House to adopt unanimously this legislation today.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this bill. This legislation builds upon legislation that was passed by the House in the last Congress and which this year was negotiated out between both Democratic and Republican members in the other body over a number of months. I encourage members to support this legislation today.

First, let me state that I was the principal House sponsor of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (TCPA) of 1991, which contained the original junk fax prohibition. Congress endorsed my call in 1991 for a general prohibition against junk faxes because of the intrusive nature of that form of advertising. Junk faxes represent a form of advertising in which the ad is essentially paid for by the recipient. The recipient of a junk fax pays for the fax paper and printer costs, pays in the form of precious lost time as the machine is tied up, and also in the form of the clutter in which important faxes are lost in the midst of a pile of junk faxes.

I think it is important to emphasize that the bill we bring to the House floor today retains the general prohibition against sending junk faxes. In other words, sending an unsolicited facsimile advertisement is against the law. We are not changing the law or the policy with respect to this—sending a junk fax was illegal and remains illegal under this bill. Neither are we changing any of the statutory enforcement mechanisms available to the FCC or consumers in this bill.

The legislation we are proposing will address certain provisions affecting an exception to the general prohibition against sending junk faxes and will improve the bill in these areas. Since the FCC originally implemented the 1991 junk fax provisions of the TCPA, Commission regulations contained an exception for faxes that were sent because an ''established business relationship'' existed between the sender and the recipient. These regulations were in place and the ability to send junk faxes based upon this exception was permitted by the Commission for over a decade.

This concept of an ''established business relationship'' permitted a commercial entity to invoke its ability to demonstrate such a relationship with a consumer in order to contact that consumer in spite of the general prohibitions of the law. The FCC has more recently determined that the term ''established business relationship'' was not specifically included in the provisions addressing junk faxes in the TCPA

and therefore changed its regulations. The new rules proposed by the Commission require ''written'' permission from consumers and these new rules have been stayed from going into effect until June 30th of this year, just a few short days away.

The legislation before us is designed to put specific language into the statute permitting an ''established business relationship'' exception to the general prohibition against junk faxes. Many businesses have complained that written permission is too onerous a regulatory requirement for many of the faxes that they stipulate are routinely sent in the ordinary course of business to established customers or customers requesting such faxes. This has been done by reputable business entities presumably without complaints from the recipients of such faxes.

We must recognize, however, that many small businesses and residential consumers find many of these unsolicited faxes, including those faxes sent because a valid claim of an ''established business relationship'' was being asserted, to be a considerable irritant and strongly object to receiving them. The legislation, therefore, addresses additional issues, including putting into the statute an ''opt-out'' ability for consumers to object to receiving junk faxes, even when such faxes are sent to them based upon an established business relationship. For the decade that the original FCC regulations were in place, many consumers simply were not aware of the FCC's established business relationship exception, nor did very many know they had an ability to stop these faxes or any clear way in which to effectuate such a request.

The bill the House is considering includes new provisions requiring an ''opt-out'' notice and policy that we will add to the statute. The bill requires junk faxes to include, on the first page, a clear and conspicuous notice to consumers that they have the right not to receive future junk faxes from the sender. Second, the notice must include a domestic contact telephone number and fax number for consumers to transmit a request not to receive future faxes.

Third, the substitute requires the notice to conform with the Commission's technical and procedural standards for sending faxes under Section 227(d) of the law, which include the requirement to identify the entity sending the facsimile advertisement. This is an important provision because one of the biggest complaints from the FCC at the hearing, and with other law enforcement entities and aggrieved consumers, is that they have had difficulty legally identifying the source of many of the unsolicited faxes. In addition, there were some senders of junk faxes who evidently and falsely believed that simply because they were sending an unsolicited fax based upon their ability to prove they had an ''established business relationship'' with a consumer, and thus did not have to abide by the general prohibition against such faxes, that this also meant they did not have to abide by the other FCC and statutory technical rules. These statutory and regulatory rules include requirements that junk fax senders identify themselves in such faxes. Law enforcement entities and consumers need to be able to find the legal business name or widely recognized trade name of the entity sending a junk fax in violation of the rules in order to pursue enforcement actions.

Fourth, this bill makes it clear that a consumer can ''opt-out'' of receiving faxes to multiple machines, if they have more than one, rather than opting out solely for the particular machine that received the junk fax. Fifth, in this legislation the Commission is tasked with exploring additional mechanisms by which a consumer might opt-out, such as in person or by email or regular mail, and also requests that the Commission establish cost-free ways by which consumers can opt-out. These notice and opt-out requirements all represent new provisions to the law for which existing enforcement remedies will apply.

This legislation also includes the ability for the FCC to limit the duration of an established business relationship notwithstanding the fact that the law would include an opt-out notice and ability which avails consumers of the right to opt-out of receiving faxes at any point in time. I believe this is an important concept and one which deals with the legitimate expectations of consumers. If a consumer buys something from a store, consumers might expect to hear from that store within a reasonable period of time. Over time however, a consumer's expectation changes and there is a time after which the established business relationship can be said to have lapsed.

Finally, I think it is important to take a comprehensive look at overall enforcement of the junk fax law. I am concerned that some of the most egregious junk fax operations, the entities that broadcast such faxes to millions, often escape enforcement. They may be found guilty, cited by the FCC and sometimes fined—but often it appears as if they either ignore the fines, skip town, or live overseas. For these reasons the bill includes provisions that will give us an annual accounting of the FCC's enforcement activities as well as a GAO analysis of what additional enforcement tools may be necessary to provide sufficient deterrent, especially to the most egregious and abusive junk fax senders.

Again, I want to commend Chairman UPTON and Chairman BARTON for their work on this bill, and in particular for their willingness and openness in working with me and Mr. DINGELL in crafting the compromises needed to achieve consensus. I encourage all the members to support it.

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

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

In closing, let me just say that I welcome my friend's comments. I would only say that we can now refer to ''the other body'' as ''the Senate.'' We changed the rules beginning with this Congress, so we do not need to damn the other side by saying ''the other body;'' we can now thank them for their efforts, and this is maybe the first time that has ever happened. But we applaud their efforts led by Chairman STEVENS and others in the Senate.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much, because this is an incantation which I have never actually been able to make legally under the rules of the House in my 29 years in this body, so I would like for the first time to utter the phrase: I would like to thank the Senate for its work on this legislation. It is much appreciated.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I thought the gentleman might want to revise and extend since we had something so gracious coming from the other body now called the Senate. But I want to thank them as well on a bipartisan basis for getting this legislation expedited to the floor. Madam Speaker, I would ask all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of S. 714, the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005.

The FCC's recent proposal to require written permission to send commercial fax messages created a great deal of controversy, and I support this small amendment to the Junk Fax law that will make the larger law work better.

I am a strong supporter of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act and its ban on unsolicited commercial faxes, which place an undue financial burden on small business and individual recipients.

It's one thing to have to receive a unsolicited telemarketer's call—it's even worse to have to pay for it by having to replace the paper from your fax machine.

However, I agree that the explicit, written notification requirement contemplated by the FCC in its proposed rulemaking is problematic for some situations like trade associations, realtors, and others who already have existing business relationships.

As a result, I am pleased to join the bipartisan leadership of the House Energy and Commerce Committee in supporting S. 714, the Junk Fax Prevention Act of 2005.

This Act corrects the FCC's rule and allows for businesses to communicate with other businesses with whom they have an established business relationship, as long as they allow business to ''opt-out'' of future faxes.

This new law will not weaken protections for residential consumers or protection for businesses from unsolicited ads for printer toner, vacation deals, and other sales pitches that cost consumers money.

This new law will prevent businesses and realtors from having to fill out paperwork to communicate with each other about an existing business relationship.

Madam Speaker, I support this bill and urge its adoption by the full House.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Michigan). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 714.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3057, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, by direction

of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 341 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 341

*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. 3057) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, 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 as follows: beginning with ''or'' on page 113, line 26, through page 114, line 10. 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. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, 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 just a minute, Madam Speaker, to reiterate that we bring this rule forward under an open rule. Historically, appropriations bills have come to the House governed by an open rule, and we continue to do so, in order to allow every Member of this House the opportunity to submit amendments for consideration, obviously as long as they comply with all of the Rules of the House.

Madam Speaker, the legislation before us appropriates over $20 billion, an increase of $73 million, for operations across the globe. The bill is fiscally sound while, at the same time, compassionate and globally responsive to the needs of those plagued by disease and international disaster.

The bill bolsters the President's Millennium Challenge Corporation to $1.75 billion, nearly a quarter of a billion dollars more than in fiscal year 2005. The expansion of assistance is meant to help bring economic security and the rule of law to some of the most of the poorest nations of the world. The Millennium Challenge provides assistance through a competitive selection process to developing nations that are pursuing political and economic reforms basically in three areas, Madam Speaker: ruling justly, investing in people, and fostering economic freedom. Economic development genuinely succeeds when it is linked to free market economic principles as well as to democracy and where governments are committed to implementing reform measures in order to achieve these goals.

Two years ago in his State of the Union address, President Bush announced the President's emergency plan for AIDS relief, the largest international health initiative in history initiated by a single government to address one disease. This bill shows Congress's continued support of the fight against HIV/AIDS, as it includes over $2.6 billion to continue the fight against that horrendous deadly disease.

Our resolve to help all those across the globe who fight this disease is strong; it is 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 the developing world are safe and effective to help those with HIV/AIDS.

In other foreign assistance, H.R. 3057 funds the Andean Counterdrug Initiative at the President's request, $734 million, $9 million more than last fiscal year. Economic growth in the area since the start of Plan Colombia is proof that the assistance we have provided Colombia has made a difference, a very important difference in that country. I myself visited in April of last year and was able to see the extraordinary progress that the Colombian government and the Colombian people have made against the narcoterrorists, and they constantly reiterate their gratitude to this Congress for the important assistance, Madam Speaker, that we have provided them and continue to do so.

However, we must not take progress in the Andean region for granted. If the United States turns its back on the region, a scenario may ensue which would require greater U.S. investment and involvement at a time when we obviously have significant responsibilities worldwide.

Madam Speaker, the underlying legislation also provides over $2.5 billion for military and economic assistance to Israel. We must continue to ensure that our friends and allies remain secure. I am fully convinced that a strong Israel is necessary not only for Israel, but also for the security interests of the United States. We are committed to do everything we can so that Israel is safe and secure within its borders.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 3057 was introduced by the gentleman from Arizona and reported out of the Committee on Appropriations on June 21 by voice vote. It is a good bill, essential to our continued commitment to the security and safety of all in the United States, and we bring it forth, as I stated before, under a very fair and, as a matter of fact, an open rule.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Arizona and the gentlewoman from New York for their leadership on this important issue, and I obviously would urge my colleagues to support both the underlying legislation as well as this rule.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend, from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) for yielding me this time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my significant concerns about the Foreign Operations bill for fiscal year 2006. The substance of the underlying legislation will be addressed later in my statement.

Madam Speaker, while the rule is similar to that of other appropriations bills, I am extremely disappointed that the majority has blocked our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) from offering an amendment that would have provided $1 billion in emergency funding for the Veterans' Administration. All of our colleagues here in the House know that the Bush administration and the Republican majority, by their own admission, have underfunded the Veterans' Administration by $1 billion. Without the emergency funding proposed by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the VA will shortly run out of money, leaving veterans, and there are 86,000 of them coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan and elsewhere, with nowhere to turn. But because my friends in the majority on the Committee on Rules did not make the Edwards amendment in order, the House will not have an opportunity to consider this critical amendment now. Shame on all of us.

Madam Speaker, the underlying legislation has some admirable provisions yet, in several areas, it falls far short of meeting the United States' near and long-term policy needs.

The majority's excuse that the budget constraints prevent greater generosity is just that: an excuse. The simple fact of the matter is that the Republicans' reckless and irresponsible

economic policies have left the United States with little room to meet our important international and domestic obligations.

Realize, I think that it is appropriate that we have funding allocated to fighting the plagues of our time, HIV and AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. I applaud the current appropriations and encourage this body to continue supporting these efforts until these diseases have been completely eradicated.

I am also appreciative of the assistance levels for the Middle East. This past April, with the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), I had an opportunity to visit Israel and the Palestinian territories, and we met with officials from both sides of the conflict. I found them at that time to be committed to the pursuit of a fair and just peace and dedicated to ensuring an equitable resolution to the many issues that divide the Israelis and the Palestinians. The United States must continue to show its commitment to Israel, our most reliable ally in the Middle East. This legislation does just that. Further, we must be engaged in the region and reward positive efforts by the Palestinians with appropriate levels of assistance.

I am also pleased to note that the United States is the leading donor of humanitarian assistance to Darfur, with $350 million appropriated in this legislation. This assistance is important, but not nearly enough. Frankly, the Bush administration has been neglectful of the realities on the ground, even while acknowledging that genocide is taking place. There should be no action on earth that compels us to act more than genocide. However, the House continues to refuse to move the Darfur Accountability Act, which provides for sanctions against the regime and authorizes the President to use force, if needed, to save the lives of innocent civilians.

□ 1100

Is there a reason vastly more compelling than halting genocide that is forcing the United States to merely shake our finger in admonishment at the Sudanese Government? The world long remembers those instances in which the United States failed to take action to prevent genocide, and I fear that this is going to be another one of those times.

Despite all of the positive provisions in the bill, Mr. Speaker, there are several aspects of this bill that project the wrong message to the global community. At a time of intense international hostility toward many aspects of United States foreign policy, we should not be compounding the problem with a ''sore loser'' attitude and a lack of commitment to protecting human rights.

Allow me to expand. Section 528 of the underlying legislation withholds 25 percent of funding to the World Bank's International Development Association if it fails to continue implementing some procurement reforms that are supported by the United States. Once again, as with last week's United Nations Reform Act, Republicans are insisting on a my-way-or-the-highway approach. This is plain wrong. We will never reform these institutions by staying at home and complaining. We must accept compromise and continue to press for change while remaining a committed participant.

Mr. Speaker, typically, the foreign operations bill is one of the most bipartisan bills that this body passes every year. While I will most likely support the underlying legislation, I am greatly concerned by the overall amount of money appropriated in this bill. Later today, we will hear from the chairman and other Republican leaders who will claim that they did the best they could with what they were given. I do not doubt that, Mr. Speaker; and I applaud the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee for the hard and dedicated work which they do for all of us. Nevertheless, the budget constraints which the chairman and others will speak of are the creation of the Republicans' fiscal mismanagement.

I am appalled that we have the money to provide egregious tax cuts to extremely wealthy people in our country; yet we do not have the money to meet our international humanitarian commitment. We have the money to provide billions in tax giveaways to the Bush administration's favorite corporate donors; yet we do not have the money to provide the necessary assistance to some of the poorest countries in the world. This is beyond shameful. It is negligent, and it leads many in the world to understandably question the seriousness of our rhetoric on human rights and the promotion of democracy.

Just once, Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to this floor with Republicans in the majority and President Bush in the White House and say, We do not have the money for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires because we have to fulfill our commitment to improving the lives of billions of people around the world, including millions right here in our own country.

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

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

With regard to some of the many, many points that were made by my distinguished friend, and I am certainly not going to address them all at this point, but I would like to make two points with regard to this foreign aid bill which we are bringing to the floor today with an open rule. We are providing over $20 billion in foreign aid in this bill. That is an increase of $73 million over last year. We are fulfilling our obligations and being quite compassionate as we do so.

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

Mr. DREIER. I thank my friend for yielding and thank him for his fine management of this very important rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule which provides for an open amendment process. Any germane amendment that any Member chooses to offer will in fact be debated and voted upon here in the House. So understand that Members under the rules of the House will have an opportunity to amend this legislation as they see fit.

I was very happy to hear praise for the bill from my good friend from Fort Lauderdale, Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) as well as the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) and an understanding that at the end of the day there will be bipartisan support for this legislation.

We know full well that this is a piece of legislation that is often misunderstood by many Americans. There is a belief that somehow we expend 10 to 15 percent of the Federal budget on foreign assistance, on foreign aid; and there is a belief that we are taking our hard-earned tax dollars and sending them down a rat hole when, in fact, there needs to be an understanding that the foreign operations bill is comprised of less than 1 percent of the entire Federal budget.

I believe that the chairman and ranking member have done a great job in putting together a bill, and I will do exactly what the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) said and say correctly that with the resources that are limited, we frankly have done, I believe, extraordinarily well. There is a reason that resources are limited when it comes to the Federal budget. It is not, as my friend from Florida said, because of reckless and irresponsible policies that President Bush and the Republicans have put forward. It is the fact that both Democrats and Republicans are regularly saying that we need to bring about a reduction in the Federal deficit. We cannot continue to have deficit spending.

Now, the so-called reckless and irresponsible policies that have been categorized as that by my good friend are policies that have actually brought the Federal deficit to a level that is $73 billion lower than had been anticipated and projected in February. First, we saw in April a reduction of $50 billion; and then just 2 weeks ago, we got the report of an additional $23 billion reduction in the Federal deficit. Why? Because of the fact that we have seen strong, bold economic growth. We have a 3.5 percent GDP growth rate taking place in this country, and we also have seen the unemployment rate at 5.1 percent, lower than the average unemployment rate through the 1960s, 1970s, 1980s and 1990s.

And so this view, somehow, that we have created more problems when it comes to the deficit, we not only have

not created more problems; we have got the deficit on a downward slope, we are still fighting the war on terror, and we are meeting these very important obligations.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) was absolutely right, Mr. Speaker, when he talked about the great trip that we took in traveling throughout the Middle East, going to Israel and the Palestinian territories. We were also in Egypt. I believe that the aid package that we have here for both Israel and Egypt is very important, and I would like to compliment my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, for his effort to focus resources on the democratization that is taking place in Egypt. We know that for the first time ever, we in September are going to see multicandidate elections take place in Egypt. I believe that that is a clear sign that the policies that we have been pursuing under President Bush in creating a chance for 8.5 million Iraqis to vote has been a very positive thing.

We know that today marks the first anniversary of the transition from the Coalition Provisional Authority to Iraqi sovereignty, which is a very, very important thing to mark. Obviously, we have tragically seen terrorist activities take place throughout the past year which have been designed to bring about destabilization. But because of what we have done, because of the resolve, and the President will be talking about this tonight in his nationally televised address from Fort Bragg, we as a Nation are determined to see political pluralism, the rule of law and the building of democratic institutions; and the effort that the gentleman from Wisconsin has put into that when it comes to Egypt is, I think, a very, very important one.

I also want to talk about the issue that was raised by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), that being the concern that we all have over this issue of a shortfall in funding for our veterans. Mr. Speaker, we all know, Democrats and Republicans alike, that there is a great responsibility that we have to our veterans. Our veterans have shed their blood and shared their courage for the good of our country. They have given us our enduring freedom, and it is our duty to honor our country's commitment to them. It is our duty to do that.

Now, just this morning at 9 o'clock, we have seen the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the very, very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that deals with this issue, the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, hold a hearing focusing on the need to address this issue. We did, unfortunately, get this report of the shortfall, but it is important to note what it is that we have done for our Nation's veterans.

We passed by a vote of 425–1 the military quality of life appropriations bill. That legislation includes over $28 billion for the Veterans Health Administration, including $21 billion for medical services. Medical services are actually funded in the legislation at $1.6 billion above the current fiscal year. Over the last 2 years, funding for medical care for veterans has increased by 18 percent. That does not in any way diminish the fact that we have unfortunately gotten this report of the $1 billion shortfall; but, Mr. Speaker, it makes it very clear that we as an institution have a responsibility to encourage the Veterans Administration to have a degree of accountability.

When you provide $28 billion in resources, $21 billion for medical services, an increase of 18 percent over the last 2 years, it seems to me that steps need to be taken to ensure that we, in fact, look at and understand this problem of the $1 billion shortfall. We should not continue to subsidize what obviously is a problem.

That is why there is a strong commitment. The White House is committed to dealing with this issue. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the chairman of the authorizing committee, is very determined to deal with this issue. And I believe that we have done the correct thing by saying the funds will be available through using surpluses that the Veterans Administration has and other operational funds while we try to deal with the challenge of this $1 billion shortfall.

There will be some who will try to claim that we are ignoring the problem of the $1 billion shortfall that has been announced if we do not defeat the previous question and turn back this rule. Nothing could be further from the truth. We face the problem head-on. We are going to responsibly deal with it working together in a bipartisan way with the executive branch and the legislative branch to ensure that we can address this issue.

I urge support of this rule. I thank my friend for his leadership that he has shown on this and a wide range of very important foreign policy issues.

I will close with one point that I raised with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) when he testified and, that is, I am very proud that Speaker HASTERT and Minority Leader PELOSI have come together to establish a task force, a commission that is geared towards seeing the United States House of Representatives directly provide technical assistance and other expertise to emerging parliaments in these new democracies that are taking place around the world, and there are very important resources for that that are included in this bill. I would like to thank my colleagues who have been involved in that. I urge support of both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) with whom I serve on the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule for one simple reason: it shortchanges our Nation's veterans. I would say to my friend and colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, with all due respect, our veterans do not need more hearings. They do not need your sympathy. They need your action. They need this Congress to act, and they need this Congress to act now.

The Department of Veterans Affairs recently admitted they are $1 billion short. Last night in the Rules Committee, Democrats offered an amendment by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) to correct this shortfall and to make sure that our veterans get the health care that they deserve. As the gentleman from Texas noted in his testimony before the committee, ''There are three basic reasons why VA health funding must be increased above present levels.

□ 1115

''First, health care inflation is approximately 7 percent a year. Second, 86,000 Iraqi and Afghanistan war veterans have needed VA care. Third, health care and prescription drug costs have caused a net increase of 250,000 veterans per year using the VA health care system.''

Mr. Speaker, despite this glaring need for more veterans health care funding, the Republican majority on the Committee on Rules refused to provide it on a partisan vote. What are our priorities?

Yesterday in The Washington Post, it was reported that senior VA officials are spending their time making sure that every VA facility has a framed portrait of the VA Secretary prominently displayed.

One senior VA official said that facilities should make the portrait their ''highest priority.''

I have a suggestion for the VA. Maybe their highest priority should be providing adequate health care for our veterans. Maybe their highest priority should be spending American tax dollars wisely.

There is a quote from Abraham Lincoln's Second Inaugural etched into the VA building downtown. It says, ''to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan.''

Lincoln did not say anything about the framed portrait of government officials.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the previous question so that we can provide adequate funding for veterans health care.

During this time of war, our veterans deserve more than nice words. They deserve the health care that they have earned.

I realize that this is not a tax cut for millionaires, something that you on the other side of the aisle embrace with urgency, but how can you turn your backs on the brave men and women fighting in the wars that you voted for?

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrageous situation that must be fixed today, not tomorrow, not next week, not next month. We do not need any more hearings. We need to fix it today. We owe the men and women who have worn the uniform of this country nothing less.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are very proud of our support for veterans. A few weeks ago, as a matter of fact, on May 25, this House of Representatives brought to the floor, considered and passed by a vote of 425 to 1 the appropriations bill for the next fiscal year on military quality of life. The legislation included over $28 billion for the Veterans Health Administration, including $21 billion for medical services. Medical services were funded $1.6 billion above the current fiscal year. Over the last 2 years, funding for the veterans medical care has increased by 18 percent.

We are very proud of our support for veterans. And I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I know of no two Members of this House who feel and have more concern for the rights of veterans than the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), as well as the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) of the appropriations subcommittee that funds veterans affairs.

So this matter brought to our attention now of a shortfall is of extreme concern to them. And as we speak, Mr. Speaker, a hearing is taking place to fully investigate the causes and the issues of this shortfall, a hearing is taking place by the appropriations subcommittee dealing with this issue, Military Quality of Life Appropriations Subcommittee, called for by the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH). And so not only are we not ignoring the issue, we are proud of our record of support for veterans and will continue to support veterans in a way which will make us all proud.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. What my colleague from Florida ignores is that we could do something today for those same veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill spends a lot of money on foreign aid, but there is a major problem with this bill today. And that problem is not money that the bill contains. It is money that the bill does not contain.

Last week we were told by the Veterans Administration that after continually resisting efforts to increase funding for veterans health care, they were finally admitting that there was, in fact, a $1 billion shortfall in veterans health care funding for the present fiscal year.

My understanding is that at the hearing of the Subcommittee on Military Construction this morning, the VA amended that number and they are now telling us that in addition to the $1 billion shortfall which they said they had in this fiscal year, they are saying that they are going to need $1.5 billion next year, plus another $1.1 billion if the Congress does not take action with respect to co-payments and enrollment fees that the Congress has already decided that it will not support.

So in other words, there is a huge hole in the Veterans Administration health care funding and it is growing.

Now, we have had to endure a lot of cynical comments from some Members on the other side over the past 2 years because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and I and several others have tried at every opportunity to get more money into the budget for veterans health care.

In fact, I recall at one point the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) was called a demagogue by a member of the majority party because he stood up and insisted that we fund veterans health care at least a billion dollars higher level than it was being funded.

I think now we recognize, and I would hope our friends on the other side of the aisle would recognize, that the numbers which the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and others have been citing are correct and that the numbers that the Veterans Administration has been citing are not.

I find it ironic that the majority party even removed from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs chairmanship, the gentleman who last year recognized along with us that we need higher funding for veterans health care. He was rewarded for being frank about the needs for veterans by being bounced out of his committee chairmanship.

I think we ought to take a look at what the facts are. Right now medical facilities are literally falling down around their patients. One veterans medical clinic had to put up scaffolding around walls to protect patients from falling bricks. Physicians at VA hospitals have reported that they had to visit neighboring hospitals to borrow supplies that they needed to carry out specific medical procedures.

The VA is proposing two solutions to the problem: diverting $400 million that was to be used for medical services next year, and using $600 million that was supposed to be used to improve hospitals. This, in our judgment, is just digging the hole deeper, and it is not the first time that we have seen this resistance.

In fiscal 2002 the administration would not allow the VA to spend $275 million that Congress had provided to meet the needs of veterans. In fiscal year 2004, the VA Secretary testified that the administration had cut his own request by $1.2 billion. They now admit there is a shortfall.

For 2006 the VA bill adds only 2 percent or $661 million for the Veterans Health Care Administration. Not nearly enough in light of today's revelations.

I will place into the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, a listing of our efforts over the past 2 years to raise veterans health care.

In short, I simply want to urge each and every Member of this House on both sides of the aisle to vote against the previous question on the rule on this bill so that we can try to respond to what is obviously an emergency situation and add to this bill the money that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) tried to add on the floor last week to a previous bill so that we can clean up the shortfall in the VA health care budget for this year, and so that we do not dig the hole deeper for the following year.

Even the money that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) was asking for last week will not be sufficient for the 2-year problem, but it is a whole lot better than hiding the problem under the rug as the administration has done for the past 2 years.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life of the Committee on Appropriations.

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

I do not think I am incorrect in stating that this discussion regarding veterans health care does not belong on a foreign operations bill. Clearly there is a venue for discussion of veterans funding. And as Members know, we have had a full discussion of that before the House and in committee and it was done in a proper way.

I just want to make sure that everyone understands that we were provided additional information after the House had concluded its work on the Veterans and Military Quality of Life bill. That prompted us, my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), my ranking member of the subcommittee, to jointly request an oversight hearing which was conducted just this morning for 2½ hours.

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

Mr. WALSH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would simply say I appreciate the oversight hearing but what we need is not so much a hearing but action. Secondly, I would grant to the gentleman that the preferred place to deal with this problem is not on this bill. The problem is we tried to deal with it on the bill where it belongs and we were blocked by the majority for doing so.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WALSH. Reclaiming my time, we can deal with this before the 2006 budget is implemented. We have time. It is June. We moved expeditiously to get the bill passed. We did that.

We now have new information and we have to respond to that. And the questions I can frankly say were aggressive and thorough, and the response from the Veterans' Administration, while complete, at least we believe complete at this time, was not as thorough as we would like.

And we asked questions, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and I and other members of the subcommittee have asked questions. We want to get at what exactly is the anticipated shortfall for 2006. We want to make sure that this projected deficit for 2005 is responded to. That there is no diminution of care or quality of care in our veterans hospitals and that is our responsibility. That is the proper venue for this debate. Not on the foreign operations bill. We will have time to respond to it.

We have had discussions with OMB and with the Veterans' Administration. We will not rest until we resolve this difference of what is needed to meet the needs of our veterans. But I assure the House and Members here today that we will get to the bottom of this, we will get the proper resolution. And if additional funds are needed, and I believe they are, we will find them.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations who has a great deal of dedication and skill in this arena.

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

I rise in opposition to this rule and urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. I am grateful for the Committee on Rules for granting an open rule for consideration of H.R. 3057, the FY 2006 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

It is always my preference each year to allow as broad a debate as possible on the provisions in the bill and on United States foreign aid policy generally.

□ 1130

I believe this rule will accomplish that.

However, I did ask the Committee on Rules to grant a waiver to one amendment during today's debate, an amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) to provide $1 billion in emergency funding for veterans health care. While I do not usually support giving waivers to amendments on the foreign operations bill that are not directly related to the bill, I wholeheartedly support the gentleman from Texas' effort.

The administration's recent revelation of a $1 billion shortfall in veterans health care funding is already significantly impacting our veterans, as facilities across the country deny new requests for appointments. This admission, which emerged during a congressional hearing last week, comes less than 4 months after Secretary Nicholson wrote to the Senate with a bold assertion that the VA ''does not need emergency supplemental funds in fiscal year 2005.'' It seems Secretary Nicholson was either misleading Congress or simply was not informed of the facts; and, frankly, I do not know which poses a greater threat to the veterans health care system.

The nonchalance with which the administration has handled funding for veterans health care is unbelievable, especially as our men and women in uniform continue to serve in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world. These brave Americans continue to give the ultimate sacrifice to defend our freedoms, and we must fulfill our commitment to care for them upon their return.

The gentleman from Texas' effort is not without precedent. The Committee on Rules made in order a Republican amendment to the Iraq War supplemental on REAL ID, allowing for adoption of this provision without any real debate or hearings. The committee also made in order a nongermane amendment to the legislative branch appropriations bill, arguing that the continuity of Congress was too important not to include.

Given what our veterans have done for this country, the gentleman from Texas' amendment is too important not to consider today, and I urge defeat of the previous question.

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

We will get to the bottom of this problem. We will solve it, and we have heard from the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that has jurisdiction over the veterans issue to that effect. We will hear as well shortly from the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and when I say we are going to get to the bottom of this and solve it, it is coming from the history of the House of Representatives that in the last 2 years alone has increased funding for veterans medical care by 18 percent. We are very proud of our record, and we are going to continue to have a record to be proud of.

So having said that, I would simply like to remind any colleagues who may be following this debate that with this rule what we are doing is bringing to the floor the foreign aid bill, the foreign operations appropriations bill, which includes about $22 billion, the foreign aid bill, includes about $22 billion, and it is almost $100 million over the amounts that we appropriated for the current fiscal year. That is what we are bringing to the floor again, Mr. Speaker, with this rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Florida, the distinguished gentleman, amazes me with his logic. We gave the veterans $2 billion more he said last year. What does that have to do with today and the fact that there is a $1 billion shortfall? This shortfall that has come to the attention of people is a mistake. When can this administration say that we were wrong about something? The veterans need $1 billion and that is that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) who has been denigrated for arguing this point over the last 2 years.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I think what the House has to decide today is what is more important: House procedures that we waive every single day for the most insignificant of reasons or taking care of a $1 billion-plus shortfall in veterans health care programs during a time of war.

Quite frankly, if the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), my good friend and leader of the House Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, were Speaker of the House, I would withdraw my opposition to the vote against the rule that denies us a chance to provide adequate care for veterans; but the fact is he is not. The fact is that repeatedly this year, not the Committee on Appropriations on veterans affairs health care spending, but the House leadership has repeatedly said no to adequate funding for VA medical care.

The gentleman from Florida talked about how proud he was of his work on veterans programs this year. Let me just point out that if we go back and look at the budget resolution passed on a partisan basis in April, that budget resolution directs a cut compared to present services of $14 billion in veterans health care over the next 5 years. I am not only not proud of that; that is the reason I voted against the partisan budget resolution in April that began this process.

This problem was not created by the Committee on Appropriations. It was created by an inadequate budget resolution that was pushed through this House in April, strictly on a partisan basis. The fact is, I am less interested in how we got here and more interested in how we take care of veterans. That is more important than all the partisan disagreements we might discuss on the floor this day.

What are the facts? The facts are that the Veterans Administration has now admitted that it has approximately, or say minimally, a $1 billion shortfall. The fact is that kind of shortfall is delaying purchasing equipment that doctors and nurses at our VA hospitals say is needed to provide quality care for veterans. That shortfall is going to have a direct impact on the quality of care for America's veterans, including veterans coming back from the Iraq and Afghanistan wars.

If anyone questions how serious this shortfall is, let me just read to my colleagues a letter dated May 3 of this year from Barbara Watkins, a medical center director for the Alexandria VA

Medical Center in Virginia. She says: ''Dear Friend: As of April 29, 2005, the Alexandria VA Medical Center is no longer scheduling appointments for new Non Service Connected veterans.'' In laymen's terms, what that means is if you are a veteran that is unemployed, if you are a veteran that is making only $10,000 a year or so, perhaps on minimum wage, and you have a serious health care concern, you will not be given a medical appointment at the Alexandria VA Medical Center. My guess is that this kind of cut in services for veterans is occurring all over the country.

The fact is that in Togus, Maine, quoting the gentleman from Maine (Mr. MICHAUD), I can tell my colleagues, using Togus VA Hospital in Maine, the Togus facility actually had to put up scaffolding over the doors to block bricks from falling on patients or staff. This crisis is real. It is serious. It is today.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), is correct: we should not normally have to deal with this on the foreign aid appropriations bill. Frankly, we should have dealt with it in April on the budget resolution that underfunded VA medical care. I wish we could have added this money in the VA budget that passed recently in the House. The fact is that is already through the House, and the problem is that if the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies has to deal with it in a nonemergency basis, guess where we will have to take $1 billion from to take care of the VA health care crisis?

It will come out of military construction. That is housing, day care facilities for our active duty servicemen and -women and their families, or it might have to come out of the defense health care budget. That is hospital care and medical care for active duty servicemen and -women, members of the Guard and Reserve who are fighting the war on terrorism.

This is not the best place to deal with the veterans health care crisis. But if not now, when? If not this bill, what bill? Let us vote ''no'' on the rule. Let us add $1 billion today to deal with the veterans health care funding crisis.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for the time.

I would like to give an explanation of how we got here. I have great respect for the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), my colleague, and his sincerity and his work not only on the commitment of men and women who wear the uniform but also our veterans.

I also extend congratulations. You are either that good, or it was the best guess that turned out to be right. What I really believe in my heart, since you are my friend, is the latter because we do not understand this health financing model as well as we should. So I know you just said I really do not want to say how we got here, let us take immediate action. First of all, we do not even know how to define the word ''adequate.'' To take action, we need to have it based on an intellect, and we are not even there yet.

So what happened here? Let me tell my colleagues how we got here. Everybody in this town seems to be throwing out a budget number with regard to veterans health. Whether it is the American Legion who has a number, whether the independent budget has a number, whether Republicans have a number, whether Democrats have a number, whether VA has a number or the OMB or the President, everybody seems to have a number. So I said wait a minute, time out here.

I looked back into what we did in the mid-1990s when after the BRAC and prior to before we ever created TRICARE for life and we are trying to figure out the military health delivery system's budget number, and we never could get it right, and we always have to come back in the supplementals, right? So what do we do? We held a hearing on the finance models on the predictability of these budgets. So we increased the predictability.

What is going on now? The modeling still is wrong. So on June 23, in the full Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we held a hearing on the finance of how we do the health modeling with regard to what are the assumptions that are used in the model, what are the risk adjustments that may be necessary, what are the variances, what are the unexpected contingencies. All of these things are very important.

One thing I think is fascinating that we learned was that the model that we used, because the VA contracts with the private sector and when we contract, the model that is used in the private sector is done on an annual basis. In DOD, they use this model, and it is a 2.5 projection. In the VA, it is a 2.5 to 3.5, which means we are stressing the model itself.

I just want everybody to know this is extremely important. We are stressing the health finance model, which means we need to go back and perhaps do more science with regard to how we predict these budgets.

My colleagues say, Steve, what are you talking about? This is extremely important, and we are going to continue our work. Why? Because we need to make sure we define the word, what is ''adequate.''

So when the VA sends this dollar figure to not only the authorizers but, more importantly, the appropriators, so when you pass a budget you know what that budget is and you have confidence in it.

Now there is no hide-the-ball here. The VA conducts a mid-year review. When they conducted the mid-year review, unfortunately a week after the gentleman from New York's (Chairman WALSH) and the gentleman from Texas' (Ranking Member EDWARDS) product is passed by the floor, we learned from the mid-year review that they are off on the 2005 budget. They are off because of OIF and OEF and dental and personnel and increase on demand of services for older veterans, and now they have a shortfall with regard to 2005.

The Secretary informs us and says I have work-around solutions with regard to 2005. We in Congress authorize what is called a cushion, whether it is DOD health or VA health, and that cushion is around $400 million that goes from year to year. He says, well, I need to take $380 million out of the $400 million cushion, and I also then need to redirect or reprogram out of the capitalization accounts for 2005.

I agree with the gentleman from New York (Chairman WALSH) and the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) with regard to our oversight responsibilities. Matter of fact, the Speaker said maintain our oversight to make sure that we maintain the quality of care and the services necessary for America's veterans. That is going to be done.

So as we listen and be a good listener with regard to the Secretary's work-around solutions for 2005, it is 2006. That 2006 budget number, I will submit there is no one here on this floor, despite whatever number they may advocate, that knows exactly what it is today.

□ 1145

Hearings are very important, and the hearings are going to continue. This is, as the Secretary said, evolution. Yes, this is going to be an evolutionary process to get it right about 2006. I do not care about just 2006, I care about getting it right from 2006 on. I care about getting it right in 2006 and beyond because of our commitment to veterans.

So it would be very good and very helpful and very appropriate for us to use the right words on this floor. No one owns a cornerstone in their advocacy to veterans and what they have done for this Nation. No one in this House. We all do. We all respect the service and sacrifice of our veterans.

So let us embrace the challenge of getting into the health modeling issue to make sure these issues are right; that we go in and work with our Senate colleagues to make sure we get the numbers correct with regard to the 2006 budget. And when we do this, we then define what is ''adequate funding'' for the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I want to work with my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and with the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH). I respect the leadership of Chairman WALSH, and I also thank him for his firmness and for his tough words with the Secretary. I look forward to working on this commitment.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate my strong support for the bill and particularly for the provisions relative to Armenia and the Nagorno Karabakh. Thanks to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the ranking Democrat, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), and also my friend and co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), for their continued support we now have $67.5 million in the bill for humanitarian assistance to Armenia, which is $12.5 million more than what the President requested; and $5 million in assistance for Nagorno Karabakh, which is $2 million more than last year. I just want to thank all the members of the subcommittee for their continued support.

It is very important this House continue to recognize the plight of the victims of the Nagorno Karabakh conflict, and that is why we must support the committee's recommendations. It is also significant that the President requested and the committee has maintained military assistance parity between Armenia and Azerbaijan with $5.7 million allocated to each country. By allocating equal levels of military and security assistance to both nations, the U.S. Government will preserve its credibility as an impartial and leading mediator in the continued and sensitive peace negotiations for the Nagorno Karabakh conflict.

Given the ongoing Azerbaijani blockades and threats to renew military aggression against Armenia and Karabakh, it is critically important the administration continue to promote balanced, short- and long-term policies that elevate regional cooperation and reduce the risk of conflict in the South Caucasus region. The members of this subcommittee and the leadership on both sides of the aisle have for a long time played a major role in trying to provide balanced, short- and long-term policies that elevate regional cooperation in the Caucasus, and I thank them once again for the assistance levels that are in this legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) was talking a moment ago about the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) either being lucky or being good, he chose that he was lucky during the last 2 years. However, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) spoke with hospital administrators, and that is how he got his information. And if somehow or another we were not so interested in hanging the picture of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs chairman somewhere rather than trying to figure out what hospital administrators need, all of us could be good.

I know this much: At the Veterans Hospital in West Palm Beach, Florida, veterans wait 6 months on occasion to get themselves treated, and I think that is ridiculous.

Mr. Speaker, I will be calling for a ''no'' vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so we can consider the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) that was rejected in the Committee on Rules last night on a straight party-line vote.

Mr. Speaker, the Edwards amendment would provide additional badly needed health care funds for our Nation's veterans today. The Edwards amendment uses the supplemental authority provided in the 2006 budget resolution to correct the current $1 billion shortfall mistake in funding for the health care needs of America's veterans, including the approximately 86,000 new Iraqi and Afghanistan veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure all of my colleagues are aware by now of the announcement last week by the Bush administration's own Secretary of Veterans Affairs that the VA is facing a $1 billion shortfall in veterans' health care. This is not news to this side of the aisle. We have known all along the funding was woefully inadequate. We have tried on numerous occasions to increase funding to care for our returning soldiers, but the Republican leadership has ignored our demands and has consistently rejected our many attempts to add money to the VA health care budget. Maybe now they will listen. Today, they will have a chance to show just how much they support our soldiers.

I want to assure my colleagues that a ''no'' vote will not prevent us from considering the foreign operations appropriations bill under an open rule. But a ''no'' vote will allow Members to vote on the Edwards amendment to help our brave returning veterans get the health care they need and deserve. However, a ''yes'' vote will block consideration of this amendment and, sadly, once again, this leadership will turn its back on our wounded veterans.

We make much of visiting veterans' hospitals. We make much of Veterans Day. All of these are appropriate undertakings. But when we learn that this administration has made a big mistake with reference to veterans in this Nation, we cannot muster here in the House of Representatives the oomph to do the things necessary for people that are putting their lives on the line for us and returning home in need of care.

Vote ''no'' on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my good friend from Florida, as he was wrapping up his remarks, as always with eloquence, talked about the ''yes'' votes and the ''no'' votes, because just 1 month ago, Mr. Speaker, when this House brought forth the bill to fund the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the appropriations bill to fund Veterans' Affairs, there was a very interesting ''yes'' and ''no'' vote on this floor; 425 yes and 1 no.

So I simply want to put in context what has been said today. If we would be acting with such unfairness on the majority side, if we would be neglecting the interests of those men and women who we all hold in such admiration, then why was the vote to fund Veterans' Affairs 425–1 only 1 month ago?

As we have heard from the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, from the authorizing committee, and the chairman as well of the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations on these issues brought to our attention subsequent to that vote of 425–1, they are being addressed. They are being delved into. They will be solved. And we will continue to be proud of our record of support for our veterans.

Now, with regard to what this rule does, the rule we have been discussing today, it brings forth for consideration by this body the foreign aid appropriations bill, over $20 million in foreign aid. A lot of important programs, humanitarian programs; support for allies and friends; for poor people throughout the world; for the sick and the infirm. It is a good piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker.

So at this time, Mr. Speaker, I would request that the underlying legislation, the foreign operations legislation, be supported, as well as the rule that brings it forth, which is an open rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 341 RULE FOR H.R. 3057 FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS FY06 APPROPRIATIONS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative Edwards of Texas or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment except for pro forma amendments or to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3. The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3057, AS REPORTED OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF TEXAS

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new title:

TITLE VI—DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

MEDICAL SERVICES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for necessary expenses for furnishing, as authorized by law, inpatient and outpatient care and treatment to beneficiaries of the Department of Veterans Affairs and veterans described in section 1705(a) of title 38, United States Code, including care and treatment in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and including medical supplies and equipment and salaries and expenses of health-care employees hired under title 38, United States Code, and aid to State homes as authorized by section 1741 of title 38, United States Code; $1,000,000,000, to be available for obligation upon the enactment of this Act and to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2006: *Provided*, That the amount provided under this heading is designated as making appropriations for the purpose set forth in subparagraph (A) of section 402(a)(1) of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 2006: *Provided further*, That amounts made available under this heading may be transferred to other accounts of the Department of Veterans Affairs to the extent necessary to reimburse those accounts for prior transfers to ''MEDICAL SERVICES'' after notice of the amount and purpose of the transfer is provided to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives and a period of 30 days has elapsed: *Provided further*, That the transfer authority in this paragraph is in addition to any other transfer authority available to the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put each question on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 458, by the yeas and nays;

Ordering the previous question on H. Res. 341, de novo;

Adoption of H. Res. 341, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

## MILITARY PERSONNEL FINANCIAL SERVICES PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 458, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 458, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 324]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herseth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Flake
Paul

NOT VOTING—26

Brown (SC)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Doolittle
Engel
Etheridge
Fossella
Herger
Higgins
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kingston
McHugh
Michaud
Murtha
Ortiz
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Price (NC)
Ross
Shays
Spratt
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)

□ 1219

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''An Act to prevent the sale of abusive insurance and investment products to military personnel, and for other purposes''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3057, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The pending business is the de novo vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 341 on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 189, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 325]

AYES—217

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—27

Beauprez
Brown (SC)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Doolittle
Etheridge
Fossella
Higgins
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kingston
McHugh
Michaud
Murtha
Ortiz
Payne
Peterson (PA)
Price (NC)
Ross
Shays
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Walsh

□ 1227

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 324 and 325 I was detained by business in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 322, 323, 324 and 325, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on all four votes.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 28, 2005, I was detained and unable to cast my vote on H.R. 458, the Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act. This important legislation will protect military services members from the sale of questionable financial products, curb abusive sales practices on military installations, and ensure regulatory oversight of financial services sales on military installations. Had I been present, I would have supported passage of the bill and would have voted "yea" on rollcall 324. In addition, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 325.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, due to a family medical emergency, I missed rollcall votes 308 through 325, which took place on Friday, Monday, and Tuesday—June 24, 27, and 28, 2005, respectively. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall votes—308 (Price of Georgia Amendment): "nay"; 309 (George Miller of California Amendment): "yea"; 310 (Brown of Ohio Amendment): "nay"; 311 (Filner of California Amendment): "yea"; 312 (King of Iowa Amendment): "yea"; 313 (Hefley of Colorado Amendment): "yea"; 314 (Hinchey of New York Amendment): "nay"; 315 (Hayworth of Arizona Amendment No. 14): "nay"; 316 (Van Hollen of Maryland Amendment): "yea"; 317 (Paul of Texas Amendment): "yea"; 318 (DeLauro of Connecticut Amendment): "nay"; 319 (Hinchey of New York Amendment for DeFazio of Oregon): "yea"; 320 (Motion to Recommit H.R. 3010): "yea"; 321 (Passage of H.R. 3010): "nay"; 322 (Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, as Amended, H. Res. 199): "yea"; 323 (Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree, H. Con. Res. 155): "yea"; 324 (Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended, H.R. 458): "yea"; and 325 (Ordering the Previous Question, H. Res. 341): "nay."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to enter this personal explanation into the RECORD at the appropriate location.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3058, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 342 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 342

*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. 3058) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, 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 as follows: beginning with the comma on page 5, line 25, through ''and'' on line 26; beginning with ''for'' on page 11, line 22, through the first comma on page 12, line 1; beginning with the colon on page 12, line 12, through ''Program'' on line 17; beginning with ''Notwithstanding'' on page 16, line 8, through the comma on line 8; sections 110, 112 and 130; beginning with the colon on page 32, line 25, through ''Congress'' on page 33, line 3; beginning with ''Notwithstanding'' on page 34, line 4, through the comma on line 4; and sections 151, 218, 808, 928, and 945. Where points of order are waived against part of a paragraph or section, points of order against a provision in another part of such paragraph or section may be made only against such provision and not against the entire paragraph or 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. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

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

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

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

□ 1230

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the rule provides 1 hour of general debate, evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

I would like to take a moment to reiterate that we bring this rule forward under an open rule. Obviously, historically, appropriations bills have come to the House floor with open rules; and we continue to do so in order to allow every Member in this House the opportunity to submit amendments for consideration, obviously as long as they are germane.

This is the last rule bringing forth an appropriations bill for the fiscal year 2006, Mr. Speaker; and I think that it speaks very highly of the Committee on Appropriations. Obviously, the chairman and the ranking member have had much to do with that, as well as all of the members of the Committee on Appropriations who have worked very hard in bringing forth all of these appropriations bills in such a timely fashion.

The bill that we are bringing forward today appropriates over $66 billion for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and independent agencies, an increase of 6 percent over last year. The bill is fiscally sound. It represents our commitment to provide necessary resources for programs and projects throughout the Nation, ranging from transportation, to housing, the Judiciary, the Executive Office of the President, the District of Columbia.

As all Members of this House know, the transportation infrastructure of the country is really the backbone of the economy, and its continued strength is essential to foster economic growth. The underlying legislation brought forth today goes far in ensuring that we have a reliable and stable transportation infrastructure to continue to help the economy grow.

The bill includes $37 billion in funds for the highway system, representing an increase of almost $2 billion. H.R. 3058 includes $14.5 billion for the Federal Aviation Administration, an increase of $887 million. Included in that amount is $25 million to hire and train 595 new air traffic controllers. I think it is vitally important as air traffic controllers retire and air traffic continues to grow. This is really essential to so many of our districts.

In my district, home to Miami International Airport, the third largest international airport in the country, without an increase in the number of air traffic controllers, MIA would not be able to continue its projected growth and continue to serve really as the hub of the Americas.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is funded at $37.5 billion, an increase of $1.5 billion. These funds will permit the Department to administer programs that assist the public with housing needs, economic and community development, and fair housing opportunities. These funds will also empower low- and moderate-income residents towards self-sufficiency.

Under HUD, the bill includes funding for such important programs as Tenant Based Rental Assistance, also known as section 8; and Project Based Rental Assistance. These two programs serve almost 3.5 million households with vouchers and project-based housing. The bill includes $20.63 billion in funds for the program, an increase of almost $1 billion. In Miami-Dade County alone, which I am honored to represent, the housing authority uses the funds provided through these programs to house over 30,000 residents and for payment vouchers for 16,000 units.

H.R. 3058 provides $5.8 billion for the judiciary, an increase of 6 percent over the current fiscal year. This will fully fund the courts' revised requests for security improvements at Federal judicial facilities and enable the courts to effectively process the priority criminal, civil, and bankruptcy cases.

This legislation was introduced by the chairman of the subcommittee, who has done a tremendous job, the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG), and reported out of the Committee on Appropriations on June 21 by voice vote. It is good legislation. It is essential to our continued commitment to the security and safety of all in the United States, and we bring it forth under a fair and open rule.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), for their leadership on this important piece of legislation. I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and underlying legislation.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this rule and to the bill. Simply put, this bill significantly and irresponsibly shortchanges key funding for Amtrak and several programs in the Housing and Urban Development Department. While this bill provides slight funding increases for highways, transit and aviation programs, it slashes Amtrak to the point of extinction and eliminates important HUD programs like Brown-fnl;fields and Youthbuild.

This bill provides $550 million for Amtrak, an amount that places the future of national passenger rail in jeopardy. This $657 million cut will not only terminate all intercity passenger rail service, but will also cause a massive disruption of the commuter and freight rail system across the country. Quite literally, this allocation is a death sentence for Amtrak.

Ironically, the amount provided in this bill is a whopping $1.25 billion below the level that President Bush's appointed Amtrak Board of Directors recommended. President Bush and the Republican leadership believe that starving Amtrak will save it. The administration and the Republican leadership believe that a forced bankruptcy upon Amtrak will bring about a change for the better, that it will create a more efficient system.

Mr. Speaker, this just does not make any sense. You do not save starving children by denying them food, and I cannot understand how the President believes Amtrak can be saved by slashing its funding. I guess by ''better,'' Amtrak opponents mean no intercity rail service anywhere, and by ''more efficient,'' apparently these same opponents mean costs of upwards of $900 million for severance payments and mandatory debt service and labor payments. All in all, the closure of routes will result in layoffs of thousands of workers, which in turn creates hundreds of millions of dollars of immediate debt.

Mr. Speaker, this backward argument that squeezing the life out of Amtrak will save it is unacceptable and irresponsible. The only thing that starving Amtrak will do is destroy it.

On top of making Amtrak extinct, this bill eliminates several critical programs within HUD. Programs like brownfield cleanup, Empowerment Zones, section 108 loan guarantees and La Raza activities have all been eliminated. Every single one of these programs has contributed to the overall improvement of our communities, and it is shameful that Congress is turning its back on our neediest communities.

In my home State of Massachusetts, brownfields cleanup has proven to be a highly successful, efficient tool for cleaning up the environment and revitalizing a community. In the 2005 annual report of the Massachusetts Brownfields Redevelopment Fund, it is noted that 4,500 new housing units and 3,250 new jobs have been created by the Brownfields program. Because redevelopment is concentrated in areas that are already in use, brownfield cleanup preserves open space, bringing opportunity to economically distressed parts of a community. Zeroing out Brownfields is a bad move, and I encourage my colleagues to offer any amendments that could provide for its funding.

Another important program that has been placed on the chopping board is Youthbuild. Youthbuild is a nonprofit program which pays at-risk youth to build houses in low-income neighborhoods. This community development program offers job training, education, counseling, and leadership opportunities to unemployed and out-of-school young adults ages 16 through 24. These at-risk youth build and rehabilitate affordable housing in their own communities, garnering life skills and adding to revitalization in their own backyards.

Mr. Speaker, how can such a thoughtful program that is full of incentives be eliminated? There are 226 Youthbuild programs in 44 States across the country, attracting 7,000 young adults. In 2004 alone, 10,000 young men and women had to be turned down for the program due solely to the lack of funding. The demand is high and the need is even greater for programs like Youthbuild. We should not turn our backs on the youth of America.

It is clear that the Republican leadership is doing its best to protect tax cuts for the wealthiest in this country while eliminating programs that benefit the neediest. At the same time, the Republican leadership hides behind a veil of fiscal discipline.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that argument just does not cut it, and the American people know it. These programs are being starved simply because the Republican leadership in the House and the Senate refuse to acknowledge their mistakes. Their tax cuts have drained the Federal surplus. Their policies continue to drive this Nation further into debt.

This is an important bill. We have a responsibility to fund Amtrak, to fund Brownfields and Youthbuild, and we have the means to do it if the Republican leadership would just acknowledge their mistakes.

My friend from Massachusetts, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), offered an amendment in the Committee on Rules yesterday that would have restored $1.2 billion of funding to Amtrak, as well as funding to Brownfields and Youthbuild. This funding would have been paid for by a slight reduction in the tax breaks given to millionaires.

Unfortunately, the Republican leadership once again proved that protecting millionaires' tax breaks is more important than keeping Amtrak trains running, and they denied the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) the opportunity to have his amendment voted on.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve a fully funded, nationwide intercity rail system that services the entire country. They deserve effective housing programs. They deserve Brownfields funding and Youthbuild, which revitalize our communities and improves the quality of life.

I will vote ''no'' on the rule and vote against this bill because the American people deserve better than this.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), the chairman of the subcommittee, who, along with the chairman of the full committee, have done tremendous work in bringing forth these pieces of legislation, including the one on the floor today.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me time and for bringing the rule to the floor on H.R. 3058. It is a bill making appropriations for, as has been mentioned, Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies, and that is why we call it TTHUD.

□ 1245

This is a good rule for a really good bill. We have tried diligently to work with the many authorizing committees of jurisdiction on the various provisions of our bill, and I think we have come to a great deal of agreement on those provisions. I thank my colleagues for working with us in such good faith, and I appreciate their help in bringing this bill to the floor tomorrow.

This bill fully funds surface transportation programs as authorized by TEA-LU and aviation programs as authorized in VISION–100. I want to repeat this; at least I want to say it once and maybe twice: we fully fund Section 8 and many other housing and assistance programs under HUD. We fully fund Section 8. We have even managed to keep CDBG in HUD. Not one dime did we not fund in the request. Did we have to make some hard decisions? Yes, we did. But we funded the most important, the most beneficial, the most effective programs under our jurisdiction.

There are some programs, like Hope 6, Youthbuild, and Amtrak, which are in desperate need of reform or reauthorization. We felt that rather than continuing to throw money at these programs, we would let the authorizers have their chance to provide oversight and legislative direction. All in all, this is a balanced and good bill that we will consider tomorrow.

I thank the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) and the Committee on Rules, particularly the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) here today, for their work, and I urge a ''yes'' vote on this rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), my colleague on the Committee on Rules.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, we have seen repeated appropriation bills moved through the House ignoring the priorities of Americans, including those residing in my hometown of Sacramento. With each bill, we see the

negative impact of the Republican-passed budget resolution on the day-to-day lives of our constituents.

As we take up the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies appropriation bill, also known by some as the Throw the Leftovers Into One Tupperware Catch-all bill, we, yet again, see the bind the budget resolution has placed us in. We see the programs important to all of our constituents and our communities forced to compete against each other for limited funding, and we see these programs being gutted.

As it stands, this bill dismantles Amtrak, slashing funding by over half, threatening its long-term health. With 9.3 million passengers in California, Amtrak is extremely popular, especially in Sacramento. With the line closures and funding cuts, it will be impossible for Amtrak to continue to operate. After severance obligations and debt service pay, nothing would remain to continue running even the lines deemed successful. Further complicating the situation, the bill fails to even fund the minimum maintenance on tracks and trains necessary to keep the thriving lines operational.

I cannot begin to estimate the negative impact this will have. Businesses which rely on the dollars commuters spend in the community and the revitalization of the city, a transformation that is not exclusive to my hometown, will be affected. Because of Amtrak, Sacramentans are rediscovering downtown. And with funding from the Community Development Block Grants, the city is able to make needed improvements to downtown and the entire city, and that is a benefit to businesses and the overall economy of our region and State.

CDBG supports over two dozen projects improving Sacramento, but CDBG is not just throwing money at a city. In addition to improving the overall look of a city, it fosters a sense of community.

Earlier this year, I was home in Sacramento and participated in a program which receives money from CDBG called Rebuilding Together, an effort to rehabilitate homes for those with low and moderate incomes. Hundreds of people came out to give back to their community and neighborhood. And, because of their work, local senior citizens, who would otherwise find it challenging, received assistance to make the enhancements and repairs their homes need.

Because of funding from CDBG, Sacramento has a program to assist first-time home buyers with down payment and closing costs. We all know the benefits of homeownership to the community: improved neighborhoods, increased civic participation, and to the individual, tax benefits, increased wealth, and increased confidence.

Unfortunately, the misguided priorities of the Republican-passed budget mean cuts to funding for worthwhile programs like CDBG and Amtrak.

But this did not have to be the case. I was disappointed that an amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) was not made in order by the Committee on Rules. It would have restored the necessary dollars to fund programs like Amtrak and CDBG by reducing the tax benefits of those with incomes over $1 million. Instead of receiving a tax break of $140,000, they would receive $131,000, a $9,000 reduction.

Because of the need for the Olver amendment and, importantly, the need to continue these defective programs, I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the rule governing this bill.

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

I think this is a very important piece of legislation that deserves our support. And, obviously, the rule bringing forth the underlying legislation in an extremely fair manner, with an open rule, deserves our support, but also the underlying bill, the underlying appropriations bill. It grows, it increases over last year by approximately 6 percent. It provides over $66 billion for the Departments of Transportation and Treasury and HUD, the Judiciary, and Independent Agencies. That is an increase of six percent, Mr. Speaker.

Now, we hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle more requests for spending, more and more and more and more. But I think it is important to keep in mind that what we are bringing forth, the bill that we are bringing forth to the floor increases spending, this bill increases spending by 6 percent over the current fiscal year. I think sometimes perspective is proper. So I wanted to mention that as I reiterate my support for the rule bringing forth this legislation as well as the underlying legislation and asking colleagues to support them both.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Let me just respond to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend.

Mr. Speaker, those on the other side keep on talking about the tough decisions that have to be made. My question is, why do always the tough decisions fall on the backs of middle income families and those who are most vulnerable? Why can not, for example, some of the sacrifice be made by those who are earning over $1 million? That is what the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) tried to do yesterday in the Committee on Rules.

We disagree with your budget priorities. We disagree that all of this money should be going for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires. We think that protecting programs like Youthbuild, that protecting Amtrak is important.

This bill, if it passes and the funding for Amtrak is not adjusted, is the death knell for Amtrak. It is that simple. There is no way to spin your way out of it. For those of us who support a vibrant, strong, intercity rail system, this bill, with these numbers right now, is unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule for two reasons. One is because of this, a little piece of plastic called a credit card. All too often, little cards like this are issued by bloodsuckers. This bill, as it went to the Committee on Rules, contained a provision to defend average consumers from some of these credit card companies who abuse their privileges under the law and wreak havoc on people's financial rights.

Right now, there are a number of credit card companies who feel no compunction whatsoever about the idea of changing your interest rate on your credit card, even if you have never missed a payment, even if you have never been a day late with that company. They still reserve the right to jack up your interest rate to the default rate called the universal default rate if you have missed some other payment on somebody else's bill. Example: if you go on a vacation and you are a week late paying a mortgage bill, or you are a week late paying a light bill, if that gets reported on somebody else's credit report, a credit card company can make you pay 30 percent interest, no questions asked, even though you have never been late with a payment for them.

As Linda Sherry of Consumer Action said, ''It is the only industry in the world to reprice something you have already paid for.''

Now, the bill, as it went to the Committee on Rules, contained an amendment which I offered which passed by a 10-vote margin on a bipartisan basis in the Committee on Appropriations. Yet, the rule does not protect that provision from being stricken on a point of order.

So under this rule, any one Member out of 435 in this House can come to the floor and, for any reason they want, can knock this provision out of the bill.

Now, we will be told by friends on the majority side of the aisle, ''Well, this provision belongs under the jurisdiction of another subcommittee, or another committee.'' There are dozens of provisions in the bill before us that require waivers of points of order, but this one was singled out to be not protected. It will be very interesting to see whether any individual Member has the chutzpah to come on to this floor and knock out this provision, which is a protection for consumers that is long overdue.

The second reason that I will vote against this rule is because it does not make in order the Olver amendment. The Olver amendment is very simple.

It says that instead of giving people who make a million bucks a year a $140,000 tax cut next year, we ought to scale that back to $131,000 so you have enough room in this bill to meet our national obligations in funding Amtrak and in funding the other high priority plans in this bill.

Now, the Republican majority has steadfastly insisted on hanging on to those super-sized tax cuts for the most fortunate people in this society. And that is why we had to have a hearing in the Subcommittee on Military Construction this morning when we find out that even though the Veterans Department is now admitting that they are more than $1 billion short in veterans health care funding this year and they are going to be more than $2.6 billion short next year, even though we face those shortages, the majority is insisting that we not treat that problem as an emergency because, ''oh, it will put pressure'' on them to reduce the size of those tax cuts.

These are minimal actions that this Congress ought to take to protect the public who needs decent transportation, to protect veterans who need decent health care, and to protect consumers who are sick and tired of being bullied by shysters who take advantage of little print on their forms that charge people an arm and a leg on their credit cards.

□ 1300

These three little things the majority could have helped out. They have not. Those are three good reasons for voting against this rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am going to surprise my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and support what he just said, part of it, just parts of it. I voted with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on the credit card issue in the committee. And I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, I do not know where the right place is to do this, but just think about the issue itself. Any one of us, our children or anybody else can receive a notice, or the credit card company can get a notice, maybe you do not cash a check on time and you get it there, maybe you miss a payment. That person can notify the credit card company, and they can raise your rates by 30 percent. My own daughter went through a credit card fraud where there were people cashing her credit cards all over the country. And that was hard enough.

But the issue the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is talking about is a valid one. And I hope somewhere, someplace, if someone does object, I will not. We can resolve that issue because it is a terrible issue.

On the issue of tax breaks for the rich, of course we will arm wrestle. Fifty percent of the money that goes to Sub S corporations provides about 70 percent of the jobs in this country. And if you take a look, the economy is improving. The interest rates are low. Inflation is low. The job rate is 5.1 percent, and we are improving a lot because of the things that we have done together in many ways to stimulate the economy.

Now, the tax relief. I happen to believe that the death tax is absolutely wrong. You work your whole life and pay everything you have to build a farm or business, and then the government comes in and wants to take a portion of that. I do not care if it is a million dollars or a hundred million; it is money, labor that you put in to your investment. And many of us feel that that is just wrong. It is not a tax break for the rich, and it improves the economy.

So I do not disagree with my friend on the issue of the credit card. But what I would ask my colleagues, every single bill that I have seen come forward, it is bashing the administration, it is bashing the Republicans. If we take a look and get our arms around this budget and balance the budget, there is going to be more money.

It is like everybody here, you have a checkbook. If you continue to spend more money than you take in, and whether it is Big Bird, whether it is Amtrak, whether it is other things, most of us support the veterans; and hopefully that will come forward in the other body, and we will be able to add money to that. But I would sure like to see less bashing and us reaching across and trying to work together rather than partisan politics. I have a lot of friends on the other side of the aisle, and it grieves me over these last bills to see the action on the House floor.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) had asked who would have the chutzpah to come on the House floor and to object to his provision regarding credit cards. I should tell you that last night in the Rules Committee, I offered an amendment to protect this language, the language that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) championed, the language that the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) has said he agrees with. I offered an amendment to protect this from a point of order, and every single Republican on the Rules Committee that was present last night had the chutzpah to not protect it, which I think is outrageous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, once again the majority of this House shows its true priorities. The resolution that is before us, the rule that governs debate on the fiscal year 2006 Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies bill, does not make in order my amendment that reflects important national public priorities. My amendment would have added an additional badly needed $2.092 billion to the bill.

Of that $2 billion, $657 million was for Amtrak, bringing funding for our national passenger rail system to exactly the present year's level, thereby avoiding the shutdown of 18 passenger rail routes and the termination of all passenger rail service in 23 States. But rather than funding Amtrak to keep passenger rail service available, the majority decided that tax cuts for millionaires were more important.

Of that $2 billion, $180 million was for tax law compliance. But rather than making a dent in the over $300 billion of taxes owed under the law that goes uncollected annually, tax cuts for the superwealthy were more important.

Of that $2 billion, $143 million was for the Hope VI program for revitalization of severely distressed public housing. Over the past 10 years, Hope VI has replaced thousands of the worst housing units in urban communities all over the country. Rather than funding Hope VI, which is zeroed out in this bill, tax cuts averaging $140,000 for all persons reporting taxable income of more than $1 million were more important.

Of that $2 billion, $250 million was for community development block grants, just to bring that appropriation up to the present year's appropriation, for a program that affects every State and virtually every community over 25,000 people in population, and a great many smaller communities as well. Again, tax cuts were more important for the superwealthy.

Of that $2 billion, $800 million was to fund the Help America Vote Act, the HAVA Act, and that $800 million which would pay for the national voter registration file that is mandated under the HAVA Act by the first of January 2006 in time for the 2006 elections, this Congress owes that money to the States. It is an unfunded mandate that ought to be paid. The majority chose those $140,000 tax cuts for each and every millionaire in America. Ninety-five percent of Americans do not have that total amount of income for a whole family as would be the amount of the tax cut for the few very most fortunate people.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, $62 million was for Youthbuild, a program which helps school dropouts gain construction skills and experience while building and rehabilitating housing. Rather than funding Youthbuild, which has been a proven success over 10 years and is requested by the President in his budget proposal, the majority once again believes helping the wealthiest Americans with huge tax cuts is more important.

The cost of this amendment was fully offset by a slight 6.5 percent reduction in the tax benefits received by those persons who report an annual taxable income of $1 million or more. Instead of receiving an average tax break of

$140,000, they would receive an average of only $131,000 instead. This small reduction in tax cuts for the most affluent Americans is a very small price to pay for the priorities included in my amendment, which was not allowed to even be debated under this rule. And we will not be able to debate it tomorrow.

I do not blame the chairman of the subcommittee for the difficult choices in this bill. The President's budget was inadequate in these and other respects and left gaps that had to be filled. Under these circumstances, the chairman did his best to provide a fair allocation of the money within the amount assigned to the committee. Creative ways were found to plug some of the holes; however, many problems still remain because of the majority party's decision to make huge tax cuts for the wealthiest of Americans their number one priority, first and foremost, above all else, putting aside human needs, ignoring the largest yearly deficits in the history of our Nation, and the national debt that has gone up 50 percent in just the last 4 years. The majority party would rather help those that do not need it than those that do.

My amendment would have corrected this imbalance, and I urge all my colleagues to put our national public priorities first and oppose this rule.

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

Mr. Speaker, a couple of points to put the debate back in the perspective and the context of what we are doing today. We are debating the rule bringing forth the appropriations bill that funds the Department of Transportation, Treasury, Housing Urban Development, the Judiciary. This bill includes over $66 billion. It provides to those Departments being funded an increase of 6 percent over the current fiscal year, an increase of 6 percent.

A number of issues have been brought out, for example, the issue of an amendment that was passed in the Appropriations Committee. The substance of that amendment was debated September 10 of the year 2003 here on the floor of this House on an authorizing bill, and again, this may sound technical to some folks, especially if they are watching on TV, the rules of the House say that appropriations bills should not be vehicles for legislating, in other words, for changing the law. Rather, they are vehicles to fund, to appropriate the Federal Government.

Now, on an authorizing bill, which is expected and called for in the rules of the House, this credit card issue was brought forth and it was debated. Again, September 10, 2003. The amendment by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) on this issue was defeated 272–142. So I think it is important to mention that because facts, I think, should be relevant to debates.

And then, Mr. Speaker, again, the issue of tax cuts. We hear time and time again, no matter what the issue before us, tax cuts for the wealthy, tax cuts for the wealthy. The policies under the leadership of President Bush that we have put into law, including tax relief have benefited all taxpayers. Every taxpayer, every payer of Federal income tax in this country received tax relief. Obviously, if you paid more in taxes than someone else, and everybody gets relief, you get more relief than if you pay less taxes. But everybody obtained tax relief under our policies.

And I think it is relevant to put in context what has happened to the economy ever since we implemented those measures. Ever since we provided tax relief to the American taxpayer: 3 million jobs in the last 18 months alone, unemployment rate at 5 percent.

I think it is relevant, Mr. Speaker, when we hear these attacks continuously against the policies of the majority, I think it is relevant to learn, to note what those policies have accomplished. And the creation of over 3 million jobs in 18 months, an unemployment rate almost at record lows are something that I think all of us should be proud of.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me clear up one fact for my colleagues who are listening to this debate. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) just said that the rules of the House prohibit us from adding legislation to appropriations bills; that is the rules of the House. Well, the majority does that all the time. We routinely waive points of order on these appropriations bills. And this bill is no exception. We had a supplemental appropriations bill where you added the REAL ID legislation to that bill.

□ 1315

We had just recently a legislative branch appropriations bill where you added the continuity of Congress legislation.

The gentleman talks about how great this economy is. I want to tell you, there are a lot of people suffering out there. Poverty has increased since you guys took over here, since George Bush became President. There are more people that are hungry in this country. These jobs that you are talking about being created, a lot of them are jobs that provide people with less pay than they were making before.

Our problem here, and the reason why we want to amend this bill, is we think your priorities are wrong. We think it is more important to save Amtrak than to give a millionaire or billionaire a tax cut. In fact, we are even willing to give millionaires and billionaires a tax cut. What the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) was trying to do was to reduce the amount of tax cut a millionaire would get from $140,000 a year to $131,000 a year. That money saved by doing that could have funded Amtrak, could have funded the Hope VI program for the revitalization of severely distressed public housing. It could have funded more money for community development block grants. It could have funded Youthbuild. It could have funded the Help America Vote Act.

But your priorities are different. You come on to the floor and you debate passionately about the need to give those with the most even more while you neglect what is happening to those who have the least.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to oppose the previous question.

Our Nation is facing a number of challenges. We are fighting a war against terror that will continue to require significant attention and resources. We are facing historic budget deficits with a national debt of almost $8 trillion.

Our country has pressing needs in education, health care, veterans services and other areas. With all of those challenges before us now, now is not the time for Members of the Congress to be voting themselves a pay raise. We need to be willing to make sacrifices. We need to behave like American families who make tough choices every day. We need to budget, live within our means, and make careful spending decisions based on our more pressing priorities.

A no vote on the previous question will allow Members to vote up or down on the automatic cost of living pay raise for Members of Congress. If the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule. My amendment will block the fiscal year 2006 cost of living pay raise for Members of Congress. Because this amendment requires a waiver, the only way to get to this issue is to defeat the previous question. So again, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the previous question.

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

Mr. Speaker, I wished to do when my good friend from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) had the floor, I wanted to ask him a question. I was trying to understand and I was a little confused.

Does the gentleman admit that 3 million jobs have been created in the last 18 months in this economy?

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Let me say that thank God there were some jobs added in the last few months of the Bush presidency, that made up for the 3½ million jobs that were lost from the first 3 years of his presidency.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. So the gentleman's answer is yes or no?

Mr. OBEY. You came within 100,000 jobs of being first President since Herbert Hoover not to add a single job in his term. It was the most anemic job growth of any president since Herbert Hoover.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Maybe the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) could answer. Have 3 million jobs been created in the last 18 months, yes or no?

Mr. OBEY. 3 million jobs that have been destroyed in the first place by the policies of the very administration that you are bragging about. You destroyed 3 million jobs and then gradually the economy recovered and you built back so you came back to about square one. I would not brag about having the worst job creation record of any president since Herbert Hoover. If you think that is a great achievement, that puts us in a different league.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Reclaiming my time, I think, Mr. Speaker, what I have heard is yes. And I think that what we have seen is remarkable, considering that we had a recession that began toward the end of the year 2000 and that was coupled by the unprecedented attack on in country, including on our economy and on our way of life on September 11, 2001. Despite that unprecedented attack, the policies, yes, under the President's leadership that this Congress instituted have permitted and have incentivated the creation of 3 million jobs in the last 18 months.

We have a record, almost a record low unemployment rate of 5 percent. And I think that despite the static from which I am trying to learn, understand the answers of my respectful questions, the answer is yes. It is a remarkable achievement.

And so to keep in mind and in perspective of what we have seen, Mr. Speaker, job growth, almost a record low unemployment rate, and with regard to what we are doing today, which I think is relevant to remember and put in context. What we are doing today is bringing forth legislation, the appropriations bill on the funding the Treasury Department, Housing and Urban Develop Department, the Department of Transportation, that includes a 6 percent growth, 6 percent growth over and above the legislation for the current fiscal year.

I think the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) has done a great job. I think the Committee on Appropriations has done a great job.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

The recession began in March 2001 under the watch of President Bush. Secondly, poverty in this country has increased dramatically, and for anybody to get up here and to try to boast about this President's job creation record when he is dead last amongst all Presidents is pretty outrageous.

Go outside the Beltway and talk to some people about how they think this economy is going right now. I will tell you, people feel it is not going as rosy as you think it is. This President has also accumulated the largest debt of any President in history. That is not something we should be proud of. That is passing on a credit card bill to our kids and our grandkids. That is something you should be ashamed about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know there was hard work amongst the appropriators and what they had to work with, but I rise with a great deal of disappointment because poverty has, in fact, increased.

Just look at the number of homeless persons across America and the 44 million uninsured. And I would have hoped the Olver amendment could have been passed to allow for additional funds to go into Hope 6 because Hope 6 rebuilds distressed public housing and changes it into mixed housing for those individuals who are without housing.

Right now in my district, there is an application in one of the most distressed areas for a youth bill. Does anyone understand that youth bill puts inner city youngsters, rural youngsters to work building homes in their communities?

What is going to happen to brownfields in our respective areas, rural and inner city areas where we are not cleaning up horribly poisoned areas that could, in fact, contribute to the economy?

In the month of May, the unemployment among African Americans went through the roof. There are no jobs being created. And then, of course, the community development block grant was saved but those dollars are needed, even more dollars are needed to enhance development in our cities and in our rural areas.

It is a shame on America when we do not stand up for our inter city, our Amtrak, our rail system, light rail and rail. And I would have hoped we would have added more than $25 million for air traffic controllers because America's skyways are overcrowded and air traffic employees are needed to be retrained as well as additional employees are needed. We could have done more if we had cut into that over excessive tax cut for millionaires and billionaires. We could have provided an environmentally safe America with providing dollars for brownfields, a youth bill to ensure that youngsters who are at-risk can help build their community; more dollars for community develop; more dollars for Hope 6.

Yes, poverty is raging in America. There are people without jobs, but more importantly there are people living earning under $8,000 which is extreme poverty. They do not have housing and it is difficult to house them. This bill needed to do more.

I hope my colleagues will go back to the drawing board. I ask my colleagues to consider the necessary enhancement of funding in the bill to help the most vulnerable.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds.

I urge my colleagues to support any amendment that will be offered today to relax the travel restrictions on Americans to Cuba. I have met with Sergeant Lazo, who is a veteran who served in Iraq who, as a result of the U.S. law, is unable to visit his own parents in Cuba. That is wrong. This man served our country. We should be able to adjust that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time.

I want to focus on just one deficiency in this bill. I, too, am sorry that the Olver amendment was not made in order.

I want to focus for a minute on what would have happened with Amtrak. It is interesting that we have some in this Chamber who have an almost theological zeal to eliminate national rail passenger service in the United States, leaving us the only major country in the world, in fact, almost all the minor countries have national rail passenger service.

This is not about cost effectiveness. This is made repeatedly clear since I have been in Congress this year. We are going to be giving about $14 billion for airport construction, $11 billion for air traffic control. We gave $15 billion in the aftermath of 9–11 in grant and loans, this to an industry, the air passenger industry, that in its 75-year history has shown a total net profit of zero. Actually, given the performance of the last couple of years, it is less than zero. But Congress lavishes support on air traffic but it is not about to help rail passenger service.

That is particularly ironic because rail passenger service is 38 percent more energy efficient than air travel. It is six to seven times cheaper to upgrade track than build new highways. And, in fact, rail passenger service provides some competition for hard-to-serve communities. This competition holds down the price of airline tickets which would skyrocket, if people did not have a rail passenger alternative.

I am pleased that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) of the majority and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) are going to bring forward an amendment to partially restore funding. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it. Instead of dismantling and starving Amtrak, we should build on our 150-year rail passenger investment.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank all the colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have participated in this very interesting debate.

We are bringing forth the last of the appropriations bills with this rule. I think it is a remarkable achievement, and I think the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) really deserves commendation as do all on the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) has done a great job on this bill.

This particular bill that we are bringing forth with this rule is the Treasury and HUD, Transportation bill. I am not sure if it is the bill that increases the most from the current fiscal year, but it certainly has to be one of the most significant increases at 6 percent. We hear from our friends on the other side of the aisle requests and demands for further spending and for further government growth; and obviously, that is legitimate, that debate is very legitimate.

I think it is also important and legitimate to put in context that this bill which has caused so much angst in terms of it being categorized as insufficient in spending from the other side of the aisle includes 6 percent more than the current fiscal year.

□ 1330

So it not only is an important piece of legislation, but it is funded, obviously, at a very high level.

With regard, again, to points that were made, so many of them were made by colleagues who took the floor. It is an undeniable fact, Mr. Speaker, that the economic downturn began in the third quarter of the year 2000.

It is an undeniable fact that September 11 of 2001 this country suffered a tremendous, unprecedented and horrible criminal attack. That obviously contributed to the economic downturn.

It is also an undeniable fact that due to the policies, certainly it is an undeniable fact that there have been 3 million jobs created in the last 18 months, that the unemployment rate is about 5 percent, and I think we all should be proud of that.

It is important to put in context, in the context of what has happened in the economy, I think, the attacks which we have heard so repeatedly, as though we were living in a different reality. The reality we are living is one of 3 million jobs being created in the last 18 months. The reality we are living is one that reflects one of the lowest unemployment rates in history. It is fair to point that out.

And I think it is fair to point out, yes, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) talked about we will have a debate on the Cuban dictatorship. I am sure we will. There is a lot to report in terms of the repression and torture and the continuation in the local prisons and so much more. So, yes, we will probably see amendments to loosen sanctions on that dictatorship, amendments that, if passed and if they became law, would see flows of hard currency going to that dictatorship. We will have that debate, but at the end of the day, I am confident that this Congress will continue to stand with those who suffer and those who are repressed and not those who cause the repression.

So, Mr. Speaker, again, support the underlying legislation which I think, again, we owe a debt of gratitude to the entire Committee on Appropriations not only for having it brought it forth in such a timely way but especially the chairman who will now soon take the floor. We have much to commend, and I know that we have all of the chairmen we see here, the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) on the floor as well, so many who have worked so hard to make sure that all of these bills have come forth in really a remarkably timely way.

So, again, I am supporting the underlying legislation, as well as this very fair rule, which is an open rule and urging support for both by all of our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

## 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. 3057, 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, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 341 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. 3057.

□ 1335

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. 3057) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from 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 very pleased to present to the House H.R. 3057, the fiscal year 2006 appropriations bill for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs. This bill provides important funding for programs that support the global war on terror, the battle against HIV/AIDS and other infectious diseases, and the national interests of the United States.

The bill includes a total of $20.3 billion in new budget authority for fiscal year 2006. This represents a reduction of $2.6 billion, or 11 percent, from the President's budget request. The bill is $533 million above the fiscal year 2005-enacted level, not including the most recent supplemental appropriations of 2005. With all of the supplemental appropriations of last year included, the recommendation represents a decrease of $2 billion from the 2005 level.

As to whether this amount is considered adequate, I quote from two headlines in Associated Press articles that appeared after the subcommittee markup of June 14. The first reads: ''Lawmakers Propose U.S. Foreign Aid Boost,'' and less than an hour later the headline reads: ''GOP-Led Panel Slashes Foreign Aid Program.'' Those were headlines an hour apart. So Members can lend their support to this bill because it increases foreign aid, or they can oppose it because it slashes foreign aid, or they can do either way with either one of those ideas.

It is important to state at the outset that the bill was developed in a bipartisan manner. I give enormous credit to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my ranking minority member, for engaging in a process that resulted in agreement on the basic components of this package, even if funding compromises had to be found on both sides.

We have made a focus of this year's proposal greater oversight of the expenditure of taxpayers' dollars. The report accompanying this bill includes language that requires more accountability of our foreign assistance dollars by urging the Department to set transparent goals and in tangible ways that measure progress toward these goals. Results, rather than resource levels, should be the yardstick for measuring U.S. assistance programs.

Furthermore, this bill and report include many requirements for the submission of financial plans, limiting expenditures until certain reforms are

implemented, and continuation of congressional notification requirements prior to the obligation or expenditure of funds.

With that, let me turn to some of the highlights of the bill.

First, the Millennium Challenge Corporation. The administration requests $3 billion for MCC. That would have doubled our $1.5 billion appropriation last year. We are funding it at $1.75 billion, or an increase of $250 million, 17 percent, over 2005, but $1.25 billion less than the President asked for.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I have made the MCC a priority in this bill. I believe in the President's vision for a new form of development assistance, where a country's commitment to fighting corruption, its commitment to reform, 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.

On the Global Environmental Facility, the budget included a $107 million request for the GEF, up from $106 million last year. Our bill has no appropriation for GEF. As part of this multilateral agreement with donors in 2002, the GEF agreed to establish a performance-based allocation system for the disbursement of funds. Despite this agreement, GEF has resisted attempts to establish this performance-based allocation system, and I think our reduction, not including any funds for this, sends a clear message about the imperative of reform to GEF.

On Afghanistan, the budget included a $430 million request for Economic Support Funds, ESF, for Afghanistan, an increase of $205 million over the 2005 level. It also included a request for $260 million for International Counternarcotics and Law Enforcement, an increase of $170 million over the 2005 level. This bill fully funds the $430 million in ESF and $211 million in INCLE for police and counternarcotics programs in Afghanistan. The bill also limits expenditures of about half of the ESF funds, or $225 million, until the Secretary of State certifies to the committee that the government of Afghanistan, at both the national and the local level, is fully cooperating with the United States-funded narcotics eradication and interdiction efforts.

On the West Bank and Gaza, the budget included a $150 million request in ESF for the West Bank. The bill funds the request and retains the fiscal year 2005 prohibitions and restrictions on the expenditure of these funds, including a GAO audit of U.S. assistance. Neither the request nor the bill includes any direct budgetary support of the Palestinian Authority.

On the Emergency Plan for Aids Relief, the bill includes $2.695 billion for the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, the third year of this effort. This funding level is $131 million over the President's request and $502 million over the fiscal year 2005 level. The bill includes not less than $400 million, twice the amount requested by the President, for a U.S. contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Mr. Chairman, no one in this body, no one in this country, should doubt the commitment of this Congress to fighting the global AIDS battle.

Anti-corruption provisions. Following through on strengthening our oversight role, the bill includes a new anti-corruption measure, a provision that withholds 25 percent of the funds made available for the U.S. contribution to the World Bank's International Development Association, or IDA, until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies that the World Bank has incorporated certain procurement guidelines, withdraws its proposals concerning increasing the use of country systems procurement, establishes a threshold for competitive bidding and, subjects competitive bidding provisions to public advertisement.

On Iraq, the budget included a request for a total of $485 million for Iraq. Our bill includes no new appropriation for this request. We are not slighting Iraq. Instead, we assume these requirements can be financed from the nearly $5 billion that remains in unobligated funds previously appropriated in the November 2003 Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund in the emergency supplemental bill.

On the Andean Counterdrug Initiative, or ACI, the bill fully funds the budget of $734 million for the multiyear Andean Counterdrug Initiative, ACI. That is an increase of $9.3 million over the current fiscal year. The United States leads the international fight against coca and poppy cultivation overseas. The narcotics industry has become a source of funding for terrorists, especially in countries like Colombia and Afghanistan. As part of the war on terror, the bill funds the President's counterdrug initiatives for eradication, narcotics interdiction and alternative livelihood programs.

On the Conflict Response Fund, the bill does not include the administration's request for $100 million for a Conflict Response Fund, but it does have a new provision that allows the Secretary of State to reprogram and transfer funds as necessary for the purposes identified for the fund; and in other legislation, funds for the administration of that office and that program are included.

On Sudan, the bill includes $391 million, as requested, for assistance to Sudan, including $69 million for the terrible tragedy occurring in the western part of that country known as Darfur; but the assistance may only be given to the coalition government if it is in direct support of the comprehensive peace agreement with the southern part of Sudan. Development assistance to the government in the south and our humanitarian assistance in Darfur will continue unabated.

In preparing this bill, we were also faced with decreases in some areas of the budget, including for some key non-HIV/AIDS health programs and in the development assistance account. We have restored most of 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 is critical to a positive U.S. image in foreign countries.

Basic education has become a signature issue for my ranking minority member, and I salute her for her commitment to this; but I will leave it to her to describe the details of our recommendation in this 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 girls.

□ 1345

This bill recommends $465 million for basic education activities, and that is an increase of $65 million over the amount provided last year.

The bill also fully supports USAID's work to support the microenterprise lending. Report language accompanying the bill expresses the committee's expectation that USAID programs reach the largest possible number of microenterprises and recommends $200 million for this program.

We continue an emphasis in this bill on helping developing countries build their capacity to participate in the international trading system. We have $214 million for trade capacity building efforts, an increase of $15 million over last year. Of this amount, $40 million is made available for labor and environmental capacity building activities related to the free trade agreement with the countries of Central America and the Dominican Republic.

The bill fully funds the export finance agencies to promote U.S. investment overseas and create jobs in the United States' export sectors. The committee bill provides $311 million for these agencies, including the Eximbank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and the Trade and Development Agency, and $275 million of that is offset by collections.

The bill provides $791 million for migration and refugee assistance programs, continuing the United States' leadership in the world for providing humanitarian responses to refugee crises. This amount is $27 million over the 2005 level but $102 million less than the request.

Finally, the bill mostly restores the large proposed reduction to the child survival and health program, providing $1.5 billion for these programs, an increase of $246 million over the President's request.

We have had to reduce sums by almost $2.6 billion from the President's request to meet our allocation for this bill. Therefore, we could not provide funding for a number of new and expanded initiatives, though requested by the President or brought to this committee's attention by committee members and other Members of Congress and outside groups.

The major reductions to the President's budget includes a cut of $1.25 billion for the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which I have already spoken of, $458 million from various programs in Iraq, and $300 million from the President's proposed local food purchases. This latter recognizes the decision to maintain U.S. food purchases through the PL–480 program funded in the agricultural appropriations bill. And, finally, the $100 million I spoke of from the President's proposed conflict are a transfer of funds instead of a new appropriation.

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

As I said, this bill was developed in a bipartisan manner and it should have the bipartisan support of this House. So, Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''yes'' vote on this important legislation.

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 H.R. 3057, the fiscal year 2006 foreign operations appropriations bill, and I want to thank the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his hard work in putting together this bill. The good working relationship we share is evident in the product we present to the House today.

The President's fiscal year 2006 request, when compared with the subcommittee's 302(b) allocation, presented us with an array of difficult choices. Our allocation is a full $2.55 billion below the request level, and into this reduced allocation we had to fit increases in administration priorities, such as the Millennium Challenge Corporation and the President's emergency plan for AIDS relief.

While I do believe that the bill reflects, for the most part, a bipartisan compromise on the distribution of resources, I feel that this allocation fails to meet our overall foreign policy and national security needs at a time when the world is facing greater instability due to disease, deprivation and conflict.

The world's attention is focused on the upcoming G–8 Summit, in which wealthy nations will announce new commitments to achieve development progress. It is in this context that we must consider the bill before us today. We must ask if it is sufficient to lead the community of developed nations in creating a new compact for global development; if it will make the United States the standard bearer in a renewed effort to lift the least fortunate among us out of poverty; if it represents the commitment we must make to achieving the good governance and adequate financial resources to address the world's challenges.

My colleagues, we did the best we could with what we had, and I commend the chairman for that, but it is not enough. We are missing an opportunity today to demonstrate that the United States understands not just the need but the urgency of beating back the AIDS pandemic, getting children in school, encouraging reformers and oppressive societies, an opportunity to show that we understand business as usual simply will not do the job and that we are willing to take dramatic steps to bring the rest of the world on board.

This bill will do a great deal of good for a lot of people. It will address many of the challenges around the world that most directly affect U.S. national security, but it is not the bold statement that we all know it could be. Nevertheless, I generally agree with my chairman on the spending levels recommended within the reduced allocation. We worked closely together to ensure that in the face of these devastating cuts, we at least level-funded child survival and health and development assistance priorities.

We provided an increase over the President's request for HIV/AIDS, doubling his request for the Global Fund to fight AIDS, TB and malaria. Although I wish we could have done more for the Global Fund, I believe we are doing the best we can with the resources we have. We provided $465 million for basic education. We continued the U.S. reconstruction program in Afghanistan, and we fully funded our commitments in the Middle East, a powerful statement at such a critical time in the peace process.

The message we have sent with this bill is clear: In contrast with the President's request, Congress will not increase funding for MCC and PEPFAR on the backs of our core development accounts.

I am pleased that we were also able to restore deep cuts the President requested in reproductive health programs. This bill provides $432 million of bilateral funding, the fiscal year 2005 House-passed level, and earmarks an additional $25 million in International Organizations and Program funds for the United Nations Population Fund. The bill further specifies that any funds for the UNFPA that cannot be spent should be transferred to USAID specifically for bilateral family planning programs, a provision we carried in the fiscal year 2004 bill as well.

As I said, I am also pleased that this bill provides a total of $465 million for basic education, $65 million more than the fiscal year 2005 level. And, once again, we provide $15 million for a pilot program to eliminate school fees and, for the first time, require a GAO study on our education programs to ensure that we maximize the effectiveness of our aid dollars.

This bill fully funds Israel's annual economic and military aid package, including early disbursal of these funds within 30 days of the bill's passage. It also includes language carried in previous years, placing conditions on U.S. support for any future Palestinian state. This year, the bill includes an additional provision requiring a GAO audit of the fiscal year 2006 West Bank and Gaza program, as well as a project-by-project plan from the State Department on how these funds are being spent. And it extends a reporting requirement included in the fiscal year 2005 supplemental on the Palestinians' progress in reforming their security services, dismantling terrorist groups, and ending incitement against Israel. I agree with the chairman that these provisions are critical to monitoring the results we achieve as well as the money we disburse.

I am proud that the bill and report carry a number of provisions aimed at increasing the U.S. commitment to fighting gender-based violence around the world, including in areas with high HIV infection rates and in areas undergoing conflict and civil strife. I want to thank the chairman for including a provision requiring police, judicial, and military training programs funded in the bill to develop training curricula on how to prevent and deal with victims of gender-based violence. And I am pleased that we were able to increase funding for UNIFEM and the UNIFEM Trust Fund to a total of $5 million.

I want to point out a few specific concerns, however, I have with the bill. First, it provides no funding to the Global Environmental Facility, GEF. The GEF is the largest single funder of projects to improve the global environment, and every dollar invested by the U.S. in the GEF leverages $14 from other sources.

I do understand why the chairman has proposed this cut. The GEF has dragged its feet in implementing a performance-based allocation system. And while I agree with the chairman's desire to send a message that we are serious about reform, I do believe cutting funding is not the right way to accomplish this. I hope we will have the opportunity to restore funding to the GEF as this bill moves to the Senate and through conference.

I am also concerned that the bill places no conditionality whatsoever on U.S. military assistance to Indonesia and international military education and training for Guatemala. For the first time since Indonesian military-backed militias laid waste to East Timor in the wake of its August 1999 independence referendum, we will provide FMF to Indonesia free of any conditions. And despite the Guatemalan government's noncompliance with military reform stipulated in the Peace Accords, we have removed IMET restrictions on that country as well.

I regret that we were not able to fully fund the President's request for

refugees and peacekeeping. The reduced allocation simply made it impossible. I am pleased that we were able to provide additional funding as part of the fiscal year 2005 supplemental, and I am optimistic we can increase funding for these accounts in conference.

Let me also say that even though this bill provides no funding for Iraq reconstruction, I take seriously the role this committee plays in exercising oversight over this effort. Reports of wasted money and poor accounting for taxpayer funds are certainly alarming. Congress, and particularly this subcommittee, has a responsibility to ensure that these funds are used properly and efficiently, and the chairman and I will continue to make this a priority.

Finally, I would like to point out that the Senate's allocation for foreign operations is a full $1.6 billion above the House. It is my hope that this allocation will enable us to significantly increase funding for a number of critical priorities in the final conference measure.

I want to thank the chairman once again for being such a good partner in the process. I particularly want to thank him and wish him a very happy birthday from all of us. With few exceptions, I believe we have put together a good bill within the context of our difficult allocation.

I appreciate the gentleman's help and the work of the staff, Nisha, Betsy, Alice, Rodney, Rob, Lori, Sean, and Beth, in bringing this bill to the floor and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona yielding to me for the purposes of a colloquy on an issue of report language that accompanies H.R. 3057, the foreign ops appropriation bill, and for his willingness to work with me through conference on this report language.

Mr. Chairman, report language appears for a reason. It is meant to send a strong message to Federal agencies; in this case, the Export-Import Bank. I am greatly concerned about the message this report language sends. I am worried it has the appearance of trying to encourage the approval of a loan that does not meet the statutory requirements.

Before a loan should be brought before the board for a vote, it must meet the congressionally-mandated test for export additionality, foreign competition, and net benefit to the U.S. economy. If we want to consider changes to the statutory requirements, those changes should be addressed during the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank that is scheduled to occur next year.

I look forward to working with the chairman and the Senate in conference regarding the committee's intent of any report language addressing this issue.

□ 1400

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) that I sympathize with his statement. He makes his case with passion and knowledge. I want to clarify my intent with respect to the language in the committee report referring to applications from the U.S. Export-Import Bank.

The report language urged the Export-Import Bank to act promptly on requests for assistance. It also asked for the bank to report on the status of pending applications.

The report further noted the committee's request for ''an explanation for any rejection of any requests for assistance, specifically applications affecting the semiconductor industry.'' This sentence could be misconstrued as prejudicing or prejudging possible applications for bank assistance.

Let me be clear. It was not and is not my intention to prejudice or prejudge the outcome of any pending application at the bank. This language is not intended to influence in any way any matter that is pending before the bank or reflect negatively on any decision made by the chairman or any other board member regarding any pending or past matter.

Loans brought before the bank must meet the bank's criteria for export additionality, foreign competition, and net benefit for the American economy. The Export-Import Bank has five full-time board members whose job it is to assess whether applications meet the bank's criteria for export additionality, foreign competition, and net benefit to the U.S. economy.

They are the ones who should make the judgments about which transactions the bank will support and those it would turn down. The committee report language in no way is intended to influence those judgments. I understand the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) still has some concerns with the language, and I will be happy to work with the gentleman and the Senate in conference regarding the committee's intent.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, the fiscal year 2006 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act.

Let me begin by commending the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his work as chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. Every year he puts a great deal of effort into examining the issues thoroughly and giving sincere consideration to Members' requests. Thanks to his efforts, we have before us today an excellent bill.

I also commend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member. She and I have worked together on a number of issues over the years, and together we have achieved some important results.

I also want to thank all of the staff for their hard work and the research they have done over the weeks and months to address the many issues in this bill. Their organization and discipline has made this year's process move more smoothly.

As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to exercise our oversight to ensure taxpayer dollars are spent as effectively as possible. Oversight has been a primary focus of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations this year, and there are important provisions in this bill to help make our foreign assistance programs more accountable.

This bill requires the administration and international organizations to set transparent goals and measure progress towards these goals in tangible ways. The bill also limits spending until certain reforms are implemented. Because of this oversight, the committee has been able to produce a bill that is $2.5 billion below the administration's request and still focuses on the important priorities.

Assistance to the Middle East is always a central part of this bill. For fiscal year 2006, Israel will receive $2.28 billion in military assistance, $240 million in economic assistance, and $40 million to help resettle Jewish refugees in Israel. I strongly support all of this funding.

I am also pleased that the bill provides $40 million for assistance to Lebanon, which is an increase of $5 million from last year. With Syria's military withdrawal from Lebanon and the recent elections, there is an opportunity for positive change. This extra funding will give the State Department and USAID some flexibility to take advantage of this opportunity.

There are also a variety of important programs in the bill that provide support to reform efforts within the countries of the broader Middle East, including $85 million for the Middle East Partnership Initiative.

Regarding Armenia, the bill provides $67.5 million in economic assistance. Unfortunately, Turkey and Azerbaijan continue to seal the transportation routes into and out of Armenia, so this funding is important to offset this economic blockade.

The bill also maintains parity in military assistance to Armenia and Azerbaijan, which is critical to our overall policy toward the South Caucasus.

There are other valuable programs in this bill, including the Millennium Challenge Corporation and funding to fight the scourge of HIV/AIDS.

But in addition to what this bill does include, what is equally important is what this bill does not include.

Specifically, this bill does not include any funding for the Global Environmental Facility. Plain and simple,

this is a matter of accountability, and we cannot afford to waste money on organizations that refuse to implement good-government reforms.

Mr. Chairman, this is a responsive bill. It is the result of significant oversight. It is fiscally sound, and it focuses on priorities that will advance our interests. For all of these reasons, I strongly support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting it on the floor today.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), a distinguished member of the subcommittee.

(Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank our ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for yielding me this time and wish a happy birthday to our chairman and thank the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership as we work for the world right here in this Chamber.

I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member, for helping us to fashion a bill that is fair. Yes, we could use more money. Our 302(b) allocations limit what we can do, but I think it is a perfect start. The Senate has $1.5 billion more to spend than we have in our bill, and I believe in conference we will see a better bill.

I want to highlight a few things about why I strongly support this bill. Everyone says it is not enough. It is never enough. HIV/AIDS is funded at the highest level it has been. I want to commend the leadership of the subcommittee. We are over a billion dollars more than the President requested for HIV and AIDS.

The Sudan and peacekeeping operations there, we are going in the right direction. We believe with this money to help Sudan we will be able to see some stability in that region soon.

I want to speak about the Middle East. I am a strong proponent of peace in the Middle East. We must have that, and our partners there are working for that.

I recently visited Egypt on my second visit there, and found that Egypt, which I already knew, some 70-plus million people, is our strongest military ally in the region. Egypt purchases our weapons and does our training and also stabilizes the other countries: Israel, with 3 to 4 million people; Jordan with 7 or 8 million people; Lebanon, Syria. The government of Egypt and President Mubarak are the peacekeepers and have been very instrumental in the Abbas-Sharon talks, as well as the Lebanon and Syria talks. So I would hope we continue to fund Egypt to work with Egypt to make sure that they keep their commitments to the Middle East as well as to this government. I am very confident that as we work together with Egypt and with the Middle East, we will hope to see peace as we work there.

This bill also provides educational opportunities for thousands of young people all over the world who are unable to fund their own education. We know education is the difference between success and failure in young people's lives; and the better the education, the more options young people have.

Mr. Chairman, let us continue to work to build a better, stronger world. The U.S. is the largest country, the strongest country in the world. I would not want to be anywhere else. We have a responsibility to build, to grow, and to be good foreign partners. I believe this foreign ops bill for 2006 continues that effort. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the foreign operations bill. It is not perfect, but it is certainly a good piece of legislation as it moves through Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3057, the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for FY 2006. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, subcommittee on foreign operations, I want to commend subcommittee Chairman JIM KOLBE and Ranking Member NITA LOWEY, Appropriations Committee Chairman JERRY LEWIS and Ranking Member DAVID OBEY for fashioning a bill that reflects consensus and a commitment to supporting the needs of the global community.

Our work on this bill was difficult given the limited 302(b) allocation that was imposed on the subcommittee. Despite the allocation constraints, the subcommittee members developed a bill that was roughly $2.5 billion below the president's request of $22.8 billion. Our bill recommends a funding level of $20.3 billion and includes a number of strong provisions.

Our bill provides substantial funding for HIV/AIDS, including a plus up of $131 million above the president's request. The Global Fund is funded at $400 million, and is an increase of $200 million above the president's request. The President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) is funded at $1.72 billion which is $150 million less than the president's request, and HIV/AIDS in the Child, Survival and Health (CSH) account is funded at $350 million, including $20 million in bilateral assistance to non-focus countries. Other HIV/AIDS funding totals $55 million. The level of funding in the bill reflects an awareness of the dimensions of the global pandemic and the necessity to commit resources to global communities that are being ravaged by the disease.

I am also pleased that my colleagues recognized the importance of funding peacekeeping operations (PKO) in Sudan. The conflicts in the north/south and Darfur necessitate a financial and peacekeeping commitment to mitigate the proliferating violence, despair and disease that is rampant in Sudan.

Given the prevailing tensions in the Middle East, particularly as those tensions relate to peace negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians, I am pleased about the level of funding provided to support the Palestinian Authority (PA) and for our allies in Egypt and Jordan. Our funding to the region reflects the importance the committee attaches to supporting countries that are committed to the goals of democratization and fighting terrorism. I also want to remind my colleagues that it is imperative that we continue to send the message to our allies in the Middle East and the Gulf region that their efforts to aggressively support democratization and to provide military security are greatly appreciated and reflected in our ongoing financial support.

Despite the good news in this bill, I want to stress my concern that U.S. foreign assistance comprises only 1 percent of our Federal budget. I believe more could be done around the world if our Nation did not have to contend with a spiraling deficit that continues to balloon because we are entrenched in a military engagement in Iraq that costs roughly $150 million per day, $5 billion per month and $60 billion per year. I am very dismayed by these figures because they highlight the reality that there is no prospect for the removal of our troops from harm's way in the near term.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us, I believe, represents a good faith effort to address the foreign assistance needs of our global neighbors. And while I wish that more resources were available to support worthy programs, we were limited in our allocation. Given current economic realities, this bill represents a good faith effort to fund essential programs around the world. The Senate allocation for foreign assistance is $1.5 billion higher than the House figure, so I am hopeful that perhaps even greater levels of funding will be provided for other critical areas of need. I am pleased to support this bill and encourage my colleagues to vote ''aye'' on H.R. 3057.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), an outstanding member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Arizona on his birthday, rise in support of this bill, and compliment the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for her work.

This bill is vital to winning the war on terror. I am particularly happy that we have focused the soft power of the United States, USAID, the Board for International Broadcasting, et cetera, on key parts of Pakistan where the leaders of al Qaeda are hiding.

I do want to strike one note of warning, though. In the last 2 years, we have witnessed an explosion of heroin production in Afghanistan. Last year, drug lords in Afghanistan made over $6 billion in drug profits with some of the proceeds supporting terrorist groups. Al Qaeda and the Taliban now depend on the sale of heroin to wage their war on terror. Two years ago, drug profits sustained just two terror groups. Today, drug profits sustain four terror groups.

Last year, more drug money arrived in Afghanistan than it had in any other country, including Colombia, in history. Two years ago, only 8 percent of Afghan heroin arrived in the United States; now it is up to 12 percent, a 50 percent increase. Two months ago, the United States arrested Osama bin Laden's banker, Haji Bashir Noorzai, for attempting to smuggle $50 million of heroin into the United States. His attempt provides a stark warning that if Afghan drug dealers can smuggle heroin into the United States, they can also smuggle terrorists.

To date, our program to reduce the Afghan heroin crop has failed. From a low of only a few hundred acres in 2001, the Afghan heroin crop topped over 200,000 acres last year.

Alternative development programs for Afghan farmers are key, and we fully fund such programs to help farmers switch from poppies to the traditional products of Afghanistan, like wheat. But even the best legal crop can only command one-twelfth the price of heroin, so we also must fund enforcement programs.

Congress approved $92 million in the fiscal year 2005 supplemental to provide helicopters for the Afghan police to catch drug lords. The program inside the administration is now adrift, and we have wasted 6 months in designing a helicopter program to help Afghan police officers. Repeatedly, some in the administration have proposed cutting this program by half to fund other programs, proposing that we largely ignore the narcoterror threat in Afghanistan.

Mr. Chairman, Afghanistan now teeters on the brink of becoming a failed narco-state. Violence against American and other NATO peacekeepers is picking up, much of it funded by narcoterrorists. As our full committee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), advised Secretary Zoellick, Congress is looking for strong action against Afghan heroin; and we want the fiscal year 2005 funding for the helicopter program to move forward, and an end to rumors that the administration is cutting the fiscal year 2007 budget for this activity.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), a distinguished new member of the committee.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY). In working on this bill, we found agreement on an initiative that is very important to me, and I think important to our efforts in Africa in terms of combating some of the difficulties there, particularly related to HIV and the growing threat of AIDS.

We have report language that accompanies this bill that the chairman and his staff were willing to agree to that would bring together a number of our more capable agencies, including the Centers for Disease Control, the USAID and others, and have them develop a plan to take a nonincremental approach at creating a healthier blood supply in Africa. In Africa, millions of people who have contracted AIDS have done so through tainted blood transfusions, particularly pediatric AIDS cases. The ranking member and the chairman and the staff have helped us move forward an initiative to focus on this problem. I rise to thank them.

Secondly, the bill also talks about creating a more coordinated and comprehensive effort on infectious diseases and health challenges on the continent of Africa, particularly in the sub-Saharan region.

Also, I have had a chance to speak to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) and his top staffer, Frank Cushing, on this matter; and I really appreciate the majority's willingness to look anew at some of these issues and think through how we can approach this matter in a creative way. I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and his staff and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and her staff.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has done well to craft a bill in a very difficult budgetary environment. It prioritizes funding for important programs. I believe his and the ranking member's efforts are appreciated.

□ 1415

I do, however, rise to express concerns about the Global Environment Facility, or GEF, whose funding is eliminated in this bill. As co-chair of the House International Conservation Caucus, I am keenly interested in conservation programs because I believe that how nations of the world manage their natural resources is a vital U.S. interest, impacting our efforts to help create a more secure and prosperous world.

The GEF is the largest international funding source for programs and support good natural resource management around the world. In the roughly 15 years since its creation, the GEF has implemented 1,500 projects in 140 countries, with biodiversity and habitat conservation being the largest single area of focus. Importantly, U.S. funding has leveraged at least $14 for every $1 we have contributed. I believe this model where our resources are matched many times over by other public and private donors is a good approach. However, I strongly agree with the chairman's push for reform at the GEF. The United States should always be pushing for transparency and accountability at multilateral institutions, and the GEF is no exception. As the chairman knows, at the request of the U.S. Treasury and other donor nations, the GEF has been working to implement a variety of management improvements. Currently, the GEF is in the final stages of adopting a major element in this reform process, a system of prioritizing its funding decisions called the Resource Allocation Framework.

The Council of the GEF is meeting in late August in a special session to finalize the structure of this framework. The GEF Council recognizes the need for reform and is meeting in less than 2 months to complete work on the reform element most important to the U.S. Government.

And I would respectfully inquire whether the gentleman agrees that the GEF's programs and projects are beneficial to conservation worldwide and to the United States, and assuming that a framework is finalized at the upcoming special meeting of the GEF, would that constitute sufficient progress on reform to have the gentleman revisit GEF funding in the conference?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from California for raising this important issue. I also support international conservation efforts, and I applaud the gentleman for his leadership as co-chair of the International Conservation Caucus.

I believe that the Global Environment Facility has done good work over the years to help conserve the environment and to address some of the more difficult international environmental problems that require international cooperation to be solved. Nevertheless, I have been concerned about the pace of reform within this organization.

My purpose in eliminating its funding is to ensure that the limited amount of resources in this bill are used in the most efficient possible way. My goal is not to definitively end U.S. contributions to the GEF this year or in the future. However, until the final GEF reforms are in place, I am concerned that GEF funding is not being used optimally.

I appreciate the unique role that GEF can play in international conservation, and I believe that a reformed and functioning GEF is worthy of support. If the GEF agrees to implement a performance-based allocation system at the August-September, 2005, Special Meeting of the GEF Council, then I would be willing and will be willing to work with the gentleman and the other body to help restore the U.S. contribution to the GEF during conference.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his response.

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

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

I want to thank the gentleman from California for raising this important issue. As I have said repeatedly throughout the process of moving this bill to the House floor, I am deeply disappointed that this bill does not fulfill the U.S. commitment to the Global Environmental Facility.

Since its establishment in 1991, the GEF has provided $5 billion in grants, leveraged $16 billion in co-financing for projects in 140 countries around the world, has provided more than 4,000 grants directly to smaller organizations. The U.S. has provided close to $1 billion to the GEF over this same time frame.

The GEF is unique in its laser-like focus on environmental sustainability. It is the most effective way for the United States and other donor nations

to support biodiversity and prevent climate change.

House passage of the bill with no funding for the GEF will send a strong message, but I hope not the wrong message. I agree with the chairman that the U.S. should encourage transparency, responsibility, and accountability of the institution. And I hope that is what the international community takes away from today's debate.

However, I do believe that in cutting off all funding to the GEF, we run the risk of sending the message that the United States no longer supports the good work of the organization. I am pleased that today's discussion will clarify that this is not true, and I join the chairman and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) in looking forward to the August GEF Council meeting, which will hopefully include the adoption of a performance-based Resource Allocation Framework. I am optimistic that the Senate will do the right thing by the GEF and that we will be able to provide the requested levels in conference. I look forward to working with the chairman and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) to see that this happens.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), who has been a real advocate for the environment.

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

I rise today to speak on an issue that is probably best spelled out in The Los Angeles Times today by Sonni Efron, who is a writer for the Times. The Times article is entitled ''Drug War Fails to Dent U.S. Supply.''

I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their commitment to international development and improving our national security by attacking the culture of poverty and injustice, which I think are the root causes of terrorism in this world. I would also like to thank the chairman for engaging in a debate with me during the full committee markup regarding the increased funding for alternative development in Colombia.

I had offered an amendment in committee that would have shifted funding from the military and fumigation side of the Andean CounterDrug Initiative to funding more alternative development programs. My amendment would have shifted funds in five of the departments, which are like ''states'' in Colombia that are receiving little or no alternative development assistance; yet they are being heavily fumigated. While we are using all stick and no carrot in these regions, only spraying a farmer's crop but not providing for an alternative livelihood is not a sustainable solution to a coca growing problem in the Andean region.

Given the chairman's commitment to work in conference to increase the funding for alternative development programs in Colombia and the Andean region as a whole, I withdrew my amendment in committee.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind the chairman of his commitment and thank him again for his efforts regarding the alternative development in Colombia, and I know the chairman has been a tireless supporter of development and security in Latin America. I look forward to working with him and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), ranking member, on these important issues and hope in conference that they can restore the funding that I am sure the Senate side will add to.

I would like to close by referring everyone to this L.A. Times article today. I think it speaks to the point that America needs to focus on working itself out of jobs, not making people dependent upon American jobs to develop economic security in their own countries.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Jun. 28, 2005]

DRUG WAR FAILS TO DENT U.S. SUPPLY

(By Sonni Efron)

WASHINGTON.—The Bush administration and congressional allies are gearing up to renew a plan for drug eradication in Latin America despite some grim news: The $5.4 billion spent on the plan since 2000 has made no dent in the availability of cocaine on American streets and prices are at all-time lows.

United Nations figures released this month show that coca cultivation in the Andean region increased by 2 percent in 2004 as declines in Colombia were swamped by massive increases in Peru and Bolivia. And the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service said last week that the anti-drug effort had had ''no effect'' on the price or purity of drugs in the United States.

The findings have fueled skepticism in Congress, where conservative groups have joined efforts to lobby against continued funding. The National Taxpayers Union called the anti-drug program a ''boondoggle.''

Nonetheless, a House committee last week approved the administration's request for $734.5 million for next year as part of a foreign aid bill. Debate on the bill could start as early as today. President Bush also may unveil a renewed multiyear commitment to South American anti-drug efforts this year when Colombian President Alvaro Uribe, a staunch U.S. ally, is expected to visit.

''We are heading in the right direction and we are winning,'' the federal drug czar, John P. Walters, told Congress last month.

''Plan Colombia''—a six-year effort by Washington and Bogota to eliminate drug trafficking, end more than 40 years of armed conflict with rebels and promote economic and legal reform in Colombia—expires this year. The Bush administration wants to continue it, a senior State Department official said.

''You adjust your tactics and you adjust your resources,'' the official said. ''There's no inclination on the part of our administration to give up just because it's tough.''

Negotiations with Bogota over details of a successor program to Plan Colombia will begin next month, the official said.

Administration and some congressional officials say Plan Colombia has had some striking success. Killings, massacres of villagers and other attacks blamed on drug trafficking all have fallen sharply since 2002, and kidnappings have fallen by half, according to Colombian Defense Ministry figures, even though this year has seen a resurgence of violence.

Drug crop eradication and drug interdictions are cutting into the profits of Colombia's right-wing paramilitaries and leftist rebels, Walters told Congress last month.

Walters testified that ''cocaine production in the Andes has declined by 29% since 2001, and Colombia's opium crop was cut in half from 2003 to 2004.'' He said the reason that price and availability had not been affected was the lag of six months to a year between the time when the coca plant was harvested and when its cocaine was available on American streets.

The reports call the administration's assessment into question. Whereas cocaine production fell 11% in Colombia in 2004, it soared by 23% in Peru and 35% in Bolivia, according to the report by the U.N. Office on Drugs and Crime. Overall, coca cultivation in the region increased 2%, the U.N. study said.

''The [U.N.] numbers are devastating,'' said Adam Isacson of the Center for International Policy, which has argued that eradication campaigns must be accompanied by large-scale development efforts that offer peasants alternative livelihoods.

''The spraying, when it isn't accompanied by any alternative development, doesn't seem to discourage [coca farmers] from trying again, because there just aren't a lot of other good choices out there,'' Isacson said.

Peasants have responded by planting even more coca, hiding it under trees and among other crops, and turning to varieties that produce a higher yield, the U.N. report said.

Whether or not the anti-drug effort is succeeding, the U.S. foreign aid budget is under new scrutiny, especially with the war in Iraq costing more than $4 billion a month and a $379-billion deficit looming for 2006. Colombia, the fifth-largest recipient of U.S. aid after Iraq, Israel, Egypt and Afghanistan, could be a target for cuts.

The Congressional Research Service tallied State Department and Defense Department spending on the Andean Counterdrug Initiative at $5.4 billion since 2000. Though the anti-drug program aids Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, Brazil, Panama and Venezuela, Colombia has received most of the money, about $4.5 billion. ''While there has been measurable progress in Colombia's internal security, as indicated by decreases in violence, and in the eradication of drug crops, no effect has been seen with regard to price, purity and availability of cocaine and heroin in the United States,'' the research agency report said.

The report said Colombia was no closer to ending its decades-long armed strife. The conservative National Taxpayers Union last week called for the program to be cut back or killed.

''By all measurable criteria, Plan Colombia's effectiveness is dubious,'' said Paul Gessing, governmental affairs director of the anti-tax group. ''It's a big taxpayer boondoggle.''

Liberals also contend that the program is wasteful. Rep. James P. McGovern (D-Mass.) plans to offer an amendment to the foreign aid bill that would slash $100 million in U.S. military and security aid to Colombia.

One senior U.S. government policy advisor, who spoke on condition of anonymity out of fear he would be excluded from administration policy discussions, agreed with many of the critics.

''It's a complete waste of money,'' the advisor said. ''You have to ask yourself, why are we in Colombia?''

He added: ''The bottom line is not how much they produce or how much we eradicate, the bottom line is, is there enough supply to meet the demand [in the United States], and there always is. . . . The traffickers are always one step ahead of us.''

Plan Colombia began under the Clinton administration primarily to fight drugs. But after the Sept. 11, 2001, attacks, the Bush administration has emphasized counter-terrorism and regional security.

While some conservatives wish to cut funding for Colombia, many Democrats want to spend less on its military and more on rural economic development. Democratic critics also wonder whether the U.S. has an exit strategy for Colombia.

Rep. Sam Farr (D-Carmel), a former Peace Corps volunteer in Colombia, said the U.S. effort there violates a key principle of international aid: ''Work yourself out of a job.''

After five years of U.S. funding, American military advisors are still training Colombian troops and American companies are still being paid to maintain expensive U.S. Black Hawk helicopters, Farr said.

''Look at how much attention is being paid to building local capacity in Iraq so we can leave,'' Farr said. ''This is where we're failing in the war on drugs, because we're not developing the capacity of these countries to handle their own problems.''

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), a distinguished member of the full committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the ranking member and the chairman for this bill.

It is easy for some people to vote against foreign ops until they understand what it is. There are four legs of a table: the military foreign ops, intel, and homeland security; and probably a fifth now with the rising cost of fuel, energy.

Foreign ops is critical in that security table. Why? If we think about the position of the Palestinian-Israeli issue with Sharon, for the first time, I heard the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) speak that we have hope in the Middle East, hope. If we take a look, it is easy to think about cutting certain countries, but think of what a thin edge they are on right now. Look at Indonesia with its problems, how they help us. Look at Saudi Arabia that is moving more and more toward a moderate state. Do they have problems? Yes. Look at Egypt, and it would be easy for someone to come up and have an amendment to cut them. But in Saudi Arabia I sure do not want ''King Osama bin Laden,'' or in Indonesia, if we look at the thin thread. Or Pakistan. In Pakistan take a look at Hamboli; KSM, Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who was a guy who planned 9/11. We just caught Abu al-Libbi, who is the guy who took Khalid Sheikh Mohammed's position. And they have stopped major events and attacks within the United States because of our foreign operations bill.

Look at Sudan. They ethically cleansed probably as many people as Saddam Hussein or in Kosovo or Bosnia, and that brings world peace.

But even worse, look at the HIV threat. There are more deaths in HIV in Africa than during the plagues, and if we support that, A, it makes a safer America, but it also protects and stabilizes Africa itself.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3¼ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distinguished minority leader, who has been a strong advocate for the United States' increased role in the world today.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time. This is an important bill. The United States is the leader of the free world, and, frankly, the United States is far behind many in the industrialized world in investing in the peace and security of the international community.

Mr. Chairman, for several years, however, I have expressed serious concerns about the amount of dollars that we give to Egypt. Egypt is a friend and an ally. Egypt is number two in terms of the dollars that we invest, both in military and economic aid. However, Egypt has one of the largest and most modern militaries in the Middle East, with approximately $2.4 billion in annual defense spending. More than half of that funding, $1.3 billion in this bill, is provided by the United States.

Notwithstanding that, however, I do not believe that Egypt and its leadership is conducting itself in a way consistent with its alliance with this country. Nearly one out of five Egyptians live in poverty; yet we give very little economic aid, relatively speaking. Roughly half of Egypt's adults are illiterate. Unemployment is in double figures, and the country has a per capita income of just $700 per year.

In this context, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the United States provides almost three times the amount of military assistance to Egypt than we provide in economic assistance, $1.3 billion to $495 million in this bill.

That is not my principal concern. My principal concern is the relationship between the extraordinary investment that America makes in Egypt and the lack of cooperation as it relates to some of their policies not only on the military side, but on the human rights and discrimination side.

Regional stability and the efforts to stem the development of terrorist organizations are served not only by providing for Egypt's military strength, but also by ensuring prosperity and economic opportunities for the people of Egypt, and having Egypt cooperate in bringing down the level of hatred, discrimination, and prejudice in its own country and in the Middle East. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that we would make that message clear to our friends in Egypt.

I offered an amendment in committee. That amendment would have shifted $40 million from military assistance to the economic assistance. That, in my opinion, would have had the effect of educating more Egyptian children, bringing more Egyptians out of poverty, perhaps investing greater amounts in the economic development and job creation seen in Egypt. That would, in my opinion, have been a very positive step forward.

My friend, the chairman of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations urged me not to do that. And as a result of his urging, I withdrew that amendment.

One of the reasons I withdrew that amendment is because Egypt is an important ally. But I would hope that our Egyptian friends would address the issues of anti-Americanism, anti-Semitism, anti-Catholic/Christian, prejudice, and destabilization within their own country and within the Middle East. We need to continue to send that message.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), distinguished member of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Let me just say at first that this bill is a well-crafted bill that I support within the confines of the amount of money that the majority has chosen to give us to work with.

□ 1430

I also want to acknowledge the extraordinary bipartisan work that has taken place here, and I want to thank our chairman and his staff for reaching out to us in the minority to include our priorities as well. I think this is a real bipartisan effort, and I am grateful for that.

I also want to acknowledge the support of our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I want to thank our chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), for all their support of the foreign operations bill this year and over the years.

Mr. Chairman, most Americans believe that America spends 10 to 15 percent of its budget on foreign aid. That is simply not the case, though. We only spend about 1 percent of our budget on foreign aid, and that 1 percent is very well spent.

We use that money, that foreign assistance, to help fellow democracies stay strong and secure. We help struggling democracies who are undergoing tough times because of the neighborhood they live in or because of their own economies. We also help people who want to be free and live in a democracy help create democracies.

Why do we care about democracies, other than being Americans and we believe everyone has a right to live free? Because we know that democracies are good trading partners and they do not go to war against one another. So there is a very practical reason for our foreign assistance program.

Beyond that, of course, is the humanitarian obligation, the moral obligation that we have to help people in need. Virtually every major religion in the world acknowledges our moral obligation to help poor people and those in need of charity and compassion.

So for all those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I believe this foreign aid bill is important. I do regret that the Global Environmental Facility is not being funded under this bill, and I look forward, as the chairman suggests, to that money perhaps being included in conference. That would make this bill complete. Then, of course, if there were as much money as the other body is designating for this foreign assistance, that would be even better.

But this is a good, bipartisan bill, because foreign assistance is in America's vital national interest, and also because it is the right thing to do.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), who has been very active in a whole range of issues involving our foreign aid program.

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding me this time. I want to commend her and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for their fine work on this balanced and bipartisan bill.

Under tight budgetary restrictions, they have crafted an important bill which addresses the priorities that affect the developing world while also shoring up our global allies. 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 Peace and Reconciliation programs in this legislation as well.

One of the groups included in the Peace and Reconciliation program is Project Children and Cooperation Ireland. Many of my colleagues have taken on interns from this program, and the young men and women from the north of Ireland have benefited greatly from these internships. As progress in the peace accord remains unsteady, we in the United States must continue to support programs that bring together the future leaders of the north of Ireland and show them their differences are not insurmountable. I hope the House conferees will work with the Senate to see that this program is funded during the conference committee.

This bill also includes $34 million for the U.N. Population Fund; but as has become a norm under this administration, the restrictions on providing this important funding will not be released by this administration. The administration seems determined to hinder the health of women around the world; and while I am troubled that this detrimental policy continues, there is much good in this bill, particularly when you look at the Middle East.

I strongly support the increase of $60 million to the State of Israel for a total of $2.3 billion in foreign military financing and economic aid in this bill. I believe the United States must do more, though, to combat the anti-Israeli and Western stances taken by our supposed allies like Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia still has not lived up to the test of the President's ''you are either with us or against us.'' It is time for this administration to start treating Saudi Arabia like the supporter of terrorists that they are. We must take a stand in this House and let the Saudis know that their time of extremism is over, because we will not stand for it anymore.

Mr. Chairman—I want to commend my colleague Chairman JIM KOLBE and my good friend NITA LOWEY for their work to craft a fair and balanced bipartisan bill.

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.

Under tight budgetary restrictions they have crafted an important bill which addresses the priorities that affect the developing world while also shoring up our global allies.

I was proud to work with the Chairman and Ranking Member on several initiatives that are important to my constituents and their families overseas.

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.

One of the groups included in the Peace and Reconciliation program is Project Children and Cooperation Ireland.

Many of my colleagues have taken on interns from this program and the young men and woman of the north of Ireland have benefited greatly from these interns.

As progress in the peace accords remains unsteady we in the States must continue to support programs that bring together the future leaders of the north of Ireland and show them that their differences are not insurmountable.

I hope the House conferees will work with the Senate to see that this program is funded during the conference committee.

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 $34 million for the United Nations Population Fund, but, as has become a norm under this administration, the restrictions on providing this important funding will not be released by this Administration

The administration seems determined to hinder the health of women around the world.

While I remain troubled that this detrimental policy continues there is much good in this bill, particularly when you look at the Middle East.

I strongly support the increase of $60 million to Israel, for a total of $2.3 billion in foreign military financing and economic aid in this bill.

As Prime Minister Sharon begins the courageous disengagement plan of removing Israeli settlers from the Gaza Strip, this funding is more needed than ever to help Israel's security and shore up civil society programs in the Palestinian Authority.

As we continue to support our friend Israel from outside threats, I believe it is time to start to rethink the way we provide aid to Egypt.

In the House International Relations Committee recent markup of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act the way aid is given to Egypt was changed by our Chairman and Ranking Member.

Egypt is at peace with all of its neighbors and I see no external threats against them that warrant the need for keeping military assistance constant.

The real threat in Egypt is from within, the limited amount of freedom that exists for her people as the level of poverty increases is a dangerous mix.

The Government of President Mubarrak has shown that it is quite quick to throw dissidents into jail, discriminate against the Catholic Minority, tolerate anti Semitism and anti Zionism in the official press, throw gay Egyptians into jail and some of my colleagues say this is ok, that the devil you know is better than the devil you don't know.

The United States must do more to help end this dangerous mix before the problem creates instability.

Egypt has been a strong friend and ally and has done much to help bring about a peaceful solution to the Israeli Palestinian conflict but we cannot allow that to cloud our judgment.

I believe the United States must do more to combat the anti Israeli and Western stances taken by our supposed allies like Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia has still not lived up to the test of the Presidents you are either with us or against us.

It is time for this administration to start treating Saudi Arabia like the supporter of terrorists they are.

We must take a stand in this House and let the Saudis know that their time of extremism is over because we will not stand for it anymore.

I also commend my colleagues for holding this Administration accountable on their lack of distribution of funds in the Millennium Challenge Account. The MCA created with great fanfare, has not lived up to the expectations set by this Administration.

I will hope that during the next few months of the Conference this Administration will work with Congress to insure that the MCA reaches the potential it was created under.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3057, the FY06 Foreign Operations Appropriations Act.

I am pleased that the bill includes $55 million in funding for Afghan women, including $5 million for the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission. This funding builds upon funding for Afghan women and girls included in an amendment that I offered to the FY04 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill.

Over the past four years, the United States has invested in the reconstruction and development of Afghanistan both because it is the right thing to do and because it is critical to our security.

Afghan women were brutally oppressed by the Taliban regime, but they have been reclaiming their role in society, in part because of critical U.S. assistance provided to Afghanistan. Millions of girls are attending primary schools, equal rights for women are guaranteed in the constitution, and approximately three million women voted in the election held last year. These victories are especially important given that women comprise 55–60 percent of the total Afghan population and should be a driving force in Afghanistan's economic and political viability.

However, while women are vastly better off than they were, many continue to endure many hardships including targeted violence, limited mobility, illiteracy, and the highest rate of maternal mortality in the world. By improving health care facilities and by giving women access to the skills and opportunities that they need to become partners in creating Afghanistan's future, we will ensure that women will no longer be second-class citizens.

While I hope that all the aid for Afghanistan will help women, I commend the Appropriations Committee for continuing to recognize the needs of Afghan women.

I also am pleased that the bill includes $34 million for the life saving work of UNFPA, the United Nations Population Fund. UNFPA is a global leader in providing reproductive health care, including family planning services to the world's poorest women. UNFPA helps women undergo pregnancy and childbirth safely and helps women and men to plan their families and avoid unintended pregnancies and protect themselves from HIV/AIDS infections.

UNFPA also is a leader in addressing the reproductive health care needs of women in emergencies. Humanitarian crises are often reproductive health disasters. Complications of pregnancy and childbirth are the leading causes of death for displaced women of childbearing age, and UNFPA takes the lead in providing supplies and services to protect the reproductive health of people in crisis. Most notably, UNFPA has played an instrumental role in helping to save the lives of women in Afghanistan by providing mobile health facilities as well as rebuilding maternity hospitals. The Afghan government was so grateful for this assistance they gave UNFPA a symbolic donation of $100 to support their work.

As we are all aware, for each of the last three years, President Bush has refused to release the funding that Congress has appropriated for this vital program due to this Administrations' unproven assertions that UNFPA supports coercive abortion in China. It has been estimated that the loss of each year's funding could prevent 2 million unintended pregnancies; nearly 800,000 abortions, 4,700 maternal deaths, nearly 60,000 cases of serious maternal illness; and more than 77,000 infant and child deaths. The Bush administration's refusal to release these funds puts at risk the very lives and health of women and children in the world's poorest regions.

It is my hope that this year, President Bush reconsiders the impact of his decision and releases the life-saving funding that this chamber is wisely approving today.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3057, the Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2005, which funds programs and activities carried out by the Departments of State, Treasury and Agriculture, the United States Agency for International Development, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and the Export-Import Bank, among others.

This measure is the tenth appropriations bill to be considered under the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution, and provides for the foreign operations and export financing needs of our nation, clearly national priorities in a time of war.

I am pleased to report that it is consistent with the levels established by the conference report to H. Con. Res. 95, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

H.R. 3057 provides $20.3 billion in appropriations for Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs for fiscal year 2006. The bill provides $571 million in funding above fiscal year 2005, but it is $2.6 billion below the President's request.

The bill provides $1.25 billion less then requested for the Millennium Challenge Corporation, $478 million less in Economic Support Funds and $146 million less in Foreign Military Financing funding. In addition, the bill recommends no funding for Iraq—a reduction of $459 million—as over $5 billion in funds previously appropriated for Iraq relief and reconstruction remain unobligated and could be used to fund the requirements presented in the fiscal year 2006 request. H.R. 3057 also provides no funding for the World Bank's Global Environment Facility until it adopts a performance-based allocation system—a reduction of $107 million from fiscal year 2005.

H.R. 3057 provides a record level of $2.7 billion in funding to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria: $131 million more than requested by the President land $502 million, or 23 percent, more than provided in fiscal year 2005. Of this total, $2.3 billion is provided specifically for HIV/AIDS programs. The bill also fully funds the President's request of $2.5 billion in assistance for Israel, $1.8 billion in assistance for Egypt, $1 billion in assistance to support reconstruction and democratization activities in Afghanistan. In addition, $437 million in funding is provided for International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement, an increase of $111 million, or 34 percent, over fiscal year 2005.

H.R. 3057 does not contain any emergency-designated budget authority or advance appropriations, but it does include a rescission of $64 million in previously enacted discretionary budget authority.

With total fiscal year 2006 appropriations equal to its allocation, the bill conforms with the budget resolution. 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.

In conclusion, I express my support for H.R. 3057.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I support H.R. 3057, and intend to vote for it in its current form. I also want to recognize the majority and minority subcommittee staff for their dedicated and professional work in meeting the demands of all subcommittee members despite scarce resources.

However, in a forum such as this, I would be remiss if I did not raise the following issues that I have consistently raised over the last several years in every relevant hearing, markup and floor debate of this committee.

Yesterday, around the world, 15–20 thousand people died of extreme poverty. Today, around the world, 15–20 thousand people will die of extreme poverty. Tomorrow, around the world 15–20 thousand people will die of extreme poverty. Extreme poverty, like malnutrition and disease,—not conflict—are claiming these lives.

The Foreign Operations Appropriations bill has a real opportunity to turn around these numbers. Look at what has been done to date. Smallpox eradication begun in the 1960s. Control of river blindness in the 1970s. Increased child immunizations in the 1980s. Initiatives to fight Guinea worm, trachoma and leprosy in the 1990s. And the effort to end polio in this decade. Measurable results produced with the dollars the Foreign Operations subcommittee provides.

But more can be done.

There is a phrase that former Labor-HHS Chairman Porter, a member of the Foreign Ops. subcommittee, was fond of saying, ''Noblesse oblige, the belief that the wealthy and privileged are obliged to help those less fortunate. In Luke, chapter 12, verse 48, Jesus simply says, ''To who much is given, much is expected.''

We are the wealthiest country in the world. We spend more money on our military than the entire world combined with the sole mission of protecting this country, its citizens and advancing U.S. interests.

We protect this country and advance U.S. interests by embracing the three Ds to a successful foreign policy: diplomacy, democracy and development. However, looking at all of FY 06 discretionary spending, I think we have been strongly emphasizing diplomacy and democracy and only given cursory treatment to development.

Providing significantly more resources to development would only further the dollars we spend on defense. Last year, Vice Admiral Lowell Jacoby of the Defense Intelligence Agency said, ''a number of factors virtually assure a terrorist threat for years to come . . . Despite recent reforms, terrorist organizations draw from societies with poor or failing economies, ineffective governments and inadequate education systems.''

I don't want anyone to misunderstand me. Given the circumstances, this bill is a tremendous effort. Chairman KOLBE, Ranking Member LOWEY and the subcommittee staff have put forward a laudable product.

But more should be done.

I keep hearing members of this committee and the House leadership say that this is a tight budget year. This tight budget year was not created by immaculate conception. Congress voted to make it a tough budget year. Congress approved the budget resolution. Saying it is going to be a tough budget year is like a farmer saying he is going to have a bad harvest because he didn't plant any seeds. Mr. Chairman, when Congress approved the FY '06 budget resolution we didn't plant any seeds. The budget allocation given to this subcommittee is not a natural disaster like a drought. This disaster was of our making.

In Matthew chapter 6, verse 21 , Jesus said, ''For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.'' If this verse is true, what does it say about us, about Congress, about our government that we pass budget resolutions each year that spend almost $400 billion on defense, and hundreds of billions on all kinds of tax cuts for the most well off, yet we can't even match the President's request for international development. I have a masters in theology from the Chicago Theological Seminary and have read my bible from cover to cover, and nowhere does it say, ''only take care of the poor if it fits into your annual budget resolution.''

Noblesse oblige Mr. Chairman.

In 1984, referring to Marxist-ruled Ethiopia, President Ronald Reagan said, ''a hungry child knows no politics.'' I would also add that

a hungry child doesn't know a 302(b) allocations from a point-of-order.'' All he knows is that he is hungry.

Again, I plan to support this bill.

But more needs to be done.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for the Global Environment Facility. The Global Environment Facility, GEF, is the primary financing mechanism for addressing global threats to the environment. After only a little more than a decade, the GEF has already established an outstanding record for cost-effective assistance to developing countries struggling with critical issues such as land-degradation, toxic pollution, energy efficiency, the elimination of ozone depleting chemicals, and the difficult task of facilitating sustainable development.

The GEF puts money into countries whose stability matters to us, and our participation in the GEF builds partnerships and a sense of cooperation with other donors in tackling global environmental issues. In addition to furthering U.S. interests, the GEF deserves support for the simple reason that it works. In the Middle East, for example, the GEF is crossing borders, bringing countries together to protect vital water and wetland resources.

U.S. leadership has played an important role in the GEF both as its leading donor and as a powerful voice for reform. Largely because of the United States, the GEF is now more effective, transparent and accountable than ever before. The institution has already met most of the reform criteria we have put forward, and the governing Council is nearing a compromise on the issue of performance-based allocation. Reaffirming our commitment in the current budget cycle will also send a positive signal for the next phase of GEF operations in which U.S. leadership will remain critical.

Clearly, I appreciate the tough decisions that this subcommittee has had to make with the allocation they were given. But we cannot allow the GEF to fail on our watch. I would like to thank Chairman KOLBE for his consideration in giving the GEF Council the opportunity to adopt pending reforms and, if they do so, in being willing to work to restore funding in conference for the GEF. I would also like to acknowledge the good work of my fellow co-chairs of the International Conservation Caucus, CLAY SHAW, JOHN TANNER, and especially Mr. ED ROYCE, for their good work on this issue.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for this bill, the Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

A strong foreign operations budget enables the U.S. to confront national security threats such as international terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, as well as strengthen relations with other countries, address challenges like the genocide in Darfur, help safeguard human rights, and address problems such as hunger and AIDS.

I am especially pleased with the strong and continued support in this bill for our close ally, Israel. This bill provides $2.5 billion in assistance for Israel, including $2.3 billion for military grants, and $240 million in economic assistance.

As Israel takes bold steps to promote the peace process by disengaging from Gaza and parts of the West Bank, relinquishing security control of West Bank towns, and releasing hundreds of Palestinian prisoners, this funding will be essential to Israel's security and economic well-being.

This bill also includes an important provision expressing the sense of Congress that Arab League countries should immediately end the boycott against Israel and its trading partners, and calls on President Bush to consider a country's participation in the boycott when determining whether to sell U.S. weapons to the country.

The bill also withholds U.S. funds for the International Red Cross headquarters building in Geneva until the organization recognizes the Magen David Adom Society as the national humanitarian society of Israel. Finally, the measure includes $40 million for the resettlement of refugees from the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and Ethiopia to Israel, provided through the Migration and Refugee Assistance Account.

To uphold our commitment to the only true democracy in the Middle East and America's closest ally in the war on terror, Congress must ensure Israel has the means necessary to defend herself.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides these funds and reaffirms our dedication to Israel's well being, and for that reason, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it.

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

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

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. 3057

*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, 2006, 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, 2006.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of entering into colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations regarding the fiscal year 2006 budget for counternarcotics programs in Peru.

Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, I have been extensively involved in United States counternarcotics efforts in Central and South America. As a result, I was deeply disappointed to see that the President's fiscal year 2006 request for the Andean Counterdrug Initiative for Peru is 16 percent below last year's enacted level. The President's budget aims to reduce the U.S. assistance for Peruvian counternarcotic eradication and interdiction from a level of $62 million enacted in 2005 to a request of $54 million in 2006, and reduces alternative development funds from a level of $54 million to $43 million.

I believe this is absolutely the wrong time for such a cut and such a low level of funding, if enacted, will only jeopardize the gains we have made in Peru in the areas of coca eradication, interdiction and alternative development.

In 2004, with the assistance of the United States, Peru eradicated almost 10,000 hectares of coca, of which 7,500 hectares were eradicated manually by the Peruvian police, and another 2,500 hectares were voluntarily eradicated by Peruvian communities in exchange for community development programs. Moreover, alternative development programs supported legally grown crops on almost 20,000 more hectares of Peruvian farmland.

Historically, Colombian narcotraffickers sent cocaine base from Peru to Colombia for conversion into cocaine HCL, but in recent years the traffickers have relied more on coca cultivation and base production in Colombia. But the traffickers in Colombia are under increasing pressure from the Colombian Government, thanks to the successes of Plan Colombia.

So far we have successfully avoided a so-called ''balloon effect'' from the successes of Plan Colombia in terms of seeing Colombian traffickers substantially shifting cultivation of narcotics crops back to Peru. But there are warning signs, indications that coca cultivation is starting to spring up outside the traditional cultivation zones in Peru that point to this happening if we do not take steps to prevent it.

Additionally, there is good intelligence that appears to indicate an upward trend in terms of poppy cultivation in Peru regarding heroin. I have spoken to officials in Peru, and they are deeply concerned about these warning signs, as well as the emerging opium threat.

Recent Ministry of Peru data indicates that Peru now may have 1,400

hectares of opium crops, mostly in the north near the Ecuadorian and Colombian borders, and there are strong indications that opium latex is now being moved by Colombian drug dealers through Ecuador into Colombia for processing into heroin. A recent seizure of 4,440 kilos of opium in Peru, nearly half a ton of opium, potentially 40 kilos of processed heroin, shows just how serious the growth of opium is becoming.

Taken as a whole, I believe, as do my colleagues in Peru, that this data indicate that enacting drastic cuts for Peruvian counternarcotic efforts at this time would seriously undermine Peru's coca eradication efforts in the long term and the ability of Peru to implement a similar opium eradication program.

So, Mr. Chairman, the government and, more importantly, the people of Peru have recognized the dangers of narcotics to their society. Public polls last year consistently found that Peruvians see narcotics as the second most serious problem in the country after the state of the economy. The people of Peru have taken a courageous stand against the drug traffickers; and like the people of Colombia, they are taking their country back from the criminals and terrorists. Now is not the time to reduce U.S. support for their efforts.

I would like to yield to my colleague from Arizona to hear his views about this funding.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I am happy to respond. I want to thank the gentleman for his stalwart efforts in fighting narcoterrorism in Latin America. I share the gentleman's concerns and thank him for raising this issue here today.

Since 2002, Peru's budget under ACI has decreased slightly each year, but the decrease in the 2006 request was for an astounding 16 percent. Therefore, the committee included language in the House report rejecting these cuts and directing that not less than $61 million be made available for eradication and interdiction for Peru and not less than $53 million shall be available for alternative development and institution-building in Peru.

When the committee proceeds to conference negotiations with the Senate later this summer or fall, I commit to the gentleman that we will push for this funding in the final agreement.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman. I really appreciate his hard work in this effort. We can count on the gentleman, I know.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word to engage the Chairman in a colloquy for the purpose of discussing the international narcotics control in methamphetamine.

Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago, Members of both sides of the aisle joined me in affirming this body's strong support for combating international methamphetamine trafficking. Today, I would like to thank the Chair and ranking members for their work on the foreign operations approps bill and for supporting the State Department's international narcotics control and law enforcement efforts above the FY 2005 level, particularly the $40 million in programs for Mexico.

As you know, the effects of international methamphetamine trafficking have invaded our communities and homes. SONDCP reported earlier this year that approximately two-thirds of meth production comes from large labs increasingly from Mexico. The trade also has origins in China, India, Germany, and the Czech Republic in the form of precursor manufacturing.

Recently, the Oregonian reported that only nine factories manufacture the bulk of the world's supply. We simply must get a handle on this situation in order to stop the sweep of this drug across this country and prevent it from infesting our areas.

I see mention in this bill report language on poppy cultivation and heroin trafficking. However, I do not see any explicit language on the importance of controlling the importation of meth precursors such as sudafedrine and efforts to train international customs officials to better control these imports.

Has the chairman considered addressing this issue in report language of this legislation?

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

Mr. BAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. The report language does not specifically raise the topic raised by the gentleman from Washington. I am certainly glad that he has taken this moment on the floor because of his interest in this issue, and I agree with him about the importance of our counternarcotics and law enforcement assistance in Mexico.

He correctly points out that the bill includes $40 million in international narcotics and law enforcement assistance for the country of Mexico. Part of this represents a restoration of funding to last year's level. The President had only requested $30 million for this purpose in this year's bill.

So I would be happy to work with the gentleman from Washington as we move forward with this bill with the Senate and in conference. We can work together to make sure that the issue of methamphetamine trafficking as it relates to Mexico is forthrightly addressed in the administration's request or in the final budget account. In representing a district right along the border, I understand fully the importance of this issue.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his leadership on this issue and his willingness to work together on this and appreciate the time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, 25 years ago this April, the breakaway British colony of Rhodesia emerged from years of guerilla conflict as the new nation of Zimbabwe. The United States and many other Western nations were hopeful that Zimbabwe's new President, Robert Mugabe, who came to prominence as a guerrilla leader in the 1970s, would moderate his Marxist views and build a better future for all Zimbabwe citizens.

□ 1445

Zimbabwe's people also had high hopes. The country had considerable natural wealth and, despite years of bitter warfare, many in the business community opted to remain, providing crucial economic stability. Zimbabwe's people were determined not to share in the fate of so many of their neighbors, who had also emerged from colonialism amid fanfare and high expectations.

Now, after a quarter century of tyrannical and frequently bizarre misrule by Mr. Mugabe, Zimbabwe is shattered. Its inflation rate is the highest in the world, unemployment estimates range up to 80 percent, with seven in 10 Zimbabweans living below the poverty line. Zimbabwe has one of Africa's highest HIV/AIDS infection rates, with more than a quarter of the adult population infected.

While the Mugabe regime has frequently resorted to Draconian internal security laws and plain old thuggery to suppress and divide the Zimbabwe opposition, Harare's intimidation tactics have taken an especially nasty turn in the last 3 months since the country held parliamentary elections at the end of March.

Those elections, which were won by Mugabe's ruling party, were fraudulent and widened the schism between Zimbabwe's urban masses, who tend to support the opposition, and rural voters, who make up the bulk of the ruling party supporters.

To punish his opponents, Mr. Mugabe's government has waged a 6-week campaign, revealingly called ''Operation Drive Out Trash,'' against opposition strongholds in Zimbabwe's cities. Tens of thousands of bewildered families have been forced into the open of the cold winter after police torched and bulldozed their shanty town homes on the flimsiest of pretexts. Street markets were also targeted and left smoldering in ruins.

Last week, the government, in a nation facing severe food shortages, moved on to vegetable gardens planted by the poor in vacant lots around Harare. Authorities claimed the gardens threatened the environment.

International human rights groups say at least 300,000 people have lost their homes by conservative estimates. The United Nations puts the figure as high as 1.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, I know that many of our colleagues share my anger and my sorrow at a state of affairs that is beginning to look eerily like Cambodia

after the Khmer Rouge came to power in 1975. I have no desire to cut U.S. aid that goes to help the people of Zimbabwe and their struggles against HIV/AIDS and one-party rule, but I feel that we cannot stand by and watch Zimbabwe become a failed State.

I am especially frustrated by the failure of the African Union and SADC, the Southern African Development Community, to confront the horrors going on in Zimbabwe. I hope that the AU will, at the weekend summit in Sirte, Libya, take a firm stand against the Mugabe regime's excesses, and I urge President Bush to make it clear at next week's G–8 meeting that South Africa's President Thabo Mbeki, who has refused to confront Mr. Mugabe and we hope Mr. Mbeki will take a strong and unequivocal stand against the Zimbabwe regime.

Will the chairman work with me and the chairman of the full Committee on International Relations and other interested Members in developing policies that continue to assist the Zimbabwe people while putting additional pressure on the Mugabe regime?

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

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I share my colleague's abhorrence regarding the rule in Zimbabwe, and he has outlined it, I think, extraordinarily well. Through his mismanagement and outright oppression, he has driven Zimbabwe, once known as the bread basket of southern Africa, into the greatest source of instability in the region. I want to make it clear that no funding, no funding from this bill will be used to support Mr. Mugabe's government.

The bill does include $15 million to help the people of Zimbabwe. I feel strongly that this assistance is critical and must be sustained. Over $11 million of this is for HIV/AIDS and other health programs. Most of the rest is used to help strengthen citizen groups and other organizations, so one day the people may have an effective voice against Mr. Mugabe and his cronies.

Democratic change must be driven by the people. As we have seen in Georgia and Ukraine, our democracy programs can be effective in supporting that process. And, the people of Zimbabwe must not feel that the international community has given up on them.

While I feel strongly that our assistance to the Zimbabwean people must be sustained, I will be happy to work with the gentleman to find ways to increase pressure on President Mugabe.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from California for raising this issue. I too am very concerned about the repressive and totalitarian turns that Zimbabwe has taken in recent years under Mr. Mugabe.

The decision to evict thousands of poor people from their homes and bulldoze their property is one of the worst forms of brutality Mr. Mugabe has used against his own people, who are already suffering from food shortages and economic stagnation. He is truly relentless in his effort to quash any opposition he perceives.

As the chairman has said, there is no U.S. funding for Mr. Mugabe's regime contained in the bill. However, at a time when Zimbabweans are suffering so much, I am loathe to place conditions or limitations on any assistance that might help the beleaguered people of the country and ease their isolation from the rest of the international community. I am particularly concerned about any limitations on HIV/AIDS programs which comprise the bulk of our assistance to Zimbabwe.

Once again, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for raising this issue, and I hope to work with him and the chairman as the bill progresses.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, last year I joined the chairman and the ranking member here on the floor to send a clear and, I thought, bipartisan message that it is not in the national interest, nor in the national security interest, of the United States to slash our development funding to our neighbors in our own front yard here in the Western Hemisphere.

Yet, I find myself here once again to send the same exact message. To be frank, it makes me question whether the administration was listening to what Congress said last year.

As the ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere and as a member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and as an American, I was outraged when the President, in his proposed fiscal year 2006 budget, slashed core development funding to Latin America by over 12 percent.

In his fiscal year 2005 budget, Latin America was the only region in the world, the only region in the world, to be cut in both total economic and development aid, and total narcotic and military aid. In his fiscal year 2006 budget, the President once again broke his pledge to the people of the Western Hemisphere. So much for looking southward, not as an afterthought, in U.S. foreign policy, an integral part of a forward-looking vision we were promised, this certainly is not it. So much for being an amigo, a friend of Latin America.

And, if we look below the broad 12 percent cuts, we find even more disturbing trends. Under the administration's proposed budget, basic education funding would be cut by over 20 percent and adult literacy funding would be cut by 28 percent, as compared to the fiscal year 2004 budget. In the midst of the debate on CAFTA, the President cuts development assistance funding to El Salvador by over 30 percent, and child survival and health funding to the Dominican Republic by over 18 percent. This will only exacerbate the gap between those who have and have not.

At a time when Latin American presidents are being toppled left and right by crowds frustrated with the failure of government to provide them with adequate education, housing, and health care; at a time when anti-Americanism is on the rise throughout the hemisphere; at a time when our hemisphere is growing smaller, when infectious diseases move throughout the hemisphere, when crime penetrates borders, when terrorists may use failed States as safe havens, these cuts are the wrong policy for the United States of America.

Let me be clear: a stable, safe, and prosperous neighborhood is in the national interest and national security interest of the United States. It is in the national interest of the United States to increase demand for U.S. goods in a region of 500 million people by enhancing economic development. It is in the national interest and national security interest of the United States to create greater economic growth in Latin America so that people will not seek to leave their homes out of despair. It is in the national interest and national security interest of the United States to increase stability in our hemisphere, because chaos and insecurity creates unwanted opportunity for terrorists and criminals throughout the region. That is the reality.

So I want to take this opportunity, as I express these frustrations and these criticisms, at the same time to commend the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ranking Member Lowey) for their bipartisan effort on this issue, particularly for including language which restores funding specifically to Central America directly in the bill text, since similar report language in our statements on the floor have been ignored in the past. I also hope our friends in the administration understand that the report language disagrees with the deep cuts to development assistance for the entire hemisphere.

I believe that we should restore all development funding that was cut to the hemisphere, not just to Central America. It has been static for so many years, and then we cut it in addition to that. It is woefully inadequate for the national interest and security interest of the United States.

But I do not believe that restoring funding to fiscal year 2005 levels is enough. In fact, that would be an overall decrease, even then, since there is no increase that accounts for inflation.

So I hope that we can move in a different direction. I know that Hispanic Americans in this country are increasingly paying attention to this issue. We are going to hear a lot of debate

about Central America and the Central America Free Trade Agreement at the same time we are eviscerating the very programs that can help create stability and opportunity within the hemisphere.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for raising this important issue today. I agree with him that ensuring a robust level of funding for all of Latin America, particularly in the Child Survival and Development Assistance account, serves U.S. national interests. We need to remember that the challenges of development are not only found halfway around the world, they exist in America's own backyard as well.

I want the gentleman to know that the chairman and I worked hard to restore cuts proposed to these two accounts in the President's budget request, and it would be my expectation that the funding in this bill is sufficient to ensure that at least the fiscal year 2005 levels would be achieved. That was certainly our intent in working to avoid the proposed cuts.

I thank the gentleman again for raising this very important issue.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point to the membership on both sides of the aisle. As has been the case with most appropriation bills this year, we are trying to work our way to a unanimous consent agreement that will limit time for discussion of amendments to this bill in such a way that we can finish this bill today.

Right now, the unanimous consent agreement which is being worked on would result, if you take into account the debate time plus the slippage time that occurs between each speech, we would probably be on the floor for about 6 to 6½ hours, not counting vote time. That means that we would be very lucky to finish this bill by 10 o'clock tonight.

We are being asked to do so earlier if possible so that we can finish the transportation bill by debating it on Wednesday and Thursday, trying to avoid a Friday session before the July Fourth break.

We are getting, frankly, crossed signals from Members. Some Members want to see to it that we get out by Thursday; other Members want to see the time on their amendments extended. We cannot accomplish both goals at the same time. So I ask Members to choose for themselves what they want, whether they want to be here Friday or whether they would like to reach a reasonably congenial agreement on time limits so that we can finish this bill at a reasonable hour tonight and finish the remaining appropriation bill by Thursday.

But this is really up to Members. We cannot control what Members offer on the floor; all we can do is deliver the bad news.

□ 1500

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Ms. SOLIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong support of the United Nations Population Fund. Regrettably, the underlying bill continues the Bush administration's policy of prohibiting the use of U.S. funds to pay for vital family planning services for millions of women around the world.

As we all know, UNFPA is the single largest global source of multilateral funding for maternal health and family planning programs. It works to provide support to over 150 countries by helping with the delivery of healthy babies, providing prenatal care and educating men and women about HIV and AIDS and other sexually transmitted diseases so people can live healthier lives.

This fund helps women and families in 30 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean and many more in Asia, Africa and Arab countries. In Nicaragua, Central America where my mother was born, families and poor women in particular struggle for survival. Infant mortality rates there are three times higher in the lowest income group and almost half of all Nicaraguan girls become pregnant by the age of 19. These infant mortality rates and teen pregnancy rates demonstrate the need for maternal health care and family planning services through this fund.

Also, the underlying bill continues the global gag rule which prohibits U.S. funding to any private or nongovernmental or multilateral organization that uses its own funds to directly or indirectly perform abortions abroad except in instances of rape and incest.

Restoring the UNFPA funding could prevent 2 million unintended pregnancies, nearly 800,000 abortions, 4,700 maternal deaths, and nearly 66,000 cases of serious maternal illnesses and more than 77,000 infant and child deaths.

We must work together to restore this funding and improve the lives of women all over the world.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I may not be able to be here during the debate on an amendment for veterans, and I wanted to speak to it. I want to offer a little history, but I think it is a balanced history from both sides. I remember when President Clinton's budget on the veterans, the VFW, the American Legion, Vietnam veterans, all rallied against the budget because it cut veterans health care. We worked with the other body, both of us on both sides of the aisle; and even some of those that voted with President Clinton on his budget voted with us to restore that health care by $1 billion.

We have increased veterans health care by 16 percent. But it is not enough. There is a shortfall and we must attend to it.

Historically, this body works with the other body in conference and I believe that some of those dollars will come forward, maybe not what we all want, but I believe some of those dollars will come together for veterans health care.

I remember in 1993 when my colleagues occupied the White House, the House and the Senate, veterans COLAs were cut. Military COLAs were cut. And there was a tax increase on the middle income.

In 1994, when Republicans took the majority, together with Republicans and Democrats, many of the same Democrats that voted with the President on his budget restored the military COLAs. We worked together to restore the veterans COLAs. And I would have to say probably on this side we will take a little more credit for restoring and reducing the tax on the middle class.

We have worked together, although we have not got what we want on concurrent receipts. For 40 years my colleagues on the other side did not address concurrent receipts. And we have. But at the same time, when it has been addressed under a Republican majority, then the Democrats have come forward and helped us.

Two different sessions we have passed bills on concurrent receipts together. And now there is a bipartisan commission going forward to see what direction we will write down.

I look at TRICARE for life, which we worked together on.

Subvention. I did not write the subvention bill, but my veterans in San Diego, California wrote that bill and put it forward, basically, where you can use Medicare dollars at VA health care.

The Filipino Veterans Equity Act. One of the gentlemen on the other side I very rarely vote with. But we worked together to restore the promise that was made to our Filipino veterans back during the MacArthur days, and we have worked together on that as well.

You do not have to look far to see where we come together, and I do not think any Member on either side of the aisle can look at another one and say, you do not care about veterans; you do not care about our military; you do not care about our Guard and Reserve. That is just not true.

Some people vote against military issues. Maybe their district has got extreme poverty and it is a way of funding their issues and their problems. It does not mean they do not care about the military itself.

The Republican budget looked at many years of substantial increases and almost every account, including veterans, including education and health care. But we decided to get our arms around the deficit.

Many of my colleagues on both sides talk about the deficit and the debt. If we, as Members, or you, Mr. Chairman, if you have got a checkbook and you spend more than you are going to take in, you are going to be bankrupt, and you are going to have less in the future to spend. For us to get our arms around this budget and still fund our priorities, I think we will when we come together with the other body.

A classic case of savings: the welfare reform bill passed many years ago which was lauded by President Clinton as one of the best bills to help people in this country. I also happen to agree with him.

But at the same time we have gone through these increases, we have been fighting the war on terror. If you look at Kadafi, his nuclear weapons are in the United States today. And even more important, we have found the black market that supported North Korea, Pakistan, India, and others. What kind of value is that to us, not just to our veterans, but our military and our homeland security?

I mentioned a minute ago Khalid Sheikh Mohammed and Hambali and Abu Halibi, the people that were actually planning raids on the United States. Now, those people are all made up of military that then become veterans, and we owe them a priority.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) to engage with me in a colloquy. And I take this opportunity to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for all of the fine work that she has done on this appropriation. And I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for the concern and care that he has shown for Africa and on this issue of HIV/AIDS over the years. And I do appreciate it.

But I rise today to talk about the fact that back in 2003, January 2003, the President made a commitment. If you recall in his State of the Union address, he said he was going to provide $15 billion over 5 years. That is $3 billion a year for global HIV/AIDS programs.

In the past year, the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or as it became known as PEPFAR, has been underfunded significantly. I do appreciate the work that you have done. But in fiscal year 2003, we only received $1.6 billion for global HIV/AIDS programs.

In fiscal year 2004, only $2.3 billion was provided for those programs. We have done better in 2005, receiving $2.9 billion.

So the total funding for the last 3 years is only $6.8 billion. Congress would have to appropriate $8.2 billion over the next 2 years to complete the commitment for $15 billion for the 5-year commitment.

Why do I push this? I push this because every year 3 million people die of AIDS. Every year 5 million people become infected with AIDS. Over 25 million are living with HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa and over 7 percent of the adults in sub-Saharan Africa are infected by this deadly virus.

So while I thank you, I guess the question I am asking is can we do more and can we even save this funding that is in the budget, given that one of your Members, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is talking about cutting it?

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

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and for her kind remarks about my support for HIV/AIDS funding. It is a commitment that I share with the gentlewoman from California. I believe very strongly in the importance of this. In fact, when I became chairman of this subcommittee, I said there were three primary things that I wanted to do, and this was one of them.

I think the gentlewoman is forgetting something, and that is there is funding in another appropriation bill for international AIDS, largely in CDC and NIH, in the Labor-HHS bill. When you add those amounts in, this year, we are at $3.2 billion total funding for HIV/AIDS and international programs, so we are above. If you take the $15 billion over 5 years that the President talked about, $3 billion would be a level funding. We started off below that. This year in the third year we are above it. We are not only on target to meet the $15 billion; we will be above that by the end of the fifth year. So we are moving clearly in that direction. And I believe that we are showing our commitment.

We are $131 million this year above the amount requested by the President. We are $502 million above the amount that was appropriated in 2005. That is just in our particular appropriation bill.

So I do share the gentlewoman's concerns about this, and I believe, however, that we are moving very strongly in that direction. And perhaps the gentlewoman from New York would like to add something.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I was referring to the PEPFAR portion of this. It was my understanding that the $15 billion commitment was above and beyond the other programs that you are alluding to. But I do appreciate that.

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentlewoman would yield just for one clarification, I think the gentlewoman is mistaken on that. The $15 billion was a total for all HIV/AIDS programs, not just the PEPFAR's program. So when you look at all the programs that were already under way in bilateral programs, things being done in NIH and CDC as well as in the new PEPFAR program, the global fund, all of that, we will be well above, I think we will be considerably above the $15 billion.

Ms. WATERS. Well, I understand that and I appreciate the gentleman correcting my thinking relative to where the money was to come from, because in the AIDS activist community, we were all under the impression that the PEPFAR fund alone would produce the $15 billion. But we will certainly take that information.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, continuing this colloquy, just so you have the numbers correct here as we see them here: in 2004, total appropriations for international AIDS programs was $2.4 billion. In 2005 it was $2.9 billion; and in 2006, the current year that we are funding, it is $3.2 billion. That gives you a total of $8.5 billion which means that we have $6.5 billion left to do in the next 2 years in order to reach the $15 billion. That would be slightly less, actually, than $3 billion a year to meet that. So I do believe we are on target.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I want to thank the gentlewoman for her commitment to combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic. She has been a strong and constant voice championing the cause of the poorest, and I agree with my colleague from California that more needs to be done to help address the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) discussed the funding in the bill. However, we all agree, and I know the chairman agrees, that more needs to be done. And the U.N. has estimated the total resources needed to combat HIV/AIDS around the world to be $15 billion per year. An additional $5 billion is needed to combat TB and malaria. And while I do not believe that the United States can or should fulfill all of the need on our own, the amount that we are currently contributing, about 15 percent of the total need, is not representative of what we are capable of doing.

□ 1515

So although the Chair has mentioned, and I would agree that we have done as much as we possibly can in this bill, I would like to work with him, you, and certainly with the Chair to make sure that we continue to increase our commitment to HIV/AIDS. I thank the gentlewoman for entering into this colloquy.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his commitment. The gentleman has demonstrated his commitment to this issue as much as anyone, more than most in the Congress of the United States. And I am going to review the numbers and

take his representation of how that funding has come together and have further discussions with the AIDS community. They are so concerned because since the President's commitment, over 7 million people have died. And also we will have an amendment coming up today from the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), and although I do not want to preempt the gentleman's presentation, I would hope the gentleman would join me in helping to put that down because that would undermine all the work that he has done.

Mr. KOLBE. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

My purpose in going through those numbers was simply to illustrate that we are meeting this commitment, not as the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) suggested, not that it is enough. There is not enough. We are not doing enough. But I think we are meeting the commitment we did make. This is a pandemic of absolutely unprecedented proportions, and we need to be doing a lot more in Africa, in the Caribbean, in Southeast Asia, now in countries like China and in Russia where it is growing with great rapidity. So there is a lot more that needs to be done. I thank the gentlewoman for highlighting that and providing the clarion call today for this country and for the AIDS community around the world to respond to this need in this pandemic.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $125,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *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, 2024, for the disbursement of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance and tied-aid grants obligated in fiscal years 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009: *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 Eastern 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, 2006.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. HOOLEY

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. HOOLEY:

Page 4, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 30, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) that I am prepared to accept this amendment.

I have concerns about a large cut in Ex-Im Bank expenses, but I certainly agree that the need in Mexico is very great to fight methamphetamines, and I certainly am prepared to accept this amendment.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's willingness to accept this amendment. I will be extremely brief.

Methamphetamine has traveled across this country. It is a huge problem. There are many children who are being referred to other people because of methamphetamine. In my State, 75 percent of the crime that is committed is because of methamphetamine.

We know that roughly 200 tons of pseudoephedrine is needed to produce all the meth sold in the United States. This pseudoephedrine from Mexico can produce half of our Nation's supply of this deadly drug. Again, we need to do everything we can to fight the spread of methamphetamine.

My amendment would provide the State Department with additional resources. With so much of meth in this country coming from Mexico, we must take action to stop the production and importation of this dangerous drug. As any cop in America will tell you, meth is destroying our communities. This should be one of the top foreign policy items on our bilateral agenda.

I thank the gentleman for accepting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to discuss foreign aid, American tax dollars that are going to the Palestinian Authority.

The problem the Palestinians have has nothing to do with money. The problem is a complete failure of their leadership. The United States has provided an average of $85 million a year per year since 1993. Not counting inflation, this comes to over a billion dollars. We have provided direct aid to the Palestinian Authority on three occasions, $36 million in 1994, $20 million in 2003, and another $20 million again in 2005.

Since 1975 we have given over $1.2 billion of assistance for the West Bank and the Gaza. Between 1994 and 1998 American taxpayers gave $65 million to expand economic opportunity in the Palestinian controlled areas and $85 million to help the Palestinian people establish their own government.

Before Congress decides to spend another $150 million, I would just like to know exactly what the Palestinian Authority has done with all of this money. With all of the money the United States has spent, with all of the international aid, the Palestinian people still live in squalor. After decades of aid and billions of dollars, it boggles the mind that there is no economic self-sufficiency and no improvement to the quality of life.

How is that possible? Because it is not about the money. It is about the Palestinian Authority failing to do what any responsible government would have done with several billion dollars, build infrastructure, improve health care, provide economic opportunities, improve education, and move the Palestinian people into the 21st century.

The money is not going into housing. Palestinians continue to live in wretched conditions in refugee camps with corrugated tin roofs and dilapidated ramshackle huts. The money is not going to schools. If it was, Palestinian children would not be rioting in the streets. They would be sitting in classrooms being trained as the next generation of doctors and engineers who will lead their people in the 21st century instead of being trained as terrorists and suicide bombers.

Palestinian education is little more than anti-Israel, anti-Semitic and anti-American rhetoric. The Palestinian Authority continues to be financially corrupt and morally bankrupt and that is why the Palestinian people turn to Hamas, the most dangerous terrorist organization on the planet, to get their basic needs met.

The problem is not a lack of money. The Palestinian leadership is either unable or unwilling to provide for basic needs of its people. It is either unwilling or unable to lift them out of poverty. It is either unwilling or unable to prepare them for statehood and self-sufficiency.

Until they disarm the terrorists and dismantle the terrorist organizations, Abu Mazen and the Palestinian leadership are sentencing their people to continued misery, continued hopelessness, continued anger and continued self-loathing. Year after year, generation after generation.

The problem is a lack of Palestinian leadership, a lack of vision, a lack of hope for the future, not a lack of money. Mr. Chairman, if our money has not been doing any good, why are we giving more? Until we get some answers we should not give another penny to the Palestinian Authority. As a matter of fact, we should be asking for a refund.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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 $42,274,000: *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, $20,276,000, 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 2006 and 2007: *Provided further*, That such sums shall remain available through fiscal year 2014 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 2006, and through fiscal year 2015 for the disbursement of direct and guaranteed loans obligated in fiscal year 2007: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation is authorized to undertake any program authorized by title IV of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in Iraq: *Provided further*, That funds made available pursuant to the authority of the previous proviso shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

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, $50,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

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, 2006, 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, $1,497,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *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: $347,000,000 for child survival and maternal health; $25,000,000 for vulnerable children; $350,000,000 for HIV/AIDS; $200,000,000 for other infectious diseases; and $375,000,000 for family planning/reproductive health, including in areas where population growth threatens biodiversity or endangered species: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, and in addition to funds allocated under the previous proviso, not less than $200,000,000 shall be made available 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 aggregate amount of funds made available to the Global Fund in fiscal year 2006 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 should 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 contribution 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 nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961: *Provided further*, That none of the funds 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 to the maximum extent feasible, taking into consideration cost, timely availability, and best health practices, funds appropriated in this Act or prior appropriations Acts 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 OFFERED BY MR. PITTS

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PITTS:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3057, AS REPORTED, OFFERED BY MR. PITTS OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 7, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $750,000,000)''.

Page 8, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $750,000,000)''.

Page 41, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $750,000,000)''.

Page 41, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $750,000,000)''.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I commend the chairman for his work on these complicated issues but I rise to raise an issue that we just heard about from the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and which we have heard about in past years from the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). I think the time has come to say enough is enough.

Since 1979 Egypt has been the second largest recipient of U.S. foreign assistance. Each year Egypt receives about $2 billion in economic and military aid. The money goes to support our strategic ally in the Middle East. But I think this money is largely misspent today on a nation that refuses change and excuses oppression.

The State Department tells us that Egyptian police routinely use torture to extract confessions and detain suspects without charge or trial. Egyptian authorities harass and imprison opposition party candidates on trumped up charges. The government is engaged in an unwarranted and dangerous military build-up. It oppresses religious minorities. It violates human rights. It obstructs democratic reforms. It censors the media. In fact, the media is controlled by the government there and they permit a lot of anti-Semitism and hate speech. It continues to arrest Christian converts who leave Islam. I could go on and on.

Egypt is an ally. But we can no longer afford to excuse oppression with the rhetoric of stability and the politics of fear.

We can no longer afford a wholesale subsidizing of such huge violators of basic human rights and basic freedoms.

My amendment would take some of the money that we spend to underwrite the Egyptian military and send it to programs that fight malaria by increasing USAID's Child Survival and Health Account for other infectious diseases, particularly malaria. Malaria kills as many as 3 million people each year. Up to 90 percent of these deaths occur in Africa and 90 percent are children under the age of 5. And though it is difficult to accurately assess the scale of the disease, the WHO estimates that 40 percent of the world's population is at risk of malaria, and there are between 350 and 500 million clinical cases every year.

Malaria disproportionately affects the poor. Fifty-eight percent of malaria deaths occur in the poorest 20 percent of the world's population, a higher percentage than for any other disease of major public health importance.

Reducing Egypt's military subsidy by $750 million will serve to send a strong message. Money sent to a nation, even a strong ally like Egypt, that refuses to make the necessary political, democratic and human rights reforms should be redirected to a place that better represents our values. In this case I can think of no better use for this funding than to treat and prevent malaria in Africa.

According to the CBO, this transfer will result in a savings of $400 million in FY 2006 in net outlays. A vote for this amendment is a vote for more responsible Federal spending. It is a vote for American values. It is a vote for kids. It is a vote against the status quo of Egypt's dictatorship.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I do rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Our assistance to Egypt has been longstanding and Egypt remains an important ally in the Middle East.

I would be among the first in this body to admit my concerns about Egypt's actions or sometimes their lack of actions when it comes to building programs of democracy in that country. And we have had a lot of discussion at both the subcommittee and full committee levels regarding ways to address these concerns.

I accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to fence $100 million of our economic assistance to Egypt and to put an earmark around those or to fence it so they could be used specifically for democracy and education programs. That is the first time that we have ever done that in this earmark for Egypt.

□ 1530

I think that sends a very strong message to Egypt. So this amendment, however well-intentioned, is not going to be constructive.

The relationship that we have with Egypt goes back 2 decades. We should not forget that prior to the Camp David agreement Egypt and Israel engaged in several wars and Egypt was an ally of the Soviet Union. That changed when President Sadat and Israeli Prime Minister Begin negotiated a peace agreement in 1978 with the help of the United States.

As part of that agreement and in an effort to bring stability and security to the region, the United States agreed to provide major economic and military assistance packages for both Israel and Egypt. Six years ago, the Committee on Appropriations under the leadership of my predecessor, former Congressman Sonny Callahan, initiated a policy to begin a phase-down of economic assistance for both Israel and Egypt. This resulted in a decision to phase out Israel's economic assistance by $120 million per year over 10 years, while increasing military assistance by $60 million. Egypt's economic assistance declines $40 million per year with no increase in military assistance.

The agreement reached 6 years ago modifying the Camp David funding formula was agreed to by the parties involved, including the administration. An amendment that would help to impose a new funding regime, a new funding formula on this money, this carefully balanced money that goes to the partners in the Camp David accords, not as a result of any discussion or negotiations with them, but by unilateral action by this body, would undo the delicate balance of economic and military assistance and would be diplomatically disastrous for the United States.

It would not be wise for Congress to disrupt any cooperation that exists between Israel and Egypt by cutting the military assistance to Egypt; and I can assure my colleagues, this is certainly not supported, though I do not speak for them, I feel quite certain in saying this is not supported by the Government of Israel.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman raises important issues. For the last several years, I have joined many of my colleagues in expressing concern about the composition of the U.S. 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 Egypt lacks economic prosperity, should we maintain such a high level of military aid even as economic assistance levels drop?

In Cairo last week, Secretary of State Rice announced a new commitment to human rights in the Arab world, imploring the Egyptian Government to hold free and transparent elections and end human rights abuses, and I was very pleased to hear her remarks. For too long, we have coddled undemocratic regimes, looking the other way as democracy and freedom have been stifled.

Despite President Mubarak's pronouncements to the contrary, Egypt is a hotbed neither of democratic reform nor respect for the rights of the opposition.

In late May, members of the Egyptian movement Kifaya, which means ''enough'' in Arabic, were beaten and dragged through the street by a government-organized mob. Police stood by as women were sexually assaulted; and in some cases, police actively participated in beating and arresting protesters. What radical agenda does Kifaya have? Free, fair, and transparent elections.

Or consider the case of Ayman Nour, leader of a small Egyptian opposition party, who was jailed on charges of faking signatures to form his party. In the weeks leading up to his arrest, Nour had called for a constitutional overhaul to restrain Mubarak's powers.

Nour spent 42 days in prison being beaten and held under inhumane conditions and is awaiting a trial that will start next week.

The Egyptian record on human rights is rivaled by its record on incitement in the media. Even as diplomatic relations between Israel and Egypt continue to progress, with the recent return of Egypt's ambassador to Israel, anti-Israel and anti-Semitic attacks in the official Egyptian media persist, with claims of Holocaust exaggeration, Zionist-Nazi collaboration, and anti-Semitic canards.

The amendment sends the message that the status quo is not okay. Baby steps toward political reform are unacceptable and will no longer be tolerated. Tepid efforts to stop smuggling along Egypt's border with Gaza are not enough. Disclaimers that the Egyptian press is free and cannot be influenced by the government will not be believed.

The tide in the Middle East is turning toward democracy and freedom, toward rights for women and educational opportunities for children. The tide is turning toward peace between Israel and its neighbors, toward economic cooperation and coexistence.

Egypt has been part of this turning tide. It was the first Arab country to make peace with Israel, and it is a needed partner in closing any peace deal between Israel and the Palestinians. But too often we have seen this powerful player in regional affairs place stumbling blocks in front of progress instead of easing the way.

We know Egypt is listening to our debate today. A lot is at stake. So the one message I have is this: great nations recognize when the changing times will leave them behind, and they stay ahead of the curve. I hope we will see the pace of reform quicken and the quality of cooperation increase in the coming weeks and months.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as this amendment is considered, I think it would be useful to remember what the committee has done with respect to our assistance to Egypt. As the gentleman from Arizona has indicated, the committee adopted an amendment offered by me which earmarked ESF funds for Egypt, doubling the amounts spent on democracy, governance, and human rights and providing additional funding for education within that account.

The amendment earmarked $50 million in ESF for democracy, governance, and human rights and $50 million for education. Both categories were projected at about $25 million in the administration request. So this essentially doubles that amount.

The reason for that has already been stated. We were looking for a way to send a clear signal to Egypt that we find their human rights record to be an embarrassment without thoroughly upsetting the administration's ability to continue to negotiate in that region, to try to move what is left of the peace process forward.

I have no idea whether the administration will be sufficiently serious about the issue. I have no idea whether or not they will be successful if they are serious, but I do just want to say one thing. I think every Member of this House would like to be able to vote for this amendment because we like where the money would be put; but we also have a responsibility, regardless of party, to try to see to it that in the attempt to send messages we do not blow things up in different regions of the world.

So I have absolutely no doubt that this amendment would produce a most irresponsible result in the region, but I think it will be interesting to note who supports the administration's position on this roll call and who does not. I intend, for one, to watch very carefully to see whether or not the leadership of the President's own party is going to be sticking with the President or not, and whether they do or not will send an interesting signal to those of us on this side of the aisle.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my colleague yielding.

Indeed, this issue was discussed extensively in our full committee. There is little doubt that the committee, in a totally nonpartisan way, is interested in sending this message; and we are laying the foundation here to reflect the reality that America is at its best when we express ourselves overseas in as close to a bipartisan way as possible.

I must compliment the gentleman for his own statement at this time, but also in the full committee. I think we laid the foundation to let people in the Middle East know how serious we are about a clear message, and this message will be carried forward to the conference with other body as well.

So I appreciate my colleague yielding.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if I could just say, I would be most curious to know what the administration is clearly saying on this subject. I have just received a message which indicates that the administration is pleased with the language in the committee bill. I hope that they continue to clarify their position to make clear exactly where they stand on this amendment. If they do not, they will be the ones who have to explain the consequences.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 87, noes 326, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 326]

AYES—87

Akin
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Bono
Bradley (NH)
Brown (OH)
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Cantor
Cardoza
Carson
Clay
Coble
Crowley
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Doggett
Duncan
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Gutknecht
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Herseth
Hinchey
Hostettler
Jenkins
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (RI)
King (IA)
Lantos
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Maloney
Matheson
McCollum (MN)
McHenry
Melancon
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Payne
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Rogers (AL)
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Souder
Stearns
Strickland
Tancredo
Tiberi
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Watson
Weiner

NOES—326

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott

McGovern
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Neal (MA)
Ney
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—20

Brown (SC)
Capito
Clyburn
Doolittle
Etheridge
Hayes
Higgins
Hunter
Kingston
Linder
McHugh
McIntyre
Michaud
Mollohan
Ortiz
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ross
Spratt
Wolf

□ 1605

Messrs. WAMP, MARSHALL, ROHRABACHER, OWENS, BUTTERFIELD, HYDE, THOMPSON of California, GREEN of Wisconsin, CULBERSON, and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. LoBIONDO, HEFLEY, GOODLATTE, UDALL of Colorado, UDALL of New Mexico, FRANKS of Arizona, CANTOR, FRANK of Massachusetts, BURTON of Indiana, SERRANO, Towns and Ms. McCOLLUM changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I was at Walter Reed Army Medical Center visiting Army Specialist Matt James, a constituent from Virginia's 10th District, who was wounded while serving in Iraq, and I missed the vote on rollcall 326.

Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "no" on rollcall 326, the Pitts amendment to H.R. 3057, Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006.

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. SIMPSON) 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. 3057) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3058, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 342 on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution and on any other votes arising in this series.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 263, nays 152, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 327]

YEAS—263

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capuano
Cardin
Carter
Clay
Cleaver
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Herger
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Honda
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Ney
Nunes
Oberstar
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Solis
Souder
Stark
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—152

Aderholt
Allen
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brown (OH)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Capps
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cuellar
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Doggett
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
English (PA)
Evans
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Foxx
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gingrey
Goode
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Hart
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herseth
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hulshof
Inslee
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kildee
Kind
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Latham
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Maloney
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McHenry
McKinney
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (NC)
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Osborne
Otter
Paul
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Ramstad
Reichert
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner

Taylor (MS)
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wu

NOT VOTING—18

Brown (SC)
Capito
Clyburn
Doolittle
Etheridge
Hayes
Higgins
Kingston
Linder
McHugh
McIntyre
Michaud
Mollohan
Ortiz
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ross
Spratt

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1623

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

Mr. LEVIN and Mr. HONDA changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 219, noes 193, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 328]

AYES—219

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—193

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Rangel
Reyes
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—21

Brown (SC)
Capito
Clyburn
Doolittle
Etheridge
Gingrey
Hayes
Higgins
Kingston
Lewis (KY)
Linder
McHugh
McIntyre
Michaud
Mollohan
Ortiz
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ross
Spratt
Stark

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1631

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I was absent from 12:00 p.m. until 7:00 p.m. on June 28, 2005. The reason for my absence was that I was required to testify before the Regional BRAC Commission hearing in Charlotte, North Carolina on behalf of my constituents. Regarding the votes that I missed please see below for the way that I would have voted if I had been present:

Vote No. 324—Rolled Suspension Vote on H.R. 458—Military Personnel Financial Services Protection Act. ''Yea.''

Vote No. 325—Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 3057—Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006. ''Yea.''

Vote No. 326—Pitts Amendment. ''Nay.''

Vote No. 327—Previous Question on the Rule for H.R. 3058—Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, The Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006. ''Yea.''

Vote No. 328—Adoption of the Rule for H.R. 3058—Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, The Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006. ''Yea.''

## LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3057, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 3057 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 341, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, 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;

the amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 4;

the amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 6, which shall be debatable for 60 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. SANDERS regarding Export-Import Bank loans for nuclear power plants in China, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

an amendment by Ms. LEE regarding excess property transfers to Haiti,

which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Ms. LEE regarding the U.S. fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria;

an amendment by Mr. SCHIFF regarding funding for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund;

an amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding funding for the Global HIV/AIDS Initiative;

an amendment by Mr. BEAUPREZ regarding assistance to countries that refuse to extradite certain individuals;

an amendment by Mr. DEAL of Georgia regarding assistance to countries that refuse to extradite certain individuals;

an amendment by Mr. BONILLA regarding an Inspector General at the Export-Import Bank;

an amendment by Mr. WEINER or Mr. FERGUSON regarding limiting funds for Saudi Arabia;

an amendment by Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire regarding limiting funds for Romania;

an amendment by Mr. OTTER regarding assistance to the Palestinian Authority;

an amendment by Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD regarding funding for pediatric HIV/AIDS centers;

an amendment by Mr. SIMPSON regarding Export-Import Bank loans to China;

an amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding Federal employee participation in overseas conferences;

an amendment by Ms. WATERS regarding sense of Congress on Haiti elections;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding employment of minors in the military of other countries;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding funding for Sudanese refugees in Chad;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding funding for water security improvements in Sub-Saharan Africa;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding funding for children in developing nations;

an amendment by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California regarding IMET funding for Vietnam;

an amendment by Mr. HEFLEY regarding an across-the-board cut;

an amendment by Mr. INSLEE regarding renewable energy;

an amendment by Mr. CAPUANO regarding Darfur;

and an amendment by Mr. KOLBE regarding funding levels.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, or by 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 except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; 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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I certainly will not object. I simply want to take this opportunity to explain to the House that what this timetable means is that if all of these amendments are indeed offered and debated to the full extent allowed under the unanimous consent request, we will be fortunate to be out of here by midnight tonight. That is how much time it will take, assuming that we have about one-third of these amendments that proceed to roll calls.

So for those Members who are asking what time we intend to get out tonight, I think it depends upon the zeal with which Members push forward with their amendments and with requiring recorded votes.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 341 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. 3057.

□ 1638

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. 3057) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) had been disposed of and the bill was open for amendment from page 6, line 20, through page 12, line 9.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, 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;

the amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 4;

the amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 6, which shall be debatable for 60 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. SANDERS regarding Export-Import Bank loans for nuclear power plants in China, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

an amendment by Ms. LEE regarding excess property transfers to Haiti, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Ms. LEE regarding the U.S. fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria;

an amendment by Mr. SCHIFF regarding funding for the Human Rights and Democracy Fund;

an amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding funding for the Global HIV/AIDS Initiative;

an amendment by Mr. BEAUPREZ regarding assistance to countries that refuse to extradite certain individuals;

an amendment by Mr. DEAL of Georgia regarding assistance to countries that refuse to extradite certain individuals;

an amendment by Mr. BONILLA regarding an Inspector General at the Export-Import Bank;

an amendment by Mr. WEINER or Mr. FERGUSON regarding limiting funds for Saudi Arabia;

an amendment by Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire regarding limiting funds for Romania;

an amendment by Mr. OTTER regarding assistance to the Palestinian Authority;

an amendment by Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD regarding funding for pediatric HIV/AIDS centers;

an amendment by Mr. SIMPSON regarding Export-Import Bank loans to China;

an amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding Federal employee participation in overseas conferences;

an amendment by Ms. WATERS regarding sense of Congress on Haiti elections;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding employment of minors in the military of other countries;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding funding for Sudanese refugees in Chad;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding funding for water security improvements in Sub-Saharan Africa;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding funding for children in developing nations;

an amendment by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California regarding IMET funding for Vietnam;

an amendment by Mr. HEFLEY regarding an across-the-board cut;

an amendment by Mr. INSLEE regarding renewable energy;

an amendment by Mr. CAPUANO regarding Darfur;

and an amendment by Mr. KOLBE regarding funding levels.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in the request or a designee, or by 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 except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LEE:

Page 12, after line 9, 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, $600,000,000 for such purpose, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That such amount is designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95 (109th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed will each control 5 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, I want to first start by thanking the chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), and our ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for their hard work on this bill and for making sure that it is a bipartisan bill. I also thank them for their very difficult work in establishing the priorities in terms of our foreign policy funding priorities. I know that every year they are given, I believe, an inadequate allocation and that they both wish that they could do more to meet our foreign assistance priorities.

But, Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to come to the floor today and offer this amendment because every year the global HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria pandemics kill over 6 million people combined. Just imagine that, over 6 million every year. That is more than the number of people who die from war, famine, terrorism or natural disasters each year combined. That is really quite mind-boggling. What is worse, each of these three diseases is completely, completely preventible and treatable; and in the case of tuberculosis and malaria, they can be completely cured.

So while we have begun to focus our efforts and funding with regard to this pandemic, I believe that we cannot afford to drag our feet and just let 6 million people die like this year after year. When do we draw the line and say enough is enough and we are going to escalate our efforts and put more resources into this pandemic?

We cannot in good conscience, Mr. Chairman, ignore this human tragedy that unfolds around us each and every day. We must act, and we must act in a bold fashion.

That is why today I am offering an amendment to add $600 million in emergency funding to the Global Fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria, adding to the $400 million already in the bill, and bringing our total contribution to $1 billion.

Unfortunately, last week $100 million was actually cut from the Global Fund in the Labor-HHS bill by this body. The Global Fund is one of the most powerful tools that we have as an international community to combat these three diseases. In fact, we created the framework for the Global Fund back in 2000 with the passage of the Global Aids and Tuberculosis Relief Act of 2000, which was signed into law by President Clinton.

□ 1645

And we provided the very first contribution in 2001 to help attract further financing from other donor nations.

Today, the Global Fund is a model for what the future of international development may look like. Designed strictly as a financing instrument, the Global Fund seeks to attract, manage, leverage, and disburse funding to support locally-driven strategies to combat AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. To date, the Global Fund has approved $3.4 billion for over 300 grants in 127 countries.

However, this year the Global Fund faces one of its biggest challenges: renewing over the $1.8 billion in existing grant agreements and approving upwards of $1 billion in new contracts, and this is still not enough. With the renewing of these contracts, there is just not enough money.

Without increased support from the United States and other donor nations, the fund may be forced to cut back on funding new grants and, worse, may be forced to cut crucial funding for people already on anti-retroviral therapy. Mr. Chairman, that would quite frankly just be totally disastrous.

Around the world, momentum is building in support of increased funding for the Global Fund and other international development initiatives. Two weeks ago, France announced it that would double its Global Fund contribution through 2007. Last week, Japan pledged $5 billion in new funding to help Africa combat AIDS, TB, and malaria, with a sizable contribution going to the Global Fund. And, with the upcoming G–8 summit taking place in Scotland next week, and with the British Prime Minister's focus on a huge new development initiative for Africa, the United States can and must do more. By providing $600 million in emergency funding, my amendment would take that first step.

Mr. Chairman, because my amendment is an emergency spending request, it will exceed the foreign operations subcommittee's 302(b) allocation and, therefore, I know that that is subject to a point of order. But I would hope that given the gravity of the pandemic, that my colleagues would consider this as a moral effort, strictly a moral effort to those who desperately need our help. Given the magnitude of the deaths and the pain and the suffering caused by HIV/AIDS, TB, and malaria, and the devastation that these diseases leave behind, I would ask the Chair to reject the point of order.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's commitment and passion, and I certainly share her commitment about the need to do something about HIV/AIDS. Nonetheless, Mr. Chairman, I must make a point of order against the amendment because it does propose 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 does include an emergency designation and, as such, it constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. LOWEY. I wish to be heard on the point of order.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for her leadership on the issue. I am pleased that the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and I were able to double the President's request for the Global Fund in the bill from $200 million to $400 million, and, as the gentlewoman probably knows, given the allocation, it was simply the best we could do.

However, I understand the urgency of the situation, and I look forward to working with the gentlewoman as we move the bill forward to continue to

meet our responsibilities, and then some, because of the tremendous, tremendous impact of HIV/AIDS in every part of this world.

The CHAIRMAN. 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.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read 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 subtitle A of title VI of chapter II, and chapter 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $1,460,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That $214,000,000 should be allocated for trade capacity building, of which at least $20,000,000 shall be made available for labor and environmental capacity building activities relating to the free trade agreement with the countries of Central America and the Dominican Republic: *Provided further*, That $365,000,000 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 $37,500, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used to monitor and provide oversight of such programs: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading should be made available for programs in sub-Saharan Africa to address sexual and gender-based violence: *Provided further*, That up to $15,000,000 should be made available for drinking water supply projects in east Africa.

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, $356,000,000, to remain available until expended of which $20,000,000 should be for famine prevention and relief.

TRANSITION INITIATIVES

For necessary expenses for international disaster rehabilitation and reconstruction assistance pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $50,000,000, 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 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 256 and 635 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, up to $21,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, 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 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: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any portion of which is to be guaranteed, of up to $700,000,000.

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 paragraph 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, $41,700,000.

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, $630,000,000, of which up to $25,000,000 may remain available until September 30, 2007: *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, $77,700,000, 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 of the amounts appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $55,800,000 may be made available for the purposes of implementing the Capital Security Cost Sharing Program: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development shall assess fair and reasonable rental payments for the use of space by employees of other United States Government agencies in buildings constructed using funds appropriated under this heading, and such rental payments shall be deposited into this account as an offsetting collection: *Provided further*, That the rental payments collected pursuant to the previous proviso and deposited as an offsetting collection shall be available for obligation only pursuant to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the assignment of United States Government employees or contractors to space in buildings constructed using funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the concurrence of the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

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, $36,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, 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

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapter 4 of part II, $2,558,525,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $240,000,000 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: *Provided further*, That not less than $495,000,000 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 of the funds made available under this heading for Egypt, not less than $50,000,000 shall be used for programs to improve and promote democracy, governance, and human rights and not less than $50,000,000 shall be used for education programs: *Provided further*, That with respect to the provision of assistance for Egypt for democracy and governance activities, the organizations implementing such assistance and the specific nature of that assistance shall not be subject to the prior approval by the Government of Egypt: *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 $20,000,000 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 $40,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading should be made available for assistance for Lebanon, of which not less than $6,000,000 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 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 not more than $225,000,000 of the funds made available for assistance for Afghanistan under this heading may be obligated for such assistance until the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations, that the Government of Afghanistan at both the national and local level, is cooperating fully with United States funded poppy eradication and interdiction efforts in Afghanistan: *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, $13,500,000, 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, 2007.

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, $357,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007, which shall be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries and section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, 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) The provisions of section 529 of this Act shall apply to funds appropriated under this heading: *Provided*, That 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.

(d) 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, $477,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That the provisions of such chapters shall apply to funds appropriated by this paragraph: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any provision of the Freedom Support Act of 1992, 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 $52,000,000 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.

(c)(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.

(d) 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, $19,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007.

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, $20,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *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

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), including the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for administrative purposes for use outside of the United States, $325,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to pay for abortions: *Provided further*, That the Director may transfer to the Foreign Currency Fluctuations Account,

as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 2515, an amount not to exceed $2,000,000: *Provided further,* That funds transferred pursuant to the previous proviso may not be derived from amounts made available for Peace Corps overseas operations.

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

For necessary expenses for the ''Millennium Challenge Corporation'', $1,750,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, up to $75,000,000 may be available for administrative expenses of the Millennium Challenge Corporation: *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 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.

Mr. KOLBE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 29, line 12, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to that section of the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $1,920,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $200,000,000 shall be made available for a United States Contribution to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Turberculosis 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 not more than $12,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

Mr. KING of Iowa. 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. KING of Iowa:

Page 29, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving a point of order, I ask for clarification as to which of the two amendments the gentleman is offering to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, to clarify that point of order, again, this is the amendment that takes $1 million out and puts $1 million back in, and it is for the purposes of raising the issue to discuss some of the things that I think we should be doing, particularly in Africa with regard to AIDS.

I recall back in this Chamber in January of 2003 when the President gave his State of the Union address. I had been reading the articles about ABC for AIDS prevention in Africa, and particularly and directly in Uganda, the ABC program being abstinence, being faithful, and, with a small ''c'' of using condoms in the event that abstinence and being faithful is not utilized.

As the President called for the $15 billion, 5-year AIDS initiative, I saw a standing ovation in here, and that standing ovation was started over in this region, and I want to give credit that it appeared to me to be a lot of the members of the Congressional Black Caucus that stood for that ovation. I stood too, because I had been getting a sense of how bad it was, and this is an international crisis. Millions of people are dying, and we do need to address this. We have a moral obligation to address the AIDS.

So I believe also in ABC. I continue to believe in abstinence, being faithful, and condoms as a last resort.

I went to Africa, Mr. Chairman, last July, late July and early August, visited Morocco, then Namibia, Botswana, and South Africa. In Morocco, the AIDS is less than 1 percent. When you get to Namibia and South Africa it is around 23 to 25 percent and, in Botswana, the HIV/AIDS infection rate is 38.8 percent. When you realize that four out of every 10 people you meet on the street are staring into a death sentence, you realize that something has to be done. Economically they have been destroyed.

As I went there, I asked the questions of the people who were implementing this multi-billion dollar policy, and it has become not an ABC policy, not a little ''c'' policy, it has been become a big ''C'' policy, a hand-out of condoms policy; when I asked, what you are doing to address the promiscuity, they told me, you do not change the culture. You cannot change the culture. Well, they are establishing a condom culture. If you can change it to a condom culture, you can promote the elimination of promiscuity and abstinence until marriage and monogamy after that.

The other question that I asked, and it is a question that Congress needs to ask is, are we saving more lives, or are we costing more lives, or are we putting people into maybe 30 more years of an active sex life, and are they going to use a condom right every time for the next 30 years, or are they going to infect more people. Some of the answers I got back was yes, condoms are the answer. They work 100 percent of the time according to the doctor from the CDC. I do not accept that. One of their other solutions was to delay the young ladies' sexual debut for perhaps another year, as if that made a statistical difference; and another one of those real good ideas was, and I say that facetiously, expedite the travel of trucks through the borders so that the prostitutes do not have as much opportunity to market themselves to the truck drivers. These were shallow approaches.

I think we need to put the drugs in there, the anti-retroviral drugs, we need to get the high-protein food there, and we need to keep people alive. I held some of those babies. We need to have a whole policy, one that is planned, an approach to save the maximum number of lives. One that puts the responsibility back on the individuals and changes the culture in that part of the world. That is the best thing we can do. I am asking that by next year we take a look at that, we get a report, and that is my initiative for this amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, though I am not in opposition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have looked at this amendment and I think the gentleman has made some very good points. It does not change in any substantive way the bill, and I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I withdraw my reservation, because I understand from the chairman that this does not have any substantive changes being made in the bill. But I certainly think that the content of the gentleman's amendment deserves greater discussion at another time. The chairman and I were also in Botswana, we were also in South Africa, we were in Tanzania as well, and there is progress being made in some parts of the country, and some not. It is a tremendous challenge, but I think

it is simplistic to say that only one area deserves further funding, and that the ABC approach may not be as successful as one may think.

So I think we need to discuss this further, and I would like to enter into dialogue with the gentleman at another time.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say I appreciate the chairman's work on this, and the comments that I have heard, and I look forward to that dialogue.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses to carry out section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $437,400,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2006, 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 $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 $33,484,000 may be available for administrative expenses.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's courtesy and extend my appreciation to the Chair and Ranking Member for the work they have done. I feel, considering the modest allocation that they were given, they have managed to fashion a solid piece of legislation.

Ironically, we only give 0.16 percent of our Gross National Product to development assistance, even though ironically, most Americans think we give far more.

I wanted to make four brief points, if I could. I wanted to thank them for earmarking $50,000 for increasing access to clean water in Africa. We are going forward tomorrow in the Committee on International Relations to explore opportunities to increase this in terms of authorization, but I think we are making an important step in the right direction.

I also appreciate the report language explaining concern over USAID's urban programs.

Mr. Chairman, the CIA's Outlook 2015 that looked at threats to the United States pointed out that the rapid urbanization in the developing world was one of the top seven security concerns for our country. For the first time in human history, a majority of people live in cities, with a million people a week moving to cities in the developing world, a million new people a week in areas that are greatly stressed.

□ 1700

Yet despite this, our country's USAID investment in urban programs is in continued decline. I appreciate the committee's spotlighting this, and I hope that we can work together to reverse this unfortunate trend.

I appreciate the colloquy that occurred earlier on the Global Environmental Facility, the GEF, that has funded over 1,000 projects in 160 countries. I think these innovative approaches to environmental challenges that can be replicated elsewhere and financed on a larger scale by non-GEF sources is very important.

I appreciate the difficulty. I know we have got a long way to go with this bill. I appreciate your efforts and would do anything I could because every dollar that we spend on GEF leverages 15 in funding from other sources in some of the most vulnerable areas of our country.

I appreciate your work. I appreciate the courtesy in permitting me to speak on this. I opted not to offer up amendments because, frankly, I could not see ways to repackage what you have done. I hope in the future we will have more leverage, more running room. But in the meantime, I appreciate your efforts; and I will support the bill.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague for his comments on the bill. And I hope the gentleman will work, certainly, with the chairman and myself and many of us who would support increased funding to address the critical issues that the gentleman mentions.

However, within this allocation, the gentleman knows it was very difficult; and I feel very strongly that in terms of our international policies, nothing is more important than expanding our support in the country for all the important initiatives included in this bill and increasing the dollars that we can spend on them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $734,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That in fiscal year 2006, 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 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 funds made available in this Act for demobilization/reintegration of members of foreign terrorist organizations in Colombia shall be subject to prior consultation with, and the regular notification procedures of, the Committees on Appropriations: *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 $19,015,000 may be available for administrative expenses of the Department of State, and not more than $7,800,000 may be available, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, for administrative expenses of the United States Agency for International Development.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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. MCGOVERN:

Page 31, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $100,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the McGovern-McCollum-Moore amendment to cut military aid to Colombia by $100 million.

For the past several years, we have debated Colombia policy here in the House. We are always being told that things are getting better; but they are not getting better, Mr. Chairman.

This policy has failed as an antidrug policy. It has failed as a human rights policy, and it has failed to have any impact whatsoever in reducing the availability, price or purity of drugs in the streets of America. In fact, illegal drugs are cheaper today than they were 6 years ago and $4 billion ago. And yet we will hear again today from supporters of Plan Colombia that everything is just rosy in Colombia, that we are winning the drug war, and respect for human rights is flourishing. Not true, Mr. Chairman.

It makes no difference whether you are looking at the United Nations numbers, the U.S. Office of National Drug Control Policy numbers, the Colombian National Police, or the CIA's. It all adds up to the same picture. Compared to where we were in 1999, right before the start of Plan Colombia, coca cultivation in Colombia has declined by only 7 percent and in the Andean region by only 9 percent. And the growing of coca did not decrease at all in the year 2004.

On top of that, the U.N. and the Colombian National Police agree that opium growing in Colombia did not decrease at all in 2004.

You have to twist yourself into a pretzel to make something good out of these numbers. You do that by deliberately ignoring where we were 6 years ago before Plan Colombia and picking and choosing bits and pieces of statistics, like starting your comparisons in 2003. Well, that only works because you ignore the huge increases in coca production in 2000, 2001, and 2002.

But, ultimately, the most damning numbers come from our own Department of Justice, which states that cocaine remains readily available on the streets of America, with wholesale and retail prices for cocaine and heroin at an all-time low and purity at or near historic highs.

Congress was told that we had to support Plan Colombia. We had to pour billions and billions of U.S. tax dollars into the Colombian military to stop the surge of drugs in America.

Well, what a waste of money it has been. Six years ago, the Rand Corporation told us that every dollar we spent trying to wipe out coca in remote areas of Colombia would be 23 times more effective if we spent it right here at home on drug treatment, prevention, and education and on local law enforcement.

But Congress chose to ignore that good advice; and here we are, 6 years and $4 billion later. Now, we may have thought our policy was tough on drugs, but it sure was not very smart.

So how about human rights? Is Colombia's human rights situation any better today? Colombia is still the most dangerous country in the world to be a trade union leader. It is the second most dangerous place to be a religious pastor or lay leader.

The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees calls the issue of Colombia's internally displaced a great humanitarian crisis second only to Sudan. Death threats against human rights defenders have increased significantly over the past 18 months.

Abuses by the Colombian military are on the rise and the armed forces commit crimes with impunity, with no high-level Colombian military officer ever having been successfully prosecuted for human rights crimes.

Even our own State Department has not been able to certify any human rights progress in Colombia since March because the situation is so untenable. But has Colombia tried to improve their human rights situation at all so that the State Department could have something, anything that will allow it to certify? Not at all.

But so much pressure from the Pentagon and the Colombian Government and even from some members of Congress is building on the State Department to go ahead and certify anyway that I hear that the State Department is likely to certify right after this Congress breaks for the Fourth of July recess.

But the most galling thing of all is this: while U.S. taxpayers have sent over $4 billion of their hard-earned money to Colombia over the past 6 years, the wealthy elites of Colombia have hardly contributed a dime. Out of a population of 42 million people, only 740,000 Colombians pay any income tax at all, and even that is a pitiful amount. So Colombians are not paying to fight their own war, and they are not paying to improve the conditions that keep so many of their own people in poverty.

It is time that this House stood up and decided to stop sending a blank check to Colombia, year after year. It is time that we demand real progress on human rights as a condition to our aid. It is time that we stop being a cheap date.

We are not walking away from Colombia. We are just sending a long overdue message that it is time to take a cold hard look at our current course and change it.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

(Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to any attempts to cut funding for the Andean Counterdrug Initiative. I think this is a time to reaffirm, not dismantle, our commitment to this program, to the people of Colombia and to American citizens who want illegal drugs off their streets.

How can we cut funding when we are seeing tremendous results in illegal crop eradication? Coca cultivation in Colombia has been reduced by 33 percent since 2002, and opium poppy cultivation dropped 52 percent in 2004 alone.

As a result of ACI funding, we have seen unprecedented levels of drug interdiction. And interdiction is what this amendment goes to, cutting $100 million.

From January to May of this year, 71.7 metric tons were seized from traffickers and destroyed before reaching our neighborhoods. Each week brings news of new seizures of cocaine and heroin, interdictions that are usually the result of U.S. supplied intelligence.

In fact, just last month, Colombian authorities seized 13.8 tons of cocaine worth about $350 million in what was one of the largest drug busts in history. Interdiction efforts like these would not be possible if the gentleman's amendment passes.

The Colombian Government is reestablishing state presence in areas where the country has lacked it for a century. Criminals who have remained at bay for years are being captured and extradited to the U.S. for prosecution. Colombia has extradited 271 Colombian citizens to the United States since August of 2002, mostly on narcotics related charges.

How do we justify pulling the plug on ACI funding when we are seeing record numbers of extraditions to the U.S. of FARC and drug cartel members?

In 2004 alone, more than 11,000 narcoterrorists were captured. More than 7,000 terrorists have deserted their organizations since President Uribe took office. Thousands of weapons and rounds of ammunition have been surrendered. The demobilization and reincorporation of illegal armed groups are part of a process that is providing stability to the entire region.

Colombians are finally beginning to feel safer. The murder rate dropped 14 percent in 2004. It has dropped 25 percent thus far this year.

Plan Colombia is working. I have been down there several times. I have seen firsthand just a month ago the devastation that drug production and trafficking has on that country. But to those who question our investment, I would ask them to visit Colombian soldiers who have lost their limbs or their eyesight or sustained permanent disabilities in their battle to return peace to their nation and keep drugs off American streets.

On a recent trip, we accompanied Colombian National Police to a manual eradication site in the mountains and helped them pull the coca crop from mountainous terrain that helicopters cannot reach. These are dedicated people giving up their lives to destroy the drug trade and rid their country of drugs and violence and prevent their illegal importation to the United States.

Our travels have shown how critical U.S. assistance is to their government.

Of course it is not all rosy and a lot of obstacles remain. But the Uribe administration is committed to this war.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, that now is the time not to turn our backs on the progress we are making. We cannot win this war on drug-supported terrorism without the proper tools.

I urge a ''no'' vote on the McGovern amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman I have been to Colombia several times and have gone well beyond the areas that the embassy has recommended me to go, and I assure the gentleman things are quite bad.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the cosponsor of this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the McGovern amendment to cut $100 million from Plan Colombia is about accountability and sending the message that cutting deals with narcotic traffickers who pose as politicians will not be tolerated by the American taxpayer.

After 6 years and over $400 billion, Plan Colombia is not reducing the supply of cocaine on our streets. But it has succeeded in making cocaine in America cheaper, more available, and more potent than ever before.

The drug war in Colombia is failing, failing the people of Colombia and the American taxpayer. Spending another $735 million to stay the wrong course and to continue to finance failure is irresponsible.

Let us send a message to Colombia that there are no more blank checks in the American taxpayers' checkbook.

Unfortunately, Plan Colombia has not made the Colombian people safer. More than 2 million Colombians have been forced to flee their homes. Ninety percent of the violent crime, murders, and rapes go unpunished. Human rights abuses among Colombia's military and law enforcement are all too common.

These are deeply disturbing trends: cheaper cocaine on American streets, millions of innocent people fleeing for their lives, lawlessness. This is hardly what we would call good governance.

In return for the narcoterrorism and corruption, the American taxpayers are being asked to reward the Colombian Government.

Now, a law passed by Colombia's congress and supported by President Uribe provides immunity and protection for right wing death squads and narcoterrorists.

For ending their participation in death squads, Colombia will be giving virtual immunity and protection from extradition to narcotraffickers, many who are sought by the United States.

One paramilitary death squad, the AUC, earns 70 percent of its income from narcotics trafficking. And the AUC is listed as an official terrorist organization by the U.S. Government.

The AUC's leader, Diego Murillo, is described as a brutal paramilitarian warlord who made a fortune in the drug trade. Under the plan for disarmament supported by our allies in Bogota, Murillo and terrorists like him who have committed massacres, kidnappings, drug trafficking, and murders of elected officials received freedom from prosecution. They get to keep their possession of riches.

In Colombia, if crime pays, if drug trafficking pays and terrorism pays, let us not have the American taxpayer pay for it. Congress needs to cut funding to Plan Colombia and save the American taxpayers $100 million and send a message that Colombia cannot protect narcoterrorists with our tax dollars.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the McGovern amendment.

□ 1715

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) may yield time on behalf of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS), a former FBI agent.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is well-intended but horribly misguided.

If you have spent time in Colombia, then you know that incredible progress is being made. This is absolutely the worst time to turn our backs on the great efforts that these folks are making against narco-terrorism, the FARC, the AUC, other militia groups. They are making progress.

Let me tell you a little bit about it. Kidnappings from 2002 to 2004 are down 52 percent. That is because they are on the offensive. President Uribe, 18 assassination attempts and maybe even climbing, has stood tall for democracy and said he will not tolerate the FARC, and the AUC, and narco-terrorist groups trying to control Colombia and sending death to America by cocaine paste and cocaine kilos and everything that we know is bad and killing our children in the streets of America.

We have a true partner who is willing to take and literally risk his life and his presidency to stop this in Colombia. This is the wrong time, Mr. Chairman.

Right now, we have three United States citizens hostage to the FARC. What message would we send to our friends in Colombia who are risking their lives to rescue these citizens from the FARC and other AUC groups by cutting this funding. This is not the time, Mr. Chairman.

This is the chance that we stand up and say, We are making progress. We will support an aggressive attitude toward narco-terrorist trafficking in not only Colombia, but all of Latin America and make that difference, not only for the three United States citizens that deserve our support, but every American who fights to keep drugs out of their family, out of their schools, out of their community.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and I compliment my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for this amendment, which is also co-sponsored by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

This amendment is important because it will force this body to look hard at American policy in Colombia. Since Congress began funding support in Colombia under the Plan Colombia in fiscal year 2000, we have spent approximately $4.5 billion in counterdrug and military support. That is a lot of money, a lot of money under any circumstance, and it is certainly at a time when we are fighting two wars elsewhere.

Given the magnitude of what we have spent and the fact that Plan Colombia will expire this year, we should be asking some really tough questions. Such as, is the amount of money spent in line with the benefits to the United States and to our national security, and are the Colombians doing enough to provide for their own security?

Funding for Colombia was initiated in order to stem the flow of drugs to our country. Yet, the United Nations figures show that decreases in cultivation in Colombia have been more than matched elsewhere in that region. There has been no decrease in drugs coming into the United States.

Funding was also intended to promote peace in Colombia. Certainly on that front, there is some progress. I believe President Uribe is trying to do the very right thing for his country, and we should support his efforts, which we are. The question is whether we should support it at the cost at a time when our military and our foreign aid dollars, our defense dollars are spread so thin across the globe.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, with this modest cut to overall aid to Colombia, should force a rethinking of our strategy in Colombia on whether we are achieving goals important to our own national security. At the same time, we need to ask whether the Colombians are doing all they can to provide for their own future security. Let me say that again. At the same time, we should ask whether the Colombians are doing all they can to provide for their own future security.

Their tax revenue continues to be at very low levels. Fewer than 750,000 Colombians contribute to their national defense through the tax base of a population of 42 million. Many Colombians with high school educations continue to avoid military service. The Colombians should be taking on more of a responsibility for their own effort. This amendment does not cut all funding for Colombia. Far from it. But it does send a clear signal that the American dollars invested are not yielding the results we need to.

At a time when we are engaged in two wars globally, we must even be more careful about where we are spending our resources, our dollars. We must urge our colleagues to support the amendment. I compliment the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I believe it would undermine the efforts to eradicate production and trafficking of cocaine in Colombia which is the primary source of narcotics entering our Nation.

We have heard some level of debate today about is the amount of cocaine down coming into the United States or not? But the real issue is, how much higher would it be if we did not have this program in place?

Operations under the Andean Counterdrug Initiative have been instrumental in reducing the cultivation of coca 33 percent since 2002 and cultivation of poppies 52 percent last year.

Are those exactly the percentages and which years do you compare? The point is not the exact numbers. The point is the trend and the trend is that there is less being grown because we know we are eradicating it every year. If we are eradicating it, if we are ripping this stuff out, if we are spraying it, if we are making sure it is not growing, that is that much more is not available. That seems pretty obvious on its face.

But this program is doing more to help improve the stability of the country of Colombia and the people who live there, particularly the realm of violent crime in Colombia. Kidnappings are down 34.5 percent in 2004 and almost 61 percent through May of this year. Homicides are down. Terrorist attacks are down. Internal displacement of people, also down by more than 50 percent. Over 200 Columbian narco-traffickers have been extradited to the United States in the last 2 years, including the leader of the Cali Cartel, an important FARC commander, and an AUC commander.

The point is we are taking these narco-traffickers out of the business of trafficking in narcotics, of bringing this terrible stuff to our borders and to our people. This is a good program that has done well and we need to continue to fund it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the gentleman who just spoke. Maybe he has not been reading the newspapers but the Colombian government just passed an amnesty law that gives narco-traffickers and the paramilitaries and people who have been guilty of crimes against humanity a get-out-of-jail-free card. That is one of the reasons why I am here today expressing my outrage.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the McGovern-McCollum-Moore amendment to H.R. 3057, the Foreign Operations bill for FY 2006. This amendment recognizes the critical problems that need to be addressed in Colombia.

Six years ago, Plan Colombia was implemented with the goal of reducing the flow of cocaine into the United States and to improve respect for human rights and the rule of law in Colombia. Based on the administration's own target indicators and data, the drug eradication effort in Colombia has been an across-the-board failure.

Plan Colombia has not significantly deterred coca cultivation, curbed cocaine availability, forced price increases or reduced cocaine use.

After 6 years and an investment of more than $4 billion in taxpayer dollars, net coca cultivation in Colombia is only 7 percent below the 1990 level. The total area under coca cultivation is estimated to be 36 percent higher than in 2000. Furthermore, reports indicate that cocaine remains readily available on the U.S. streets. The cocaine and heroine problems in the United States are more acute today than they were 6 years ago with lower prices, higher drug purity, and increased usage.

Tragically, what we have seen in the past 6 years is an increase of human rights abuses, including violations by the army, unchecked government collusion with abusive paramilitary forces and violence against trade union members. We cannot be seen as condoning the ongoing human rights abuses in Colombia. We must be seen the world over as defending human rights. By supporting the McGovern amendment, we would be sending a strong signal to the international community that, yes, the United States does indeed value human rights.

For genuine, lasting and positive changes in Colombia, the Colombian government and Colombian people must take an active role in initiating and sustaining those changes.

Plan Colombia is not working and given the inexcusable ongoing human rights violations and military abuses in Colombia, reducing the allocation for Plan Colombia by $100 million is not only the responsible thing to do with taxpayer dollars, it underscores our Nation's standing as an advocate of human rights. Vote yes on the McGovern amendment.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have heard what they are against. What are you for?

We have got a drug problem that we are trying to deal with. Plan Colombia, according to the statistical data that has been quoted time and time and time again by my colleagues, and I am quoting a little bit about that, shows that we are making progress. You are against it, but what are you for?

I mean, we have got a war against drugs and you are standing here saying, okay, let us not do this, let us not do this, but the drug problem exists so what do you want to do about it?

Unless you have got some constructive alternative, I think you ought to take a hard look at what has been talked about here today by the colleagues on our side of the aisle.

Now, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) sent out a ''Dear Colleague'' to my colleagues and I would like to read you a little bit about what is in his ''Dear Colleague.'' Aerial eradication has reduced coca cultivation by 33 percent. That is a plus. Reduced coca cultivation by 16 percent in the Andean region in 2003 and by an additional 5 percent in 2004. That is a plus.

Opium poppy cultivation in Colombia dropped 52 percent in 2004, the third straight year of decline. That is a plus. They have got alternative development programs. Since 2000 we have supported and they have supported more than 63,000 hectares of legal crops, some substitutions. That is a plus. Resulted in the manual eradication of 23,200 hectares of illicit crops, coca and opium. That is a plus.

Security. Police presence is extended to all 158 municipalities in Colombia that did not have any police protection before. That is a big plus.

Colombia has extradited 271 Colombian citizens to the U.S. since August of 2002, mostly on narcotics-related cases. Another plus.

Human rights. Kidnappings were down 34 percent in 2004 and a further 60.9 percent through May of this year. Another plus. Homicides are down 14.2 percent and another 22.3 percent through May of this year.

There were 137,315 newly displaced persons in 2004. That is a drop of 67.5 percent. Those are all pluses. Those are things that are being accomplished.

Yes, we still have problems. Yes, there are narcotics in America. Yes, they are coming into this country. But we are making progress. And what you folks want to do is stop the progress. So what is your alternative?

I do not hear anything but complaints. This is the wrong time and it is the wrong message to send to our allies, President Uribe, who is making progress down there. It is also the wrong signal to send to the surrounding countries that have to deal with this drug problem and the drug cartel.

I guess I am out of time, but I think the point has been made. Unless you have a constructive alternative, I suggest you do what the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) has suggested. Read his ''Dear Colleague.''

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

Mr. Chairman, let me respond to the gentleman. I believe we need a balanced policy. And some of us tried in the Committee on International Relations and in the Committee on Appropriations to make some modest changes in support of increased alternative development aid, but we were shut down on even those modest changes. Maybe the gentleman did not listen to my statistics.

Also, we have a critique of the letter of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) that he sent to Members of Congress, and I think the gentleman would be interested to know that some of the figures that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) has cited we believe are totally inaccurate.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

□ 1730

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am rising in support of this amendment partly because my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to include reasonable amendments that direct or redirect funds to help the most in need in Colombia. In fact, they refuse to move on to a more balanced policy on Colombia.

For example, Afro-Colombians comprise approximately 26 percent of Colombia's total population. Nevertheless, they are overrepresented amongst the poorest of the poor. Eighty-two percent of this disadvantaged minority lack even basic public services.

There are problems with this bill, and we should not continue to throw good money after bad. Plan Colombia had 5 or 6 years to prove itself, and what it has proven is that the plan has caused more harm than good. Eighty percent of U.S. assistance to Colombia goes to the military and police. We need a more balanced policy on Colombia.

Plan Colombia's aerial fumigation strategy has forced coca growers not to stop growing but to move their coca crops further west and north to Afro-Colombian and indigenous territories. Fumigation is ruining food crops, animals and livestock, while threatening the health and environment of Afro-Colombians, especially in the department of Choco.

In 2002, only two municipalities in the department of Choco registered some sort of coca crops. Today, all 31 municipalities in that region have coca crops. Plan Colombia is destroying the traditional cultures of Afro-Colombians and their communities while providing little or no alternative development aid.

Furthermore, a primary U.S. objective for Plan Colombia has been to prevent the flow of illegal drugs into the United States. In my district in southeastern Queens, New York, and on the streets of the United States of America, cocaine remains available today and at lower prices than ever and the levels of use are stable, if not rising.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I ask my colleagues in conference to support alternative development and social programs that work and can make our policy in Colombia more balanced and thereby giving the American people a better bang for their buck in Colombia.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), a distinguished member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will be defeated later on today because it would snatch defeat from the jaws of victory in Colombia. We see a close connection between narcotics and terrorism.

The people of Colombia saw that. When the Medellin cartel killed three major candidates for president, the people elected the last candidate left who wanted to fight the narcoterrorists. In their last election, the people of Colombia chose the candidate who took the hardest line against narcoterrorists, and after September 11, who could blame them?

President Uribe of Colombia has asked for our help, and so far, what has our assistance accomplished? Coca growing is down, kidnappings are down, terrorist attacks are down, opium growing is down, several hundred drug kingpins extradited to the United States, and desertions among terrorist groups are up.

In a recent poll, 73 percent of Colombians said they supported the U.S. assistance under Plan Colombia. We have seen narcoterrorists in Colombia offer training to other terror groups in other countries; and with these international links, we see Colombian drugs not only poisoning our kids but the profits from their sale are now supporting international terror.

If we give up on Colombia, a new narcoterrorist state will rise in our hemisphere, and when a narco-state took power in 1991 in Panama, it took the direct action of the U.S. military to restore democracy.

I think we should not give up on democracy in Colombia. We should listen to the voices of their people through their elected president and make sure that he and his team remain in power and that this stays as a Colombian struggle and is not surrendered to become a full blown American one.

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

Let me just respond to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, if I can, by saying, if the Colombian people support this policy so much, then why is it that only 740,000 Colombians pay income tax in a country of 42 million people? That is a fact. That was stated in the Council on Foreign Relations report that came out last year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I would only ask my colleagues on this side of the aisle, where have all the conservatives gone? Where are the fiscal conservatives? A decade or so ago, the conservatives on this side of the aisle voted against all foreign aid. Now they are the champion of foreign aid.

We are running a national debt increase right now of nearly $600 billion a year, and the gentleman from this side of the aisle suggests that maybe we can spend $100 million less out of a budget that is over $20.3 billion, suggesting we could save $100 million, which sounds like pretty good sense, and all we hear are complaints about why we need this program.

One gentleman asked the question, what are we for if we are against this program down in Colombia, Plan Colombia? Well, I'll tell my colleagues what I am for. I am for the American taxpayer, and I will tell my colleagues one thing. I will bet them I am right on this. I will bet my colleagues, on either side of the aisle ever goes home and ever puts it into their campaign brochure and say, you know what, I voted $20 billion for foreign aid; and I know nobody over here will go home and brag about $100 million that they were able to vote against cutting from this side of the aisle. They will not do it.

I was here in 2000 when this debate was going on and strongly opposed it for various reasons, but I remember the pretext for Plan Colombia. The pretext was the drug war and this is what we have heard about today. The evidence is very flimsy. If there was any success on the drug war, production would be down and prices would be up. Production is up and prices are down, and that is an economic absolute.

So there has been nothing accomplished. There has been more production in other countries in the Andes, but the pretext there was only the drugs, but I remember so clearly in the year 2000 who lobbied for this bill.

Does anybody remember oil companies coming here to get their oil pipelines protected, and we still protect them? This is a little private army that we sent down there. We have 800 troops and advisers in Colombia and spending these huge sums of money.

Who else lobbied for Plan Colombia? Do my colleagues remember the debate on who would get to sell the helicopters? Would they be Black Hawks or Hueys?

Then we wonder where the lobby is from. It is not from the American people. I will bet my colleagues nobody wrote to anybody on this side and said please make sure you spend this $100 million dollars; this would be tragic if you would not spend it because it is doing so much good. That does not happen. It is the lobbying behind the scenes of the special interests whose interests are served by us being down there. It is part of this military industrial complex which exists, and I do not

believe it has had one ounce of success. I think it is a complete waste of money; and besides, just incidentally it is unconstitutional for us to do this.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Arizona for the time.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. I do not doubt the sincerity of proponents of the amendment on either side of the aisle. Many compelling questions have been asked.

In the final analysis, it is my firmly held conviction that what many maintain would be re-evaluation, that this immediate reduction would send the signal of retreat.

We have heard criticisms of the taxation policies of Colombia. We have heard criticisms based on different political ideologies in the United States; but in the final analysis, as we conduct a worldwide war on terror, I would remind all in this House we are not just talking about Islamic fascism. We are talking about the rise of narcoterror.

For that reason I oppose the amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I want to commend the gentleman for offering this amendment, and I certainly agree with his intent, which is to minimize United States investment in failed counternarcotics programs.

For far too long, we have supported policies and funded programs in Colombia that simply do not work. Our counternarcotics programs in Colombia have long been an inefficient use of taxpayer dollars.

The data we have from the National Drug Intelligence Center at the Department of Justice with respect to the success of this program is negative. It shows that the program has not decreased the amount of cocaine coming into the United States. In fact, the quantity of cocaine on our streets is increasing, and the price is decreasing, making it all the more affordable and attractive to our youth.

The billions that we have put into Plan Colombia have not been effective in substantially decreasing the amount of coca being grown in Colombia either. After spending over $4 billion and spending nearly 6 years, have we even cut coca production in half? No. We have decreased by less than 7 percent the number of hectares of coca in Colombia.

It is becoming even more difficult and costly to eliminate each hectare of coca. The U.N., whose own surveys found a small decrease in Colombian coca in 2004, found that for every acre of coca reduced in 2004, 22.8 acres of coca had to be sprayed. This ratio has never been so high.

U.N. statistics indicate that the overall amount of coca grown in the Andes increased by 3 percent last year, led by substantial increases in Bolivia, 17 percent; Peru, 14 percent.

Finally, the failure of this program to solve the problem of coca production is all the more compounded by the heavy toll it imposes on the rural communities in Colombia that are already suffering from armed conflict. Continuing to fund it at such a high level is simply bad policy.

I am troubled by the fact that this amendment cuts $100 million from the foreign operations bill without adding it back for one of the many programs that could use it. The allocation with which the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and I had to contend is already $2.5 billion short of the President's request; and with the increased needs we face around the world, to combat the HIV/AIDS virus and other diseases, fight hunger, improve child health and education, and promote peace and security in the Middle East and elsewhere around the globe, I am concerned that this amendment further reduces our funding in the bill.

Again, I support the gentleman for raising these important issues, and I thank him for all the time he has spent really understanding the issue, working on the issue and trying to stress how useless this funding really is in making a dent in the coca operation.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), who is a member of the Task Force on Drugs.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I also had the privilege of chairing the Criminal Justice Drug Policy Subcommittee before the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and inherited those responsibilities, actually, from the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House. All during that era, the Clinton era, we saw really the beginning of this incredible problem in Colombia.

During the 8 years of the Clinton administration, the other side of the aisle, even some of the folks that have spoken today, did everything they could to keep resources from going to Colombia; and when you do not have the resources to combat narcoterrorism, what happens?

I have a little map here, and it shows where the drugs come from. This is not a guessing game. We know from chemical analysis even the fields the cocaine and heroin came from.

So they blocked helicopters, they blocked assistance, they blocked eradication, interdiction, anything they could, because they did not want to harm the hair on a single leftist terrorist in that region.

□ 1745

But we are now trying to get a handle on that with the efforts of Speaker HASTERT, with this President.

They said Plan Colombia has not worked, when kidnappings are down a third in Colombia; they say it has not worked when murder is down a third; it has not worked when pipeline attacks from 2000, which were at 177 that year, to 20 last year. It has not worked?

Human rights? My colleague is concerned about human rights? Tens of thousands of people died, judges, legislators, thousands of police were slaughtered, and their human rights were not considered while you blocked aid and assistance.

We have a President of the United States who has a firm policy, we have a Speaker who has developed Plan Colombia and we are initiating that. We have success in that land because we have a President who is also getting the resources to another president, in Colombia, who has a tough stance against narco-terrorism.

The drugs in the United States are still killing our young people. We had over 26,000 people die, the silent deaths on our street. Our biggest social problem. This is where our few dollars and resources need to go, and that is where the drugs are, at their source, and we can eradicate them.

Talk to one mother or father who has had a child die of a drug overdose and you will see the worth of what we are doing here today. We know where these drugs are. We can eradicate them. And we can do that continuing Plan Colombia in an effective manner and not having the legs cut out from under us when we have made such great progress.

I urge defeat of the McGovern amendment. I urge defeat of attempts to again thwart the effort to stop drugs coming in across our borders.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this important issue.

I rise in strong support of the McGovern-McCollum-Moore amendment to cut $100 million from the Andean counterdrug initiative account, which, by the way, still leaves $634.5 million in the account. I am not against helping create a more peaceful nation for the people of Colombia, and of course we want to reduce the flow of drugs to this country and the use of them by Americans, but I do not support throwing good money after bad in the quagmire that is our Colombia policy.

I wanted to read from an article today in the L.A. Times written by Sonni Efron, the headline being ''Drug War Fails to Dent U.S. Supply.''

''The Bush administration and congressional allies are gearing up to renew a plan for drug eradication in Latin America despite some grim news. The $5.4 billion spent on the plan since 2000 has made no dent in the availability of cocaine on American streets, and prices are at all-time lows. United Nations figures released this month show that coca cultivation in the Andean region increased by 2 percent in

2004 as declines in Colombia were swamped by massive increases in Peru and Bolivia. And the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service said last week that the antidrug effort has had 'no effect' on the price or purity of drugs in the United States. The findings have fueled skepticism in Congress where conservative groups have joined efforts to lobby against continued funding.''

Let me underscore that: ''Conservative groups have joined efforts to lobby against continued funding. The National Taxpayers Union calls the antidrug program a 'boondoggle.'''' That is from The L.A. Times.

And the policy of fumigation is not only ineffective, but it is inhumane. The majority of small farm families whose crops are sprayed do not receive assistance to transition to food crops from either the Colombian or the U.S. Governments. They are given no incentive to change their behavior, no alternative to make a living that will help them survive.

There are areas in Colombia where massive spraying is occurring and little or no development aid is provided. Even legal crops in those areas are killed. They are subsistence crops, and there is nothing given to replace that loss for those families. This is inhumane and it is also remarkably ineffective. Sixty-two percent of the coca fields detected by the U.N. in Colombia in 2004 were new; evidence that fumigation, in the absence of alternatives, is not moving farmers away from planting coca.

If we want a long-term and effective plan, it has to be a new one. It is not enough to send a report to our constituents each year and detail how much we are spending to go fight drugs. And it is not a real success when we reduce coca in one country while cultivation soars in another. We need to show them results, and this plan has provided none.

So if you truly care, you are going to support the McGovern-McCollum-Moore amendment and send a message that we need a new approach.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I find this debate most interesting, especially the statement made by the previous speaker, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA). It has been my experience on this floor through the years that the most baffling moments come not when we are talking about things we do not know, but when we are talking about things that we do know that ''ain't'' so.

I think the gentleman from Florida just illustrated what I mean. He stood here on the floor and suggested that somehow those of us on this side of the aisle who are skeptical about Plan Colombia had blocked all kinds of initiatives. He also suggested that this plan was a plan which had been forged into a successful program by President Bush and Speaker HASTERT.

Well, the fact is that I remember when Plan Colombia was first pushed through the Committee on Appropriations, because I opposed it vehemently. I thought, based on my experience in chairing the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, for 10 years, that our drug interdiction programs were largely a flop. I know that I had officials from the Reagan administration tell me privately that we had intercepted less than 5 percent of the drugs that came across the southern borders from not just Mexico, but from elsewhere in this hemisphere.

I would ask what initiatives did we block? I wish we had blocked some, but what I remember is getting run over. And I was not run over by President Bush and Speaker HASTERT, I was run over by President Clinton and Speaker HASTERT. They were the two who pushed it down the throats of the Committee on Appropriations, each trying to compete with each other to show who was most zealous in their resistance to the drug problem.

So I would simply say I do not mind each of us rewriting a little history, if it is on purpose, but I hate to see history being rewritten by accident. That gets to be more than a little dangerous.

So I would simply suggest that on the merits, this program has had a long time to prove itself. In the end, the only way it could succeed is if you had a Colombian society that was determined to make it succeed, and that society has not been willing to do that. They have not been able to muster the forces necessary to deal with the problem effectively.

So we are left to ask what is ordinarily spoken of as a good conservative question, and that question would be: No matter how desirable this program is, does it work? And the answer is clear. This program has, at best, had only marginal success, very hard to see certainly, night or day. So I would simply suggest that with all of our challenges in the foreign aid area, even if we confine those challenges just to the Western Hemisphere, there are a lot of other places where we could more productively spend this money than we are in this initiative.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me this time, and first of all, I want to commend him and the ranking member for bringing this bill to the floor and for all their hard work. It is a very difficult bill, as we can see by the debate here.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). The Andean Counterdrug Initiative is an important antidrug effort that supports Colombia and the countries in the Andean region. After years of steady increases, cocaine and heroin production in the Andean Region is decreasing. For the third straight year, from 2002 to 2004, the ACI has helped reduce coca production by 33 percent in Colombia and 21 percent in the region. Opium poppy cultivation in Colombia dropped 52 percent in the year 2004 alone. The total land under coca cultivation in Colombia decreased 7 percent in 2004, the fourth consecutive annual decrease.

The United States and our allies disrupted the transport of 248 metric tons of cocaine headed through the transit zone before it could reach U.S. shores in 2004 alone. The ACI has helped streamline extradition procedures resulting in over 250 extraditions to the U.S. since August of 2002, including FARC leader Simon Trinidad and ex-Cali cartel leaders.

Over 60,000 families have received alternative crop development assistance, and almost 1,000 infrastructure projects have been built using ACI funds. Even as detractors cite individual instances of human rights' abuses, overall kidnappings dropped by almost 35 percent in 2004 and fell another 60 percent through May of this year. Homicides are down 14 percent in 2004 and dropped another 22 percent since May of this year.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the Members to strongly oppose this amendment which would very much harm our ability to fight this scourge in our country.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise with a great deal of concern about Colombia and in support of this amendment, because I think the facts I have heard here on the floor just misconstrue what is really going on down there.

We need to wake up and smell the coffee. The debate here should be about improving sales of Colombian coffee, not about the increased sales of Colombian coca. What was Plan Colombia has now become Plan K Street. What was supposed to help Colombians help themselves has now become Help American Corporations Stay in Business in Colombia. What should be money to eradicate the poverty that drives drugs in the first place has become a program to give Dyna Corporation $80 million, to give 16 U.S. contractors money to maintain Colombian helicopters and money to U.S. firms to own and fly the eradication aircraft. This is not about Plan Colombia anymore. This is about Plan K Street. Lockheed Martin got $9 million.

Congress Members here travel to Colombia almost monthly on what I have now called the Narcotourism Tour that American Congressmen like to have. They come home thinking that they have seen the problems in Colombia and that all we need to do is give more money. I am all for a real Plan Colombia, a plan that invests in Colombia, that lets Colombians do the jobs that Americans should be working themselves out of. For 5 years the same companies are doing the same things they have been doing; 5 years without

the Colombians owning those companies, without the Colombians doing that work.

It is time that we make a statement. Cut this $100 million, put it into alternative development, do something that helps Colombians help themselves so that we do not have to keep American corporations on the handout from American Congress Members to keep their businesses going in the guise of trying to eradicate drugs in Colombia. It is time to stop.

Mr. Chairman, it doesn't take an inside-the-beltway policy work to understand that the current policy towards Colombia is broken.

My district on the Central Coast of California is filled with compassionate people who closely follow US foreign policy towards our southern neighbors and they recognize that our current policy towards Colombia is broken.

They are well aware that only eradicating a farmer's crops and not providing for alternative livelihoods is not a sustainable solution to the coca growing problem in the Andean region.

US assistance to Colombia is reflective of this flawed policy: 80 percent of funds have gone for military assistance and been eaten up by coca eradication.

Only 20 percent of funds have gone to social and economic programs. These programs are what build local economies and communities and provide alternatives to coca production.

This distribution of assistance is not a recipe for permanent coca eradication. It's not a recipe for peace. It's a recipe for disaster.

And that disaster is reflected in the Administration's own figures for coca production. The White House Office of National Drug Control Policy statistics for 2004 show that, despite a record number of crops sprayed in Colombia, data shows that coca production remains "statistically unchanged" and the US street prices of cocaine and heroin are at or near all-time lows.

I'd like to quote a constituent and friend of mine, Bert Muhly, who has traveled extensively throughout Latin America for decades and has been a tireless advocate for the downtrodden throughout the Western Hemisphere.

Bert correctly states:

"Plan Colombia must be abandoned in favor of a Plan for Peace where the billions our government spends on shoring up the military establishment of countries of Latin America that are used to suppress the hopes of their people is diverted to programs that will alleviate poverty and give hope to the people within those countries."

I was a Peace Corps Volunteer in Colombia in the 1960s and have visited Colombia many times since then. I have seen first hand that Colombians are resilient and bright people who desperately want peace.

Yet U.S. assistance and the Colombian government have not laid the ground work for peace.

The Colombian government has failed to focus on creating a rural development strategy to address the underlying causes of poverty.

With such a lop-sided policy that fails to invest in the innate capabilities of rural Colombians so that they can build a life for themselves that doesn't involve coca production, I am sad that my adopted country will remain stuck in this quagmire of civil war.

House rules prevent the $100 million from the McGovern-Moore-McCollum amendment to be reallocated to alternative development, which would be my preference. Absent that option, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in support of this amendment which is a step in the right direction to encourage reform of U.S. policy in Colombia.

□ 1800

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and also an individual who has spent a great deal of time in Central America and Latin America studying this issue.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and who I have great respect for, but disagree on some things, particularly this amendment. This amendment, I believe, would cut the rug out from under our democratically elected ally in Colombia.

Let us look at the facts. The facts are that Colombia is a democracy. The facts are that Colombia is our hemisphere's second oldest continuous democracy. The facts are that 90 percent of the cocaine and 50 percent of the heroin that comes into my home State of Illinois comes from the Andean region, particularly Colombia. The facts tell us that Colombian drugs in 2001 killed more Americans than the attack on the World Trade Center. The facts tell us that the criminal sale of narcotrafficking of drugs supports almost 30,000 terrorists, terrorists who are affiliated with two leftist terrorist groups, FARC and the ELN, and one right wing terrorist group, AUC.

I would note that these are terrorist groups that enslave child soldiers, sending children into battle against the democratically elected government of Colombia.

Today, 65 elected officials, judges, and a presidential candidate are held hostage. They are political prisoners, held by the FARC. These 65 political prisoners are the only political prisoners held in our hemisphere outside of Cuba, that brutal dictatorship.

We have a partner in President Uribe, and Colombia is making progress under Plan Colombia. Homicides are down, kidnappings are down, terror attacks are down, and 250 narcoterrorists and drug kingpins have been extradited to the United States for trial. Again, Plan Colombia is working.

When it comes to intercepting drugs this past year, 475 tons of drugs were eradicated or seized in 2004. I would note just this past week the Colombian Government was successful. In one drug bust, they seized 15 tons of street-quality cocaine, worth $400 million in Boston or Chicago. Again, progress is being made. Clearly, by voting "yes" for this amendment, Members pull the rug out from under the democratically elected government of Colombia.

I have worked with many friends on both sides of the aisle. We have talked about finding alternative crops to help the farmers in Colombia make money and have a profitable alternative to becoming cocaleros, and I am proud that through USAID our investments are paying off. Today, thousands of former cocaleros are now cafeteros, growing coffee for a more profitable market as coffee prices have increased in the past year. As part of that commitment, the United States joined the International Coffee Organization. Since then, prices have gone up $1 a pound.

Mr. Chairman, vote "no" on the McGovern amendment.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let us look at the facts. The facts are that illegal drugs are cheaper today than they were 6 years ago and $4 billion ago when we began Plan Colombia. The facts are that the elites in Colombia want us to bankroll this war. It remains an embarrassing fact that only 740,000 Colombians pay income tax in a country of 42 million. They are relying on us to bankroll this war.

Mr. Chairman, the other fact is that widespread impunity for human rights abusers is getting worse. It has been widely publicized in our newspapers about the new law that the Colombian Government has passed to grant immunity and to grant amnesty, for the most part, to individuals in the paramilitaries who are guilty of crimes again humanity, many of them involved in the drug trade, and they are doing that right before our eyes.

The facts are that the human rights situation is so bad that our own State Department has yet to certify human rights progress in Colombia. We are being drawn into a quagmire. The legal limit on the number of military and contractor personnel had to be increased in 2004 from 400 to 800 military, from 400 to 600 contractors.

Let us try to solve the problem of drug abuse, not just throw money at failing strategies. We need to invest in drug treatment and prevention here at home and in the Andes, in alternative development programs to help small farmers transition permanently from growing illicit drugs. But this policy has failed.

Mr. Chairman, the question was raised before what are we for. I include for the RECORD a statement of what we are for.

RETHINKING PLAN COLOMBIA

Low-cost: use U.S. leverage far more vigorously in support of human rights and the rule of law; support the recommendations of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights for Colombia; insist upon the complete dismantlement of paramilitary forces and structures, within an effective legal framework for justice, truth, and reparations; make trade consistent with sustainable drug policy and human rights; encourage negotiations with the guerrillas for a just and lasting peace; encourage Colombia's elite to use more of its own resources to improve governance.

Fund by reducing security assistance: support a strong judiciary and an independent

human rights sector; expand alternative development within a comprehensive rural development strategy, and end aerial spraying; encourage the strengthening of civilian governance in rural areas, including local peacebuilding initiatives; increase and improve humanitarian assistance, and expand protection, to displaced persons and refugees; reduce U.S. demand for drugs through evidence-based prevention strategies and improved access to high-quality treatment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for yielding me this time. I rise in opposition to the McGovern amendment.

This amendment would take valuable resources away from a program that is working to help keep drugs off our streets. The Andean Counterdrug Initiative was established to eliminate the cultivation and production of cocaine and opium, build Andean law enforcement infrastructure, arrest and prosecute traffickers, and seize their assets. The more we can disrupt the production of the drugs that are smuggled into our country, the safer our citizens will be.

The Andean Counterdrug Initiative has provided resources necessary to fight the war on drugs where these drugs are grown and processed, and efforts to disrupt the drug trade are working.

Aerial eradication efforts in Colombia have been impressive: 127,000 hectares were sprayed in 2003; 136,000 in 2004; and 95,000 hectares, or nearly 250,000 acres, have already been sprayed in this year alone.

Efforts like these, which are supported by resources from the Andean Counterdrug Initiative, have reduced coca cultivation in Colombia by 33 percent. Opium poppy cultivation in Colombia dropped 52 percent in 2004, which represents the third straight year of decline.

Due to these types of efforts, traffickers have been forced to decentralize their crops of coca, which has worked to decrease the total amount of coca cultivation. Efforts to seize drugs in Colombia have also seen impressive strides with the help of this important program.

Mr. Chairman, 114 metric tons of cocaine were seized in 2003, 178 metric tons in 2004. Drugs seized in Colombia are drugs that do not make it to the United States. Now is not the time to reduce funding for such a successful program. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, if this policy is succeeding, why does cocaine remain readily available on U.S. streets at lower prices than ever, and the levels of use are stable if not rising? There is increased availability.

If this policy is such a success, why are there increased abuses by the army? Why are trade union murders on the rise? Murders of trade union leaders increased in 2004 over 2003.

Let us look at the facts here. The bottom line is that this policy has not succeeded. It is time for us to take a fresh look at it and to change course.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the McGovern amendment. Assistance under Plan Colombia is not just about policies; it is about saving lives. It is about the countless judges and other innocent Colombians who have, throughout the years, perished under the violence of ruthless narcotrafficking networks.

It is about fighting a threat to stability and security in our own hemisphere and addressing the drug activity and the related criminal enterprises that create an environment where terrorist activities can blossom. It is about assisting our democratic allies in confronting a threat that gradually erodes the institutional framework necessary for the survival of these relatively new and fragile democracies. It is about going to the source of the problem and providing for the welfare of our children and our Nation's future.

Plan Colombia is working, and the funds appropriated in this legislation are vital for the continued success of this effort. If we truly care about the people of the Andean region, let us not abandon them. I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, first, let me make a couple of points clear. This amendment does not save a dime. It merely transfers money from counternarcotics efforts to other efforts. Those Members who act like it saves money are wrong.

Secondly, it is about kids and families in America. It is not about contractors; it is about the cocaine on our streets and what is the best way to deal with it.

Look, this is a tough problem. I am not going to admit that it is not a tough problem. Rape is a tough problem. Child abuse is a tough problem. Spouse abuse is a tough problem, but we do not say let us give up efforts; let us give in because we have not seen a drop in spouse abuse or child abuse; why do we not just surrender and give the fight up.

Our problem is difficult here. This is a map of Colombia. If you look at the map, the reason you hear passing statistics going on here is because basically our policies have pushed the narcoterrorists out into the jungle, instead of on the streets of Bogota where they are assassinating elected officials, terrorizing individuals, as reported in Garcia Marquez's book, ''Diary of a Kidnapping.'' We have pushed them into the jungle, so we have seen a tremendous drop in kidnappings and a tremendous drop in murders and blockades and all other types of things in the populist areas of this part of the country.

The fact is that now for the first time in modern history, every single city and town in this country has an elected official because he is not worried about being murdered.

I am all for alternative development. Alternative development, however, first requires you to get the guy from the FARC and the ultraparamilitary rightist groups away from them with a machine gun saying, plant palm heart and I will kill you. As you talk to the individuals, you can offer all of the incentives you want; but, quite frankly, they can make more money in coca. And as long as they are being terrorized and as long as they think they can make the money in coca and the terrorists think they can make money in coca, they are not going to let them do alternative development.

So we have to get control of the land. Just like in Afghanistan with heroin, it is fine for us to talk about alternative problems; but until you eradicate the heroin, it does not do any good to talk to them about planting a crop that will yield only about one-fifth the amount.

Now, I want to put a couple of other charts up here to show Members the depth of this problem. This is the eastern Pacific and western Atlantic. In this map from southwest Colombia in the eastern Pacific, you see the main trafficking routes. This is a Caribbean route, basically, going over to Yucatan.

The reason that is important is if you look at this map, the area we are trying to patrol in the eastern Pacific is basically as big as the continental United States. That does not even count the Caribbean.

Now, facts are stubborn things. In 1993, we cut 75 percent of the interdiction budget. What we saw was cocaine and heroin pour in from Colombia in that region to the point where after basically 10 years of effort, we have steadily reduced it back to where we were. It jumped 50 percent in 12 months when we cut the budget. We are now gradually working our way back down and trying to restabilize.

Let me conclude with this. This is not a Colombian problem; it is our problem. It is our addictions and Europe's addictions that have terrorized this 200-year-old democracy. Because we have not licked drug abuse in America, they have had 30,000 police killed. President Clinton, while initially he had bad policies in his administration, he is the one who came up with the Andean Counterdrug Initiative and came up with the Colombian Initiative, working with this Congress, because he realized it did not work to cut back.

It was terrorizing a legitimate democracy. An economy that has coffee, emeralds, oil, flowers, that had a flourishing middle class, that is an example of a country that fights for itself, where their police are dying. Unlike what it has taken in Afghanistan and Iraq to rebuild a police force, they had a police force. What they needed was helicopters, bullets, and communications systems. They needed help with their legal system and alternative development. They needed help with building roads into some of the rural areas where they had fled to. We provided that help to the Colombians.

This is a model of what we are trying to do in Iraq and Afghanistan; but it shows that when the terrorists can get drug money, whether it be in Afghanistan or Colombia, they are a threat to the stability, to the law and order, and to the people who want to follow the law. We need to stand behind them because it is our habit that has caused the problem.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will not cripple our military support for Colombia. Currently, there is $332 million in the Andean Counterdrug Initiative for Colombia.

□ 1815

This amendment reduces that amount by $100 million. There is an additional $152 million for alternative development, human rights, and rule of law programs for Colombia in the ACI. We are not touching that money. There is another $90 million in military aid for Colombia in the FMF account in this bill. We are not touching that money. In the defense appropriations bill that we passed just a few weeks ago, there was another $165 million in military aid for Colombia.

And should this amendment prevail, I will be happy to work with the chairman, a gentleman I greatly admire, and the distinguished ranking member to ensure that the intent of this amendment is made clear in the final foreign operations conference report.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard some talk today about the new law passed in Colombia last week to demobilize the paramilitary forces. Maybe we should call the law up here what they are calling it in Colombia: the Impunity and Immunity law. It fails to establish any mechanisms that will ensure the dismantling of the paramilitaries' organizational structures or financial structures. Commanders who are major narco-traffickers and have committed crimes against humanity will get off with very limited, if any, sentences, probably spent under house arrest at their local hacienda, profits in hand.

Mr. Chairman, 6 years, over $4 billion. We are paying for Colombia's war. As I pointed out over and over in this debate, there are 42 million people who live in Colombia. Only 720,000 of them actually pay taxes. We are bankrolling this war. Maybe the elites in Colombia should put up some of their own money.

We need to send a strong message: We are not Colombia's piggy-bank. We cannot just keep writing blank checks. This policy has failed. It has failed. The availability of cocaine on the streets of the United States of America has never been more plentiful. The price has never been lower. This policy has not made a difference to any of the people in this country.

So I urge my colleagues to vote for the McGovern-McCollum-Moore amendment. Enough is enough.

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

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

I do rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I think this is the wrong time to send the signal to the world that the United States Congress does not fully support President Bush in his fight against terrorism and narcotics in this hemisphere. I believe that the current mix of the ''hard side'' versus the ''soft side'' of programs in Colombia has been vital to our success. The aerial spraying eradication program enjoys strong public support in Colombia. Part of the support is due to the fact that we are offering alternatives to farmers who used to cultivate coca and poppy. Illicit cultivation is not now their only option.

The soft-side programs promoting alternatives is even more effective in Colombia due to the realization if they do not stop cultivation and take advantage of legal opportunities, their coca or poppy will be sprayed and they will not have anything available to them. The carrot-and-stick incentive structure has proven to be very effective in Colombia. I think we have gotten the mix right.

The political will of the Uribe government is part of the reason for our success. However, Colombia has provided more than just political will. In the last 3 years, it has doubled its portion of the GDP that is devoted to public security and democracy. The narco-terrorists they face are smart, well financed, and ruthless. Therefore, both the government of Colombia and the United States must keep up the pressure to end narco-terrorism in Colombia.

Our government has been a strong supporter of Colombia, and President Bush has confirmed to President Uribe our firm commitment to support Colombia in its efforts to combat narco-terrorism. Secretary Rice has also confirmed this commitment during a recent visit to Colombia.

We need to consolidate the many successes of Plan Colombia. There has been almost a 33 percent reduction in coca cultivation in Colombia since 2001 and a 72 percent drop in poppy cultivation. We need to ensure that this trend continues.

Our goals in Colombia are to eliminate narco-terrorism, promote respect for human rights, create economic alternatives and opportunities, respect for the rule of law, and achieving peace. Democracy is flourishing in this important ally and terrorism is being defeated. We cannot afford to lose the momentum.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, at issue in the case of Colombia are priorities, but in a different sense than is usually assumed. The "priority" debate today is not about whether stemming the drug trade is appropriate, but the methodology of going about it. Military approaches fit war scenarios. Civil war is more problematic; criminal activities even more so. My concern is that when America enters into internal conflicts we change the nature of ongoing struggles as well as the motivations of various combatants. We become implicitly accountable for a panoply of policies of any side we back and accordingly answerable to the people for that side's allegiance or lack thereof to social fairness and the rule of law itself.

In this context, would it not be better to limit our military involvement in this struggling, divided country and focus our efforts instead on alternative crop production, democracy building programs and the effective prosecution of human rights abuses? And at home wouldn't we be better off emphasizing education to reduce the demand for drugs?

Military involvement simply carries too many seeds of counterproductivity as well as the prospect of escalation if policies at one level of engagement prove insufficient.

Accordingly, I support the amendment before us, not out of a conviction it is an adequate answer to a real dilemma for both of our societies, but out of a belief that more balanced social involvement holds a better prospect for more productive economic and social development in Colombia and hence more comprehensive drug curtailment through national law enforcement.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of the McGovern, McCollum and Moore Amendment to the FY06 Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill that will reduce counter-narcotics and military funding to Colombia by $100 million. The U.S./Colombia campaign against drugs and terrorism is not working. Not only have efforts to reduce the production of cocaine in Colombia not been effective, funds from the program that should have been used to fight terrorism are instead being used by paramilitary groups to commit human rights abuses.

The U.S. has invested billions of dollars into Plan Colombia and successive programs since passing the FY 2000 budget. The Bush administration wants to continue this misguided policy with a request for $734 million in the FY06 Foreign Operations Appropriations request for the Andean Counter-drug Initiative.

One of the main objectives of Plan Colombia has been to prevent the flow of illegal drugs into the U.S. At the center of this effort has been the aerial spraying of herbicides on Colombia's coca crops. But U.S. and UN reports confirm that aerial spraying has not produced any appreciable reduction in coca production. In fact, cocaine production in Colombia may even have increased. According to the UN, 62 percent of Colombian coca fields detected in 2004 were new!

The lack of any appreciable reduction in production combined with an increase in production in countries such as Bolivia and Peru

has actually led to an increase of supply on the global market and a decrease in the cost of cocaine in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I am also troubled by reports in the news that recently the Colombian Congress, while approving a law governing the disarmament of its country's death squads, at the same time, granted generous concessions to paramilitary commanders accused of human rights abuses. I am concerned that U.S. assistance is being used by Colombian security forces that operate in conjunction with paramilitary forces targeting social leaders with threats, disappearance, and execution. The U.S. should not provide assistance to governments that refuse to hold perpetrators accountable for human rights abuses.

Mr. Chairman, until I am convinced that the funds to Colombia are fixing the problem instead of making it worse, I cannot support full funding for aid to Colombia. That is why I support the McGovern, McCollum, Moore Amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. 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 Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will be postponed.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, the Foreign Operations appropriations bill is one of the best vehicles Congress has to address an issue of paramount importance, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. This bill contains important Middle East provisions, but I believe we could have done better in our efforts to bring peace to these two long-suffering peoples.

I support our $2.3 billion package for Israel. Maintaining Israel's military superiority in the region is a prerequisite for any peace agreement, and I am pleased that the bill fulfills the President's request for an additional $150 million for the Palestinians. The President believes, as do I, that it is imperative to deliver U.S. assistance quickly to improve the Palestinians' quality of life and empower their democratically elected leadership. But I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee on Appropriations could have seized this historic opportunity and provided direct funding to the Palestinian Authority. Instead, this bill prohibits direct funding and places excessive conditions and limitations on the aid package.

Of course, we must ensure transparency and accountability. But the requirements in this legislation continue to go far beyond what we ever demanded in the Arafat era. This strikes me as shortsighted. We should join with President Bush in strengthening President Abbas, especially in the face of a strong challenge from Hamas in the upcoming parliamentary elections.

As Israel and the Palestinian Authority prepare to implement the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza, it is incumbent upon the United States to help both Prime Minister Sharon and President Abbas confront the extremists on each side who seek to derail this process. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that when this bill comes to the conference with the Senate, we can redirect some of our assistance directly to the Palestinian Authority. Fragile as it may be, a flicker of hope and optimism has been kindled in the Middle East. It may truly be our last hope, and what a tragedy it would be for Israel, for the Palestinians, and for America if we did not do everything in our power to bring an end to this conflict.

I thank, again, the ranking member for yielding to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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, $790,720,000, which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not more than $22,000,000 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)), $30,000,000, 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, $400,350,000, 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 that restricts assistance to foreign countries, 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 $37,500,000, to remain available until expended, may be made available for the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund, notwithstanding any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries, 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 $705,000, 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 that are available for ''Anti-terrorism Assistance'' and ''Export Control and Border Security'' shall remain available until September 30, 2007: *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 Committee 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. ROYCE:

Page 34, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $7,000,000) (reduced by $7,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

This amendment seeks to direct $7 million in funding for the Small Arms/Light Weapons Destruction initiative that is housed within the Nonproliferation, Anti-Terrorism, Demining and Related programs account. That account is called the NADR account, and the entire NADR account is reduced by approximately 1.75 percent in order to

account for the increase in this Small Arms/Light Weapons Destruction initiative.

I am very pleased here to have worked with the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), ranking member, to craft an amendment that I believe is acceptable to both of them. Seven million dollars is the fiscal year 2005 enacted level for this activity.

And, Mr. Chairman, of growing concern to the United States are these shoulder-fired, anti-aircraft missiles, referred to as MANPADs, which have proliferated throughout the world, especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union. These are U.S.-made Stingers, they are British-made Blowpipes, and most of them are Russian-made SA–7s. According to one report, 6,000 shoulder-fired missiles are outside of government control. There are known black markets for these shoulder-fired missiles throughout Africa, throughout the Middle East, and in Asia. And for between about $5,000 and $30,000, a MANPAD can be acquired; a low cost relative to the damage they could inflict in human loss as well as economic and psychological damage. A successful attack with one of these shoulder-fired missiles against an airliner could halt aviation, and recently we had a study done by RAND, and they released this report that found that the total economic loss resulting from an attack could be in the billions of dollars.

The alarming news is that more than two dozen terrorist groups are believed to be in possession of these weapons. Several incidents have highlighted the danger that these weapons pose: the November, 2002, attempted missile attack on an Israeli commercial airliner in Mombassa, Kenya; the August, 2003 sting in which a man was arrested trying to sell Russian-made shoulder-fired missiles to FBI agents posing as terrorists. Also in 2003 we had the British government deploying approximately 450 troops at Heathrow Airport after intelligence indicated a possible al Qaeda plan to use these shoulder-fired missiles against their civilian flights. Al Qaeda training films recovered by allied forces in Afghanistan contained detailed instruction on how to use Russian-made shoulder-fired missiles.

Most observers recommend a multi-layered approach to defend against possible terrorist attacks using these shoulder-fired missiles. An important piece of this strategy are U.S. efforts to take these deadly weapons out of play around the world. Last week the International Terrorism and Nonproliferation Subcommittee that I chair held a briefing with administration officials on the State Department's efforts to identify, secure, and then destroy these shoulder-fired anti-aircraft missile stocks.

The Small Arms/Light Weapons Destruction initiative is one part of our effort against this threat. To reduce the number of shoulder-fired missiles that could fall into the hands of terrorists, we are providing bilateral assistance to foreign governments to identify and destroy their stocks in excess of their security needs as well as to improve security at their storage facilities. The State Department is now overseeing the destruction or pledges to destroy shoulder-fired missiles from Bosnia-Herzegovina, from Cambodia, Nigeria, Liberia, Serbia, and other countries. And most importantly, I think, since 2003, this program has destroyed over 10,500 of these shoulder-fired missiles.

Unfortunately, there is a lot of work left to be done. This amendment helps to continue this work. At little cost these efforts are helping to mitigate a critical threat to our security.

So I want to thank the chairman and I want to thank the ranking member for working with me on this amendment. They have a tough task on this bill, and I look forward to working with them on this legislation as it moves forward.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, although I am not in opposition.

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, I do rise to say that I think that the issue that has been raised by the gentleman from California is a very important one, and we do accept this amendment.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

And I want to thank the gentleman for raising this issue today. I strongly support continued funding for programs to secure and destroy small arms and light weapons around the world, and I join my chairman in delightfully accepting the amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would just say simply that the program is certainly a worthwhile one and we have no problem with it. We simply did not earmark specific dollars from this account for it. This would suggest that certain dollars are to be spent, and we do support what is being done.

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. ROYCE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 70, line 19 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 36, line 16 through page 70, line 19 is as follows:

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, $20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009, which shall be available notwithstanding any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries.

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, 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, of 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, $65,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *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 $45,000,000 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 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.

## 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, $86,744,000, 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 Nigeria 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, $4,442,300,000: *Provided*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $2,280,000,000 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: *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 $595,000,000 shall be available for the procurement in Israel of defense articles and defense services, including research and development: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated by this paragraph, $206,000,000 should be made available for assistance for Jordan: *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 and Guatemala: *Provided further*, That funds made available under this heading may be used, notwithstanding any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries, for demining, the clearance of unexploded ordnance, and related activities, and may include activities implemented through nongovernmental and international organizations: *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 $41,600,000 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 $373,000,000 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 2006 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 2006 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.

#### PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 551 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, $177,800,000: *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

#### CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

For payment to the International Development Association by the Secretary of the Treasury, $950,000,000, to remain available until expended.

#### CONTRIBUTION TO THE MULTILATERAL INVESTMENT GUARANTEE AGENCY

For payment to the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency by the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,741,515, to remain available until expended.

#### LIMITATION ON CALLABLE CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTIONS

The United States Governor of the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency may subscribe without fiscal year limitation to the callable capital portion of the United States share of such capital in an amount not to exceed $8,126,527.

#### CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTER-AMERICAN INVESTMENT CORPORATION

For payment to the Inter-American Investment Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,741,515, 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, $1,741,515, 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, $115,250,000, to remain available until expended.

#### CONTRIBUTION TO THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

For payment to the African Development Bank by the Secretary of the Treasury, $5,638,350, 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 $88,333,855.

#### 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, $135,700,000, 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, $1,015,677 for the United States share of the paid-in portion of the increase in capital stock, to remain available until expended.

#### 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 $2,249,888.

#### 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, $328,958,000: *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 $115,000 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 2006 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 2007 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, except with respect to Libya, 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 military coup or decree: *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 5 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 that restricts assistance to foreign countries, 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 4 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 1 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, 2007.

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 investments; 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, Kazakhstan, and Uzbekistan 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 2006, 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 Serbia, Sudan, Zimbabwe, or Pakistan, 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 provision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries 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.), as amended.

AFGHANISTAN

SEC. 523. Of the funds appropriated by titles II and III of this Act, not less than $954,000,000 should be made available for humanitarian, reconstruction, and related assistance for Afghanistan: *Provided*, That 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 2006, not less than $50,000,000 should be made available to support programs that directly address the needs of 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.

HIV/AIDS

SEC. 525. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, 25 percent of the funds that are appropriated by this Act for a contribution to support the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (the ''Global Fund'') shall be withheld from obligation to the Global Fund until the Secretary of State certifies to the Committees on Appropriations that the Global Fund—

(1) has established clear progress indicators upon which to determine the release of incremental disbursements;

(2) is releasing such incremental disbursements only if positive results have been attained based on those indicators; and

(3) is providing 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.

(b) The Secretary of State may waive paragraph (1) of this subsection if she determines and reports to the Committees on Appropriations that such waiver is important to the national interest of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to this section of the bill?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEMOCRACY PROGRAMS

SEC. 526. (a) 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.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law that restricts assistance to foreign countries, 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.

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:

Page 70, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $9,000,000)''.

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.

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

□ 1830

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

Mr. Chairman, the promotion of democracy has been one of the cornerstones of American foreign policy throughout the history of this Nation, but especially during the last century.

In his second inaugural address in January, President Bush committed this Nation ''to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture.'' In enunciating this goal, the President reiterated a long-standing core principle of American national security policy. Promotion of democracy is not just aspirational; political liberty and transparent government increase the chance that a nation will be economically successful and politically stable, a responsible member of the international community.

I have been concerned for several months now at proposed reductions in funding for a whole range of our democracy promotion programs, many of which were deeply cut in the President's budget request. In March of this year, several of my colleagues joined me in asking the Congress to more fully fund these efforts. I understand the difficult circumstances that confront us on this bill. This is a tough environment for appropriators, and I know that we have prioritized efforts to expand the circle of democracy in the Islamic world as part of the war on terror.

Unfortunately, though, other important democracy programs have suffered greatly. For example, the National Endowment for Democracy for which the President recommended an increase of $20 million over fiscal year 2005 levels was actually cut in the State Department bill that we passed this month. This and other similar cuts have made the job of promoting democracy more difficult for American policymakers and diplomats. I believe these cuts also endanger our national security by pulling needed resources out of countries and regions that are at critical stages in their political development.

Other programs funded through the foreign operations bill have also been cut dramatically. The Support for the East European Democracy Act, SEED, has been an important act in the ongoing transition to democracy of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. In the current fiscal year, SEED received an appropriation of $396 million. For fiscal year 2006, President Bush requested $382 million, but the bill funds SEED at only $357 million.

Similarly, the Freedom Support Act has been central to our efforts to transform the states of the former Soviet Union. In the current fiscal year, FSA appropriations totaled $555 million. The President requested $482 million. But the bill provides for only $477 million.

One of our most flexible tools, the State Department's Human Rights and Democracy Fund, promotes democracy, human rights and civil society in countries and regions of strategic importance to the United States. HRDF funds are important tools by which the Department of State maintains pressure for universal human rights, democratic processes, and civil liberties in all countries.

These challenges will be addressed by funding programs that promote democratic reform and result in greater political pluralism and respect for fundamental freedoms in countries with significant Muslim populations, and that promote the protection and enforcement of legal rights and an independent judiciary, increase popular participation in government, and develop civil society in China. HRDF funds also support programs around the world that include political party building, promoting independent media and labor and worker rights, and supporting civil society and democratic institutions.

In the current fiscal year, HRDF is being funded at $36 million; but the bill pares that back to just $27 million, a 25 percent reduction.

My amendment is simple: it would increase the recommended funding level back to $36 million. It is a modest, but important, signal to the world that America's commitment to democracy in Eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, Africa, and Asia remains a central pillar of American diplomacy and national security strategy.

When he asked Congress to declare war on Germany in 1917, President Woodrow Wilson told the Nation that ''the world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty.''

In that war and in the other wars that this Nation has fought to preserve those ideals, we have paid a dear price. Our efforts to promote democracy hold forth the promise of widening the circle of freedom, while also reducing the prospect of failed states, terrorism and the horrific human rights abuses that so often require the intervention of American military force. Short-changing these programs is short-sighted and dangerous.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their interest and support in this amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, though I am not in opposition, I will claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. HEFLEY). 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, I would just say the bill that we do have does provide that not less than $27 million of the funds appropriated under this section should be allocated for the Human Rights and the Democracy Fund. What the gentleman has been talking about I think is a very worthwhile program. The addition of the additional funds to that I think is worthwhile. For that reason, we would accept the amendment.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. Strengthening democracy and promoting human rights are at the heart of our national security strategy. The President has made these ideals central components of U.S. foreign policy.

The State Department's Human Rights and Democracy Fund focuses on the countries and regions of greatest strategic interest to the United States, supporting those who seek to bolster human rights and promote democracy in key areas of the world.

Unfortunately, the administration's request cut funding by $9 million below FY 2005 levels. This was in part because the administration requested increased funding for democracy programs through the National Endowment for Democracy in the Science-State-Justice-Commerce bill. However, the House did not grant the requested increases for NED; and, in fact, the SSJC appropriations bill cut funding for NED below the FY 2005 enacted levels.

I therefore am very pleased that the chairman will accept the gentleman's amendment so that we may ensure sufficient funding for democracy programs in the FY 2006 bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the chairman and the ranking member again.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 132, line 13, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 71, line 10, through page 132, line 13, is as follows:

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, 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.

FINANCIAL MARKET ASSISTANCE IN TRANSITION COUNTRIES

SEC. 531. 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'', ''Assistance for the Independent States of the Former Soviet Union'', ''Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs'', and ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and Baltic States'', not less than $40,000,000 should be made available for building capital markets and financial systems in countries in transition.

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

SEC. 532. Unless expressly provided to the contrary, provisions of this Act, and 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, LEBANON, 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 Lebanon, 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 that restricts assistance to foreign countries and section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

(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 that restricts assistance to foreign countries and section 660 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, 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, 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) CONTINGENCIES.—During fiscal year 2006, the President may use up to $45,000,000 under the authority of section 451 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, notwithstanding the funding ceiling in section 451(a).

(g) 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.

(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 that restricts assistance to foreign countries.

(i) 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 that restricts assistance to foreign countries.

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) all Arab League states should normalize relations with their neighbor Israel;

(4) 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

(5) 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 on assistance for foreign countries contained in this or any other Act 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 2006, restrictions on assistance to foreign countries contained in this or any other Act 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 Act or any other provision contained in prior Acts authorizing or making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs: *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.

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 of 1979. 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 AND REAL PROPERTY TAXES 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 and unpaid property taxes owed by the central government of such country shall be withheld from obligation for assistance for the central government of such country until the Secretary of State submits a certification to the appropriate congressional committees stating that such parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes 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 regular notification procedures of the appropriate congressional committees, provided that no such funds shall be made available for assistance for the central government of a foreign country that has not paid the total amount of the fully adjudicated parking fines and penalties and unpaid property taxes owed by such country.

(c) Subsection (a) shall not include amounts that have been withheld under any other provision of law.

(d)(1) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) with respect to parking fines and penalties 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.

(2) The Secretary of State may waive the requirements set forth in subsection (a) with respect to the unpaid property taxes if the Secretary of State 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 and unpaid property taxes and interest 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, 2005.

(4) The term ''unpaid property taxes'' means the amount of unpaid taxes and interest determined to be owed by a foreign country on real property in the District of Columbia or New York, New York in a court order or judgment entered against such country by a court of the United States or any State or subdivision thereof.

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 that restricts assistance to foreign countries, 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'', ''Overseas Private Investment 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.—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 Government is 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, 2006, 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, 2007, 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 2006, 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 which he has determined to be involved in or advocating terrorist activity.

(c) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act for assistance under the West Bank and Gaza program may be made available for the purpose of recognizing or otherwise honoring individuals who commit, or have committed, acts of terrorism.

(d) 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.

(e) Subsequent to the certification specified in subsection (a), the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit and an investigation of the treatment, handling, and uses of all funds for the bilateral West Bank and Gaza Program in fiscal year 2006 under the heading ''Economic Support Fund''. The audit shall address—

(1) the extent to which such Program complies with the requirements of subsections (b) and (c), and

(2) an examination of all programs, projects, and activities carried out under such Program, including both obligations and expenditures.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS POPULATION FUND

SEC. 560. (a) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF CONTRIBUTION.—Of the amounts made available under ''International Organizations and Programs'' and ''Child Survival and Health Programs Fund'' for fiscal year 2006, $34,000,000 shall be made available for the United Nations Population Fund (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''UNFPA''): *Provided*, That of this amount, not less than $25,000,000 shall be derived from funds appropriated under the heading ''International Organizations and Programs''.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funds appropriated under the heading ''International Organizations and Programs'' in this Act that are available for UNFPA, that are not made available for UNFPA because of the operation of any provision of law, shall be transferred to ''Child Survival and Health Programs Fund'' and shall be made available for family planning, maternal, and reproductive health activities, subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

(c) 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.

(d) CONDITIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available under ''International Organizations and Programs'' for fiscal year 2006 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 the central Government of Serbia after May 31, 2006, if the President has made the determination and certification contained in subsection (c).

(b) After May 31, 2006, 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 Serbia and Montenegro 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 Government of Serbia and Montenegro 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 Serbia and Montenegro 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.

(d) This section shall not apply to Montenegro, Kosovo, humanitarian assistance or assistance 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 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, respond to disasters, address gender-based violence, and foster improved police relations with the communities they serve.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Assistance provided under subsection (a) shall be subject to prior consultation with, and 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 that restricts assistance to foreign countries, 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 $465,000,000 shall be made available for basic education, of which not less than $250,000 shall be provided to the Comptroller General of the United States to prepare an analysis of United States funded international basic education programs: *Provided*, That the analysis, which should be submitted to the Committee within nine months of enactment of this Act, shall include, but not be limited to:

(1) the amount of funds provided for basic education by all United States Government agencies in fiscal years 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005;

(2) a country-by-country and project-by-project breakdown of such funds;

(3) an analysis of host country contributions to education at the local, provincial, and federal level;

(4) the amount of funds, including loans, provided for basic education by other major bilateral donors and multilateral institutions, including United Nations agencies and the World Bank Group, including a historical view of such levels;

(5) an analysis of United States efforts to increase the commitment of other major bilateral donors and multilateral institutions to basic education;

(6) an analysis of how various United States Government agencies coordinate in the provision of such assistance, including how such coordination contributes to achievement of the Millennium Development Goals with respect to basic education;

(7) an analysis of the effect of the quadrupling of United States assistance for basic education since fiscal year 2001 on education programs in the developing world; and

(8) recommendations on the content and structure of United States assistance that would increase its effectiveness in promoting literary and numeracy.

RECONCILIATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 568. Of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'', not less than $15,000,000 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.

SUDAN

SEC. 569. (a) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the funds appropriated by title II of this Act, not less than $367,000,000 should be made available for assistance for Sudan.

(b) LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE.—Subject to subsection (c):

(1) Notwithstanding section 501(a) of the International Malaria Control Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–570) or any other provision of law that restricts funds for foreign countries, 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 taken significant steps to disarm and disband 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 unimpeded 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;

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

(3) assistance to support implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this 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 June 5, 2004, and, Southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains State, Blue Nile State and Abyei shall be deemed ''areas outside of control of the Government of Sudan''.

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 $522,000,000 should be made available for trade capacity building assistance: *Provided*, That $20,000,000 of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''Economic Support Fund'' shall be made available for labor and environmental capacity building activities relating to the free trade agreement with the countries of Central America and the Dominican Republic.

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 2006, 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, Afghanistan, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia, Georgia, India, Iraq, 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.

GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE TRAINING

SEC. 573. Programs funded under titles II and III of this Act that provide training for foreign police, judicial, and military officials, shall include instruction on how to address incidences and victims of gender-based violence: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall report to the Committee on Appropriations, no later than 180 days after enactment of this Act, how such instruction is being incorporated into programs funded under titles II and III of this Act.

LIMITATION ON ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS THAT ARE PARTIES TO THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

SEC. 574. (a) 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.

(b) The President may, with prior notice to Congress, waive the prohibition of subsection (a) with respect to a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (''NATO'') member country, a major non-NATO ally (including Australia, Egypt, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Argentina, the Republic of Korea, and New Zealand), Taiwan, or such other country as he may determine if he determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that it is important to the national interests of the United States to waive such prohibition.

(c) The President may, with prior notice to Congress, waive the prohibition of subsection (a) with respect to a particular country if he determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that such country has 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.

(d) The prohibition of this section shall not apply to countries otherwise eligible for assistance under the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003, notwithstanding section 606(a)(2)(B) of such Act.

TIBET

SEC. 575. (a) The Secretary of the 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 that restricts assistance to foreign countries, 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.

CENTRAL AMERICA

SEC. 576. Of the funds appropriated by this Act under the headings ''Child Survival and Health Programs Fund'' and ''Development Assistance'', not less than the amount of funds initially allocated pursuant to section 653(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 for fiscal year 2005 should be made available for El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Honduras.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

SEC. 577. (a) AUTHORITY.—Up to $75,000,000 of the funds made available in this Act to carry out the provisions of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', may be used by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to hire and employ individuals in the United States and overseas on a limited appointment basis pursuant to the authority of sections 308 and 309 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—

(1) The number of individuals hired in any fiscal year pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) may not exceed 175.

(2) The authority to hire individuals contained in subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2008.

(c) CONDITIONS.—The authority of this section may only be used to the extent that an equivalent number of positions that are filled by personal services contractors or other nondirect-hire employees of USAID, who are compensated with funds appropriated to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', are eliminated.

(d) PRIORITY SECTORS.—In exercising the authority of this section, primary emphasis shall be placed on enabling USAID to meet personnel positions in technical skill areas currently encumbered by contractor or other nondirect-hire personnel.

(e) CONSULTATIONS.—The USAID Administrator shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations at least on a quarterly basis concerning the implementation of this section.

(f) PROGRAM ACCOUNT CHARGED.—The account charged for the cost of an individual hired and employed under the authority of this section shall be the account to which such individual's responsibilities primarily relate. Funds made available to carry out this section may be transferred to and merged and consolidated with funds appropriated for ''Operating Expenses of the United States Agency for International Development''.

(g) DISASTER SURGE CAPACITY.—Funds appropriated by this Act to carry out part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, including funds appropriated under the heading ''Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States'', may be used, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, for the cost (including the support costs) of individuals detailed to or employed by the United States Agency for International Development whose primary responsibility is to carry out programs in response to natural disasters.

HIPC DEBT REDUCTION

SEC. 578. Section 501(b) of H.R. 3425, as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(5) of division B of Public Law 106–113 (113 Stat. 1501A–311), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(5) The Act of March 11, 1941 (chapter 11; 55 Stat. 31; 22 U.S.C. 411 et seq.; commonly known as the 'Lend-Lease Act').''

OPIC TRANSFER AUTHORITY

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 579. Whenever the President determines that it is in furtherance of the purposes of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, up to a total of $20,000,000 of the funds appropriated under title II of this Act may be transferred to and merged with funds appropriated by this Act for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation Program Account, to be subject to the terms and conditions of that account: *Provided*, That such funds shall not be available for administrative expenses of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation: *Provided further*, That funds earmarked by this Act shall not be transferred pursuant

to this section: *Provided further*, That the exercise of such authority shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

CONFLICT RESPONSE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 580. Whenever the Secretary of State determines that it is in the national interest of the United States, the Secretary is authorized to furnish reconstruction and stabilization assistance, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine, for the purpose of preventing, responding to, or enabling transition from conflict or civil strife in foreign countries or regions: *Provided*, That the Secretary may transfer up to $100,000,000 among accounts of the Department of State and to other Federal agencies as necessary to carry out these authorities: *Provided further*, That pursuant to a determination by the Secretary of State that it is in the national interest of the United States to prevent or respond to conflict or civil strife in foreign countries or regions, or to enable transition from such strife assistance provided under this paragraph, as well as assistance provided with funds appropriated under titles II and III of this Act for countries subject to a determination made under this paragraph, may be used: *Provided further*, That the exercise of such authority shall be subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

RESCISSION

SEC. 581. Of the funds provided in title II of Public Law 108–447, under the heading ''Other Bilateral Economic Assistance, Economic Support Fund'', $64,000,000 is hereby rescinded.

ANTICORRUPTION PROVISIONS

SEC. 582. Twenty-five percent of the funds appropriated by this Act under the headings ''International Development Association'', shall be withheld from obligation until the Secretary of the Treasury certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(a) World Bank procurement guidelines are applied to all procurement financed in whole or in part by a loan from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) or a credit agreement or grant from the International Development Association (IDA);

(b) the World Bank proposal ''Increasing the Use of Country Systems in Procurement'' dated March 2005 has been withdrawn;

(c) the World Bank is maintaining a strong central procurement office staffed with senior experts who are designated to address commercial concerns, questions, and complaints regarding procurement procedures and payments under IDA and IBRD projects;

(d) thresholds for international competitive bidding are established to maximize international competitive bidding in accordance with sound procurement practices, including transparency, competition, and cost-effective results for the Borrowers;

(e) all tenders under the World Bank's national competitive bidding provisions are subject to the same advertisement requirements as tenders under international competitive bidding; and

(f) loan agreements are made public between the World Bank and the Borrowers.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against what was left unprotected by H. Res. 341 in section 565 that begins on page 113, line 26, through page 114, line 10, for the reason that it violates rule XXI, clause 2, which prohibits legislative language in a general appropriations bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained. The provision is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEAUPREZ

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEAUPREZ:

Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES THAT REFUSE TO EXTRADITE TO THE UNITED STATES ANY INDIVIDUAL ACCUSED IN THE UNITED STATES OF KILLING A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Department of State may be used to provide assistance to any country the government of which has notified the Department of State of its refusal to extradite to the United States any individual accused in the United States of killing a law enforcement officer, as specified in a United States extradition request.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ).

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to first of all acknowledge the hard work and dedication of the chairman, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), for their dedication and the construction of a very, very good bill.

But I rise tonight with an amendment, and the intent of this amendment is very, very simple. It is to return cop killers back to the United States to stand trial in our country, the same country in which they committed their unthinkable crime.

The problem was brought to my attention last month after Denver Police Detective Donnie Young was allegedly executed by Raul Gomez-Garcia. After killing Detective Young and shooting and wounding his partner, Gomez-Garcia fled to Mexico, where he was tracked down and arrested weeks later. The Mexican Government now refuses to extradite him back to the U.S. if there is any chance he could spend life in prison without parole. Detective Young's widow and his two children now face the further tragedy of either partial justice or no justice at all being served to her husband's killer.

In another case, in 2002, a convicted felon who had been deported three times allegedly shot and killed a Los Angeles County sheriff following a routine traffic stop before fleeing to Mexico, where he remains today, essentially escaping justice.

The U.S. should not be forced to plea bargain with other countries in order to try criminals, especially cop killers, in our own courts. As a good neighbor, Mexico should live up to their end of our extradition treaty. Killing a police officer is one of the most egregious crimes, and we should have the right to seek justice for the families of the slain officers.

The U.S. is not obliged to give foreign aid, and we should not reward nations giving safe haven to cop killers. I ask my colleagues to vote for this commonsense amendment that will bring help and peace and justice to those who deserve it most.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's leadership in the State of Colorado and here in Washington, D.C. on this issue, about fighting to protect our law enforcement officers.

There is a growing problem in this Nation where criminals will commit violent crimes, including murdering law enforcement officers, and flee to nations that refuse to extradite to the United States those criminals because of our tough sentencing laws, including mandatory minimum sentences.

This amendment is simple: it will not allow taxpayer funds to go to nations that refuse to stand with us against the vile act of murdering law enforcement officers.

Law enforcement officers across this country are bravely fighting crime, responding to emergencies, and protecting our rights. We have an opportunity to stand up for them with this amendment here today. When countries do not extradite their criminals, it actually creates a twisted incentive to be even more violent in their crimes. The more violent the crime, the tougher the sentence here in the United States; and the tougher the sentence, the less likely they are to be subject to extradition.

The Beauprez-McHenry amendment will apply the pressure that usually gets the best results, and that is withholding tax dollars to those countries. I, for one, think it is prudent and just that we require nations to extradite cop killers before receiving aid through this appropriations process.

Again, I applaud my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ). I certainly appreciate his representation of his constituents in Colorado, I thank him for his leadership and friendship, and I urge my colleagues to vote for the Beauprez-McHenry amendment when the time comes and protect our law enforcement officers across this Nation.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment that would cut off assistance for U.S. programs in Mexico, and let us make it clear that Mexico is the country we are talking about today, no other.

The amendment is based on the wrong assumption that U.S. foreign assistance to Mexico is only in Mexico's national interests. I am here to say that the funding in this amendment prohibits the United States' national interest, so I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no''.

President Bush and his Office of National Drug Control Policy are fully supportive of the assistance we provide in this bill for the country of Mexico. The bulk of that assistance takes the form of international narcotics and law enforcement, roughly around $40 million. There is another $11 million in ESF funds that support democracy and the rule-of-law programs. Around $22 million supports child survival and development programs. All of these resources are central to the U.S. national interest.

This amendment could directly cut off $40 million in resources that are essential for our counternarcotics assistance, law enforcement assistance, and border securities. We do not, in other words, with this amendment, gain any kind of leverage over the country of Mexico.

I highlight the fact that this assistance is more for us than Mexico because the objective of this assistance is to increase U.S. national and border security, something I am acutely aware of, living along the border. Cutting off these funds would be very shortsighted and would serve to hurt U.S. interests, not the interests of Mexico.

For decades, the U.S.-Mexico relationship was one of acrimony, distrust, and a lack of good working relationship to meet the challenges of the enormous border relationship between our two countries.

Only with the passage of NAFTA, 10 years ago, were we able to write a new chapter in U.S.-Mexico relations. We started down a path of deeper cooperation in order to spur development in Mexico, secure our shared borders, and fight the flow of illegal drugs across our territories.

□ 1845

Passage of this amendment could have a devastating impact on that effort to stop the flow of drugs.

I would point out that Mexico has offered tremendous cooperation in improving border security and counterterrorism efforts. Let me cite just a couple of things. During the threat to aviation security at the end of 2003, Mexico worked closely with the U.S. Government canceling some flights, Air Mexico flights to Los Angeles and stepping up passenger screening. They stopped those flights in direct response to our request. At the commencement of the war in Iraq, the Government of Mexico implemented a plan and its military assumed a higher state of alert for potential targets of international terrorism, including key infrastructure sites and centers of tourism. Third, multilaterally, Mexico is party to all 12 United States conventions and protocols against terrorism and has hosted several conferences on security.

I believe this amendment would undermine the spirit of cooperation and the degree of cooperation that we have achieved, and I do not think this amendment reflects the priorities of the national interest of the United States. I would urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on it.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the comments of the chairman. I think that this amendment would be detrimental to the national security, and I urge my colleagues to defeat it.

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

Mr. BEAUPREZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

I could not agree more with the chairman that this is more for the U.S. than it is for our neighbors. I also want to state for the record that I have enormous fondness for our neighbors to the south. I have 20 percent Hispanics in my district and many of them came from Mexico. One of my earliest childhood memories is of migrant workers sitting around our kitchen table at our farm, my mother cooking them lunch as they harvested our crops, thrashing the grain crop from our dairy farm. I have great fondness for them but, I also believe, as the gentleman stated, in the rule of law.

Let me quote Steve Cooley, the Los Angeles District Attorney. ''As you are aware, the Mexican Supreme Court unilaterally altered the Extradition Treaty in 2001.'' He goes on to say, ''This decision and its application to the Extradition Treaty between the United States and Mexico is clearly violative of the Treaty.''

That is what we are talking about tonight. We have a treaty in place. Good neighbors mean what they say and say what they mean, and live by treaties that are reached.

This amendment is all about just being honest and fair-dealing with good friends. We intend to be a good friend of Mexico and other nations around the globe. We will live by our treaties, and we ask that they live by theirs.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

I would just briefly close by citing just a few statistics on extraditions. I have had the privilege over the last 10 years now of serving as chairman of the U.S.-Mexico Interparliamentary meeting. I can remember when I first started attending 20 years ago, extradition was the issue that we are always talking about. We do not talk about that very much anymore, and the reason is very simple.

The first 14 years of the Extradition Treaty with Mexico, from 1980 to 1994, a total of 14 years, Mexico extradited eight, a total of eight fugitives to the United States. Between 1996 and 2000, Mexico extradited an annual average of 13 fugitives each year to the United States.

Mexico has extradited more fugitives every year between 1996 and 2000 than in the first 15 years of the Bilateral Extradition Treaty combined. In 2004 they extradited a record 34 fugitives to the U.S., up from the record numbers of 17 in 2001, a record number of 25 in 2002, and 31 in 2003. These include 19 Mexican nationals and 17 narcotics defendants.

So I think there is no question that Mexico is doing what they can do. Can there be more done? Can they do better? Do we have areas of disagreement? Yes, we do, and one of these issues is the matter of the length of term for which a person may be sentenced to prison. We are working with them on that.

But I would urge my colleagues that this amendment is certainly not going to help us get a cooperative attitude with Mexico if it were to pass. I urge its defeat.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. HEFLEY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) will be postponed.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WEINER. Is this the appropriate place in the reading for a limiting amendment?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may offer his amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the more appropriate question about this amendment is not why should we restrict any funds in this bill from going to the Nation of Saudi Arabia, but why should we allow any funds from this or any other budget to be going to Saudi Arabia.

There is not much in the bill, but there is $25,000 for the Saudis, the IMET program. More importantly, that money triggers allocations in future bills that permit the Saudis to buy U.S. arms at a discounted rate.

The administration, when they were asked to justify why we would give any money to a nation that exports terror, a nation that is getting almost $60 for a barrel of crude oil, here is what they say in their State Department budget justification: ''While Saudi Arabia controls the world's largest oil reserve, it faces an increasing budget pressure.''

So I guess one of the reasons we are providing aid to the Saudis is because of their budget pressures.

Frankly, we have heard a great deal over the course of years; in fact, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, who has done a terrific job on this bill in many ways, has argued in the past that the Saudis are doing better, they are doing better at cracking down on crime. But on May 28 of 2005, Syria arrested 300 Saudis trying to cross the border into Iraq to join the Jihad against the United States. I would say to my colleagues in the House that if you are relying on Syria to crack down on terrorism against Saudi Arabia, you know you have trouble.

Recently, a report in The Washington Post analyzed all of the Web sites where Jihadists brag about their so-called martyrdom, places where they list those who have given their lives so that they can blow up others, including our troops. They concluded that 70 percent of the homicide bombers on Islamic extremist Web sites are Saudis. Sixty-one percent of the Arab martyrs in Iraq are Saudis. This is just in recent months, in recent times since our last bill passed.

According to Ambassador Dory Gold, in testimony before a Subcommittee of the House Committee on International Relations in July of 2003, at least 50 percent of the funding for Hamas is Saudi blood money.

We all know the history of Osama bin Laden. When he left Saudi Arabia, he did so with, by some estimates, nearly $1 billion of Saudi blood money which was subsequently used, as we know, to attack my city, and others.

The time has come for us to say once again, just as we did last year in this bill, no aid to Saudi Arabia, no aid to a country that exports Wahabisim, no aid to a country that exports terrorism, no aid to a country that has been worse than uncooperative in our efforts to control worldwide oil prices.

There is no other way to view the Saudis except as our enemies, not as our friends. Nothing, I think, was more troubling for many of us than to see the President waiting in Crawford, Texas for over an hour while the Crown Prince came and then gave a lecture to our President on the way to fight terrorism.

The way we in the House should fight terrorism is to not provide any more aid to the Saudis, and my amendment would do that.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This is another one of those amendments that is difficult to speak against, I suppose, because we all have our problems with the record in Saudi Arabia. But it is also one that when we look at it in the cold light, I think we recognize that it does not do what it says it is going to do, it is symbolic, and the symbolism comes down on the wrong side.

In the past there have been elements, certainly, of the Saudi Government that have not been helpful to the United States in its Global War on Terrorism but, in the past few years, the Government of Saudi Arabia has greatly increased its efforts to root out terrorism and has increased its cooperation with the United States Government.

Now, this bill provides a really very small sum of $25,000 to the International Military Education and Training program, or IMET, to help train and increase military contracts with the Saudi military. Some would say, what could you possibly do for $25,000, and why do we not charge the Saudi Government for this training? In fact, that is exactly what we do. By providing this sum of $25,000, about the cost of training one officer, we allow them access to the program, and this results in Saudi Arabia spending approximately $13 million of its own funds on an annual basis to train over 400 students at U.S. military schools. This training exposes Saudi officers to U.S. military doctrines, training regimes, systems and, most importantly, to U.S. values.

With the Global War on Terrorism, now is not the time to turn our backs on those who have albeit belatedly, turned to us for assistance and cooperation. We need all the friends and the allies that we can get in this fight against terrorism. There is no question that the Saudi Arabian government has been remiss in the past in its commitments to combating terrorism, but that is changing and, above all, we need to be encouraging the change, not discouraging it, which is precisely, of course, what this amendment would do.

So let us not drive a wedge between the United States and the Arab regimes that are cooperating with us on the War on Terrorism. I urge that we defeat this amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Weiner amendment. This provision was included in the fiscal year 2005 Foreign Operations bill, and I believe it should be included again.

This is a common sense amendment. It sends a message to Saudi Arabia that the United States is serious about reform.

We impatiently await Saudi Government efforts to eliminate anti-Semitic and anti-Israel propaganda from its state-controlled media. We are looking for democratic reforms in Saudi Arabia, including reforms that would allow the women of that country a voice in shaping their country.

We still have not seen Saudi Arabia disavow its propaganda campaign against Christians and Jews, a campaign that is alive and well here in our very own country, as Saudi-exported materials inciting hatred and prejudice are made available at Saudi-supported American mosques.

In short, it is all carrot these days and too little sticks. The Weiner amendment provides some incentive for change in Saudi Arabia. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, and I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) for introducing this amendment yet again, which I have supported year after year. I rise in strong support of this amendment.

No one is born knowing how to hate; it needs to be taught. The Saudi Kingdom, our purported partner in peace, have turned teaching hatred into a perverted art form. Saudi textbooks, official publications of the Education Ministry, paint a hate-filled, distorted portrait of a world in which Israel does not exist, the 9/11 attacks were perpetrated by a worldwide Zionist conspiracy, and the protocols of the Elders of Zion is taught as history.

Saudi Arabia's religious beliefs have banned Barbie dolls, calling them Jewish toys that are offensive to Islam.

Last year, Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah was quoted as telling Saudi television that ''Zionists'' were behind the attack at the oil facility at Yanbu. The Crown Prince was also quoted as saying, ''Our country is targeted, you know who is behind all of this. It is Zionism.''

Fifteen of the 19 9/11 attackers were Saudi nationals; we all know that.

Knowing this, did the Saudi government express one word of remorse or regret to the families of the victims? No, not one word.

The Saudis and President Bush are constantly declaring to the United States that they are our partners in the War on Terrorism. We are talking about the same Saudis that support, encourage, and finance terrorism, the same Saudis that exude racist and anti-Semitic hatred, the same Saudis that have the worst record on the planet when it comes to religious intolerance, racial intolerance, and discrimination against women.

Our world will never be safe when children are taught hatred and disdain, when the terrorist mission of death and destruction is being funded by the Saudis.

It is unbelievable to me that we continue to pretend that they are our allies, and it is completely inexplicable that one penny of American taxpayer money is going to Saudi Arabia.

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 partner in peace that either they are with us or they are against us. They cannot have it both ways, and neither can our administration.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER).

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to a couple of things that the chairman said.

For 3 years now, I have heard the argument for continued support for the Saudis as two somewhat contradictory positions. One, it is not a lot of money; and two, they are getting better.

Well, I think it is incumbent upon all of us, particularly in this bill when we are already short-funded, to justify why it is we provide any money at all if they are not an ally. If they are not espousing U.S. American views, if they are not improving democracy, what are they doing? I will tell you what they are doing, Mr. Chairman. They are traveling to Iraq and blowing up our troops.

□ 1900

That is not according to me; that is according to their own bragging Web sites and The Washington Post assessment about who they are. There is a dramatic increase in the amount of violence since we offered this bill last year, not a decline. There is a dramatic increase in the exporting of Wahabiism, not a decline. And there is no sign of greater cooperation. You know, a sign of great cooperation is not hiring a very expensive lobbyist here, running TV ads, running newspaper ads. A sign of cooperation is saying we are going to start cracking down on terror, not moving it out of our country into someone else's problem.

The problem that we face here, whether it is $25,000, $25 million or $25 billion, is we articulate our values in this bill. And our values are simply not to be supportive of the Saudi Arabian Government.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time. I want to thank the chairman for his very good work on this bill. It is an excellent bill. I know they put an enormous amount of work into it, and I rise in support of this amendment because I think we can make it even better; and that is why I am joining the gentleman from New York in offering this amendment, the Weiner/Ferguson amendment; and I rise in strong support of the amendment.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia continues to be one of the largest financers of terrorism in the world. And the fact that this bill provides American dollars to this country for U.S.-subsidized military training is nothing short of astounding.

Our own government's reports chronicle Saudi Arabia's continuing human rights abuses, ongoing financing of terrorist groups, and exporting of terrorist ideologies. It is amazing that we are looking to Saudi Arabia, one of the wealthiest countries in the world, and giving them money out of our legislation. Now is not the time to reduce pressure on Saudi Arabia. Instead of rewarding the Saudi Government for financing terrorism and harboring terrorists, we should be holding them accountable for well-documented human rights abuses and terrorist connections.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Weiner/Ferguson amendment.

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

First of all, let me just say to the chairman and the ranking member, they have done an excellent job with a limited budget. But I think we should give them an extra $25,000 to work with by saying that we are not going to provide comfort to the Saudis, we are not going to provide aid, taxpayer aid to the Saudi Arabians.

This is not just the position of a bipartisan group here in Congress. The Council on Foreign Relations has said for years individuals and charities based in Saudi Arabia have been the most important source of funds for al Qaeda.

The 9/11 Commission said Saudi Arabia is ''a problematic ally in fighting Islamic extremism.'' Our own State Department says Hamas receives funding from ''private benefactors in Saudi Arabia.''

There is not probably an observer of the scene today that does not recognize that Saudi Arabia has done a very deft two-face game. They come here, they send us a moderate face. They have convinced, obviously, our State Department, who walks along almost in lock step with everything that they say.

We here in Congress should say we understand that we are going to start judging nations in the post-September 11 world by what they do, not by what they say. And what the Saudi Arabians have done is export Wahabiism to the United States, export terrorism to the troops in Iraq, and export terror all around the world.

Vote ''yes'' on the Weiner/Ferguson amendment. Let us finally put an end to it.

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

I just want to try to reiterate one argument and add a point on another argument that has just been made by the gentleman from the other side. First, on the issue of the funding, the financing of this program, I hope that the comments that I made have dispensed with that. For $25,000, in other words, the country has access to the program, they become a part of the IMET program, we get a $13 million payment from the country. So it is not as though we are giving money to the country of Saudi Arabia. It is a legal process that they have to do to access the program; and to do that we have to provide training for one officer, then they are able to provide training for the hundreds of other officers that come to the United States, and they pay fully for them.

And that money is here in the United States and stays here in the United States where these people are being trained. So I think that is a pretty good rate of return on the investment, $25,000 getting you $13 million. The foreign aid argument is untrue. It has nothing to do with whether Saudi Arabia is a rich country or not. It has to do with whether or not these countries should be getting any kind of training. And I think the kind of training that we give in the IMET program is exactly the kind of training we ought to be giving to military officers of other countries including Saudi Arabia.

And on the last point, the gentleman from New York made the suggestion that these people from Saudi, he said, where are they going. We know where they are going. They are going to Iraq and blowing up our troops. The implication that somehow the Saudi Government is involved in an official way in blowing up our troops in Iraq is an absolutely outrageous statement and has no basis in fact whatsoever. And so I would reject this statement.

And I think on this basis alone this amendment ought to be defeated because we should not be saying to the Saudi Government that we believe that somehow you are involved in blowing up troops in Iraq.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it very clear that it has been the Saudi policy to export their worst troublemakers like bin Laden, like Wahabiism, so that the problem is not turned inward. That is their policy.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the statement is made. The gentleman from New York has just confirmed what I thought. The statement is that the Saudi Government is officially involved in helping to kill American troops in Iraq. And I think that statement is an absolute outrage, and I do not think there is any basis of fact whatever for that.

I would urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment. It does not belong here. We should not do it. We should not be sending this kind of signal. I urge defeat of 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 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.

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:

Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY AND THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE

SEC. ____. (a) 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 2006; 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 2006 unless the Secretary of State determines that the Palestinian Authority has not provided support for acts of international terrorism during the three-month period preceding the first day of that quarter.

(b) In this section, the term ''quarter of fiscal year 2006'' means any three-month period beginning on—

(1) October 1, 2005;

(2) January 1, 2006;

(3) April 1, 2006; or

(4) July 1, 2006.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

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

I want to join with my other colleagues in congratulating both the chairman and the ranking member for having put together a foreign ops bill that certainly had to be an arduous task. But like the amendment that preceded me, I think that my amendment can improve on a near-perfect piece of legislation.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise today to correct 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 as the world leader on the world stage, when our foreign aid policy forces us to support our friends while we are indiscriminately doling out money to our and their enemies at the same time.

All the effort 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 on a recipient's demonstrated willingness to support the ideals and the aspirations for their regions. 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 and their goals.

Let me give you an example of what I am talking about here. When my children were younger, I gave them a monthly allowance. Unlike gifts that they got at Christmastime and holidays, this was money that they had to earn themselves. And this allowance came with certain strings attached. It came with an understanding that I could expect certain behavior from them. On occasion, they would forget our bargain, and their behavior would not reflect the expectations that I had set for them. But when they did not receive their allowance the next month, they were quick to fix the problem so that we could all then once again live peacefully together.

Foreign aid is like an allowance which the United States is neither obligated to offer nor give, and which does not come without strings attached. And yet we continue to act as if we are required to hand out money to nations and people who actively oppose the principles of democracy and peace. And this practice must end.

Today we have a golden opportunity to change the way we address the issue of foreign aid because of some important changes and changes in leadership of the Palestinian Authority. We have an opportunity to further the development for a partnership for peace between our countries. In light of the renewed request on foreign aid, 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.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, is the first step. It states that no more than 25 percent of the funds appropriated to the Palestinian Authority or any other Palestinian entities will be available to the Palestinians during each financial quarter. What that means is that every quarter, the four quarters of the year, one fourth of the money in this bill that would otherwise go in one lump sum to the Palestinian Authority, but one fourth is all that will be able to be advanced to them during any one quarter. And then it will be advanced to them so long as we have the Secretary of State who will determine that the Palestinian Authority has not participated in or supported any acts of international terrorism during the previous 3 months.

In other words, our expectation is that they should quit killing people. They should quit creating acts of terrorism. And for that, we will pay them.

We know right now that those folks are being paid $25,000 a piece to wrap a bomb around themselves and go get on a bus in their so-called enemy's territory. And so that is why, with that expectation, then we make the payment.

The President is working to achieve lasting peace in this region, realistically and, I believe, in good faith; and I applaud his efforts. But if we are going to see a change in the Middle East, our approach to foreign aid must change as well. What better time than now to change our attitude and the way that we hand out foreign aid.

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 weight of our principles.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not have any comments. I would make a point of order, though, if the gentleman is not prepared to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman giving me the opportunity to make the point. One of these days, one of these years, perhaps during my lifetime in the United States House of Representatives, I will be able to frame this amendment so that it will not have a point of order successfully placed against it. And I thank the chairman for that opportunity to explain my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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:

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS BY THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES TO APPROVE AN APPLICATION FOR A LONG-TERM LOAN OR LOAN GUARANTEE WITH RESPECT TO A NUCLEAR PROJECT IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 601. 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 long-term loan or loan guarantee with respect to a nuclear project in the People's Republic of China.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS).

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

This tri-partisan amendment has widespread support across the ideological spectrum, from Democrats and Republicans, from progressives to conservatives. It is being cosponsored today by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH). It also is being supported by a number of leading national organizations including the National Taxpayers Union; Friends of the Earth; Citizens Against Government Waste; the Green Scissors Coalition; Taxpayers For Common Sense; and U.S. PIRG, the U.S. Public Interest Research Group.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple and straightforward. It would prohibit the Export-Import Bank from providing corporate welfare for the construction of nuclear power plants in China.

Mr. Chairman, I think the rationale for supporting this amendment is obvious. At a time when we have a $7.7 trillion national debt and a record-breaking Federal deficit, it is not only absurd, but it is dangerous for the taxpayers of this country to be subsidizing the construction of nuclear power plants in China.

□ 1915

Mr. Chairman, amazingly enough, the company involved here, Westinghouse Electric, which builds nuclear technology is owned by British National Fuels which itself is a company wholly owned by the British government. So we are dealing with the absurdity of American taxpayers who are in the midst of a record breaking deficit, subsidizing the British government, a nation which, to the best of my knowledge, is not made up of starving, desperate people in the developing world.

Mr. Chairman, there is no debate, but that when these four nuclear power plants will be built at a cost which involves an Export-Import loan of some $5 billion, that when these nuclear power plants will be built, the Chinese will own the technology. And a question that every Member of this Congress should be asking is, is it really in the best interest of the United States of America to provide advanced nuclear technology to China. Furthermore, the Chinese company which is building these four nuclear power plants, the Chinese national nuclear company has been tied to at least three instances of weapons proliferation involving Iran and Pakistan.

Mr. Chairman, I do not always agree with the National Taxpayers Union. But let me briefly summarize what they say in a letter that they sent to me today.

NTU has long advocated total elimination of taxpayer funding of the Export-Import Bank for the simple fact that American taxpayers should not be forced to subsidize the overseas operation of U.S. corporation or foreign governments. Considering the rapid pace of economic growth in China and its emergence as a strong force in the global business environment, it is particularly egregious to waste taxpayer dollars on such a project.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) seek to control the time in opposition?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. As he said, this amendment would prohibit the Export-Import Bank from supporting the sale of nuclear power plant and technology in China.

It was 6 years ago in 1998 during the Clinton administration that the U.S. lifted the ban on the export of civilian nuclear power plants and fuel to China. After we became satisfied that China had met the conditions of the 1985 U.S.-China agreement on peaceful nuclear cooperation.

Last September the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Commerce expressed their support for increasing trade with China in nuclear energy technology and for the export of U.S. civilian nuclear power plants. In February of this year the Ex-Im Board of Directors approved a preliminary commitment of $5 million from Westinghouse Electric Company to enable it to make a bid on the design and construction of four 1,000 megawatt commercial power reactors on two sites in China.

These reactors will be the first in a series of 26 new commercial power plants planned for construction through the year 2020. So we are looking at a very large possible export in business for United States businesses. We are in heavy competition. Westinghouse is in heavy competition with companies from France and from Russia to provide the same or similar kind of technology. This order would create or sustain, according to Westinghouse, about 5,000 jobs; 5,000 jobs in the United States at Westinghouse and its American suppliers.

Because I have heard the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) on the floor railing against outsourcing and the China trade deficit, I thought, here is an opportunity for us to do something about that, to create jobs here at home for us to make sure that we are selling things to China. But this amendment of course would make it impossible for Westinghouse conduct this business while, other countries would get the kind of commitments that they need from the government to protect those kind of investments. We, the U.S. Government, would not be doing so for Westinghouse.

There can be no question about it. Prohibiting the Export-Import Bank from supporting this and future transactions is going to have a tremendously negative impact on U.S. exporters and U.S. employment. And it is going to send a signal to businesses that they better not be doing business in China. Nothing could be worse for us.

I strongly urge us to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. And with all due respect, we have been hearing this type of argument for 20 years. When are the American people going to demand that the Members of the United States Congress start watching out for the interests of the people of the United States and not some small group of elite Americans and international financiers who will make a profit off this in the short run, but in the long run will create the situation that we have found in China today and the situation we find ourselves in here.

For 20 years we have been told by trading and having economic relations with this monstrous dictatorship that we would see liberalization, that we would see a change in the policies that the Chinese government has towards its own people. What have we seen instead? It is the same massive dictatorship. This is the world's worst human rights abuser, and it is the last country in the world that we should be subsidizing American business in order to create business in that country.

The fact is we have seen jobs and businessmen in this country go to China because business leaders in this country will personally make a quick buck by betraying the American working people. That is what is happening here. How can we think they would do anything else?

This government, as we are hearing today, is subsidizing this. Now, when it comes to Westinghouse, when it comes to Westinghouse, this is not even an American company. And we are going to have the United States taxpayers subsidizing a British company in order to build a nuclear power plant or a series of nuclear power plants for communist China? This makes no sense at all. We should not be subsidizing it even if it was an American company.

What are the Chinese going to do when they get this technology from Westinghouse? I can tell you right now, it is certainly something that is

acknowledged in the business community, they will start building those plants and they will copy every piece of technology that we have spent, the American taxpayers have spent, developing the technology, and the Chinese will just take it and copy it. That is why today the greatest threat to our freedom, the greatest threat to America's prosperity is not radical Islam, although that is a challenge we have to face, but in the long run it is a China that is emerging on the scene that is belligerent to everything we stand for as a people.

The last thing we should be doing is building up their economy as we have been doing as a policy of this government for the last 20 years. And let me note, nuclear power plants? Has anyone looked at the proliferation record of the communist Chinese? Why do you think we are having a challenge right now to the world peace in Korea? Do you think the North Koreans just discovered all this technology on their own.

No, the fact is that the Chinese are the ones who are behind the nuclear development in Korea and the development of weapons that threaten Japan and the United States. The last thing we should be doing is helping them develop and perfect their technology that deals with nuclear energy.

This is, again, a no-brainer for me, but the American people need to find out whose side the Congress is on. The policies we have had to China in these last 20 years have created a Frankenstein monster that threatens not only the peace on the world, but threatens the prosperity of our people and the freedom of those who would seek freedom in China itself.

We have been cutting a deal with the devil and we are now coming to a point where everybody recognizes that threat, except perhaps the leadership, unfortunately, in the United States Congress.

So I would commend the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS). I look forward to working with him on this.

Let us get the word out to the American people whose side we are on.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time. I appreciate the good job of leadership that he is providing on this issue.

I think a question seems to be resonating here and that is, who is going to look out for U.S. jobs? I think that is a very good question. Here we have on one side Westinghouse, who is working as an American company, a conglomerate, with other corporations trying to build some of the product to be able to export that product in order to create jobs here in America and provide something to China that they are going to get one way or another.

What are the options of that? Well, we can ignore the opportunities we have for American jobs. We can say, let us give the jobs to France. France is also bidding on this. Let France have the jobs.

We have a good example of how France is gaining ground on us in the aircraft industry. They have a government that is willing to do what is necessary in order to move the aerospace industry in France forward. And here we have an opportunity to move forward with the technology that we happen to have that other countries want. So we can either create the jobs here or we can allow them to be created in France. Or there is the other Russia company that is bidding on it as well. We could let the jobs be created in Russia.

So who is looking out for U.S. jobs? This supply of finance from the Export-Import Bank would meet all the guidelines that have been established and it would provide the funding for an American company to move forward and make jobs for here in America. And that is a good motive. But the overall question is, what is Congress going to do about United States jobs?

We hear a lot about outsourcing American jobs. Nobody ever stops to say, why are we outsourcing American jobs? We keep putting barriers in place for American jobs to be created. Here is a good example. We could have Westinghouse jobs or we could have French and Russian jobs. But it goes beyond that.

Congress has created barriers over the last generation that have driven this economy to a very difficult point. Our trade deficit was $670 billion last year. Our Federal deficit is going to be about $300 billion this year. And we are seeing the loss, the outsourcing of high-quality, high-paying jobs.

If you look at what we have done here in Congress, we have created barriers that have made it difficult for people who create jobs. Health care policy, driven largely by Medicaid and Medicare, is a socialist health care policy that has driven a whole lot of paperwork and a whole lot of unnecessary practices. For example, the Hospital Association in Kansas says for every hour of health care it takes an hour of paperwork to comply with it.

We have litigation here that drives up the cost of building products here. We have regulation that costs $8,000 for every American worker, 12 percent of every product driven up by Congress' rules, and that pushing jobs overseas.

Our tax policy ends up on the bottom line of our products. Our energy policy, that cannot to make law. We could create 700,000 American jobs but we cannot get an energy bill through the Senate. We have trade policy that is unenforced. When there is a violation of our trade policy, we do not get the proper support.

The one thing that we have a surplus of in this country that we do not export is lawsuits. The only way you export lawsuits is through trade policy. You have got to have a trade policy in place to do that.

We also need to improve our research and development and our lifelong learning, but we have got to protect American jobs and this is one way to do that.

I just want to finish this up by saying, we could do a lot in Congress to create an environment here in the U.S. that would keep and create jobs, but we put barrier after barrier in place, and here is one more opportunity for us to drive jobs to France, give the jobs to France.

Let's say no, let us not do it this time. Let us oppose this amendment. Let us support Westinghouse. Let us do something for an American company for once. Just because it has the name China as the destination for the product we shouldn't go into shock. That is not the point.

The point is American jobs, either you will have them in Westinghouse, or you will have them in Russia or you will have them in France. I say bring the jobs back to America. Let us remove these barriers that we have put in place. Let us create jobs in America. We can do it and we can do it today by defeating this amendment.

I thank the Chairman KOLBE for doing a fine job.

□ 1930

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

In another time and place, I would like to deal with many of the assertions made by my friend who just spoke, but now is not the time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Vermont for yielding me time.

Why should the American taxpayers underwrite a British company to build nuclear power plants in China? That is exactly the transaction the Export-Import Bank has already given preliminary approval for. British Nuclear Fuel's U.S. division would receive loans of about $5 billion to build four nuclear power plants in China. Why should American taxpayers underwrite a British company to build nuclear power plants in China? According to the Export-Import Bank, ''The nuclear power plants are being purchased to meet the increased demand for power in the heavy industrialized region of the country.''

This is not the sort of transaction the Export-Import Bank, read American taxpayers, should be funding. First, the purpose of Export-Import Bank financing is to enable manufacturing sales to countries that are too poor to afford those U.S. goods without financing. But China has no shortage of U.S. dollars that they have earned mounting the largest trade deficit the United States has with any single country.

In the last 4 years alone, China added net $472 billion to its bank holding of U.S. dollars. Poor China. According to

the International Trade Agency, that is the amount by which Chinese exports to the U.S. exceeded Chinese imports from the U.S.

Mr. Chairman, when I was growing up in Cleveland, there was a myth that, if you dug a hole deep enough, you could get to China. Well, you know what, we have succeeded in doing that with our trade deficit; and we will keep digging this hole with this proposal unless the Sanders amendment passes.

China does not lack access to substantial amounts of U.S. currency to enable it to buy U.S.-manufactured nuclear power plants without a taxpayer subsidy. Yet the Export-Import Bank is subsidizing China to buy nuclear power plants.

Now, if anyone here doubts China's wealth and thinks that we have to help China further, consider that just this last week a Chinese oil company offered $16.5 billion to buy Unocal. If they have that kind of wealth to spend on energy, do my colleagues not think they can afford nuclear power plants without a taxpayer subsidy?

Some might say that the sale of nuclear power plants to China would improve the trade imbalance with China and is therefore, beneficial; but do not believe it. If U.S. taxpayers have to buy the nuclear power plant, that is what the Export-Import Bank financing is, then we give it to China, and that will not make a difference in the fundamental imbalance of trade.

Unless the Sanders amendment passes, American taxpayers will be giving a gift of at least $5 billion for nuclear power plants in China.

The applicant for the Ex-Im Bank funding is a wholly-owned division of a British conglomerate. For those watching the trade deficit, the U.S. is already in hock to Britain as well as China. In the last 4 years, the U.K. has accrued $27 billion in surpluses. The profits from the sale of the nuclear power plants to China will flow to Britain, not to the U.S.

If my colleagues think the American taxpayers should not be buying nuclear power plants for China, then vote for the Sanders amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close. I am the only other speaker at the moment that is here.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains for either side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has 3½ minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. SANDERS. The gentleman from Arizona closes; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

The American middle class is shrinking, and one of the reasons that we are losing good-paying jobs is that corporation after corporation is throwing American workers out on the street and moving to countries like China where desperate people are paid 30 cents an hour, 20 cents an hour and go to jail when they stand up for their political rights or stand up for their right to form a union.

There is increasing concern by people from all walks of life that the economy of China, which is growing in leaps and bounds, is threatening the American standard of living. Whether it is blue collar jobs or white collar, information technology jobs, China is growing while our jobs are shrinking; and we are losing good-paying jobs and providing our young people with low-wage jobs, with minimal benefits.

If it makes sense to anybody in this country to be putting $5 billion of American taxpayer money at risk, to be subsidizing the development of nuclear power plants in China, providing them with the technology that can be used for military purposes, with a company that is owned by the British Government, if somebody got up here and proposed subsidies for a federally owned company, people on the other side would go ballistic; but it is okay to be subsidizing a nationalized company in Great Britain providing and building nuclear power plants in China.

I think that the time is long overdue that the United States Congress took a very hard look at Export-Import Bank in general. Over the years, what we have seen is they are providing huge subsidies to large corporations who are outsourcing American jobs. In this instance, they are providing a subsidy to a British company owned by their own government building nuclear power plants in China.

I think that is a very bad deal. I think the American people would be shocked if we allowed this to go through, and I hope that we can support this tri-partisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 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 that much time to close this debate.

The gentleman from Vermont talked about outsourcing jobs and jobs being moved to other countries in order for them to get this business. The exact opposite is the case here.

If we do not support this kind of business, it is a legitimate thing for a government, I think, to have an export-import kind of relationship. Virtually every major country in the world does that. It is a way of saying, without putting at risk the taxpayers' dollars, and so far Ex-Im Bank has never cost the taxpayers' dollars, any real money in terms of lost loans that we have had to pay for as taxpayers, it is a way of us making sure that we get jobs here in the United States, of keeping businesses here in the United States, and that is exactly what this would do: high-paying technology jobs, high-paying engineering jobs, high paying work, design work that would be done by engineers and others to support the construction of nuclear power plants in China, a very large project.

What we are talking about here today is only the tip of the iceberg. We are talking about building a large number of these plants over many years. No doubt whoever wins the initial contract, it will be like doing cookie cutters after that. They will get the rest of them. So I think we are talking about something much, much larger than is shown here today.

It is for that reason that the State Department has strongly opposed this amendment, because they believe that it affects jobs that will result, and Westinghouse has said about the loss of 5,000 jobs if they are not able to get this contract. We think we have the technology to get it. We think we can get this contract, and we expect that we will win those jobs as a result of that.

I think it is ironic that even at a moment when my colleagues are talking about the weak economy or they are talking about the fact that we are losing jobs overseas because of the trade deficit that they want to create a larger trade deficit. They want to stop jobs from being created here at home. They want to stop American companies from exporting this kind of technology, all of which has been decided that it is safe and politically safe as well as technologically safe. They want us to stop us from exporting these kinds of jobs.

The last point I would make, Mr. Chairman, is that one of the reasons we want to do this, we should be so anxious that China increases its reliance on nuclear power, is that if they fail to do that, they are going to have to continue to use more and more fossil fuels, particularly petroleum; and we know it already is occurring. Virtually all of the incremental production in the world is being consumed by China which has a rapidly growing economy, and that is what is helping to drive up the price of oil in the world to the skyrocketing, the sky-high levels that it is today.

If we are not able to help with this kind of technology, China would perhaps have to go back to other kinds of fossil fuel-using plants. Not only does it have environmental degradation, but it obviously has enormous impact on the economy of the rest of the world.

For all of those reasons, this is a very bad amendment, ill designed, ill directed, and ill timed; and I urge its defeat.

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.

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:

Page 132, insert the following after line 13:

GOVERNMENTS THAT HAVE FAILED TO PERMIT CERTAIN EXTRADITIONS

SEC. 583. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Department of State, other than funds provided under the heading ''INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT'', may be used to provide assistance to any country with whom the United States has an extradition treaty and whose government has notified the Department of State of its refusal to extradite to the United States any individual accused of committing a criminal offense 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 5 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, the amendment that I have at the desk relates to the growing problem of lack of extradition of criminals who committed violent offenses in the United States and then flee across our borders and are not able to be returned by way of extradition.

This is a growing problem. It is a problem for a country such as ours that now has an estimated 11 million people illegally in our country. Mexico to our south has become a point of refuge. Many of the individuals who are committing these offenses are committing them and immediately fleeing to their home country of Mexico.

Some are not quite so quick. Some are offenses such as the one we have heard in a previous amendment as it relates to the killing of a police officer in the line of duty, but it is a growing concern for all of the citizens of the States of this country and one that I think we need to begin to point a finger at.

This amendment says that if you refuse to extradite for an offense that would have a life imprisonment or less, then if funds flow through the State Department, those funds would be withheld if they are refusing to extradite.

Let me give my colleagues a scenario. Let us assume that you have two men who rape and brutally murder a 4-year-old child. One is a citizen of the United States. The other one is a citizen of Mexico who is illegally in the country. Both flee across the border to Mexico. The district attorney or the prosecutor in the circuit indicts them, and of course, in those kind of cases, they face either life imprisonment or, in some cases, capital punishment. Mexico will extradite the United States citizen back here. They will not extradite the Mexican citizen back unless the prosecutor agrees to lower the offense to a crime that would be less than a life sentence.

Now, that is a hypothetical case. I will allude to the facts as they now exist in my community in a few minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), my colleague.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me time and for bringing this amendment to the floor.

This is a discussion and debate that this country needs to have, and it takes me back to about 6 weeks ago when the incident in Denver where the alleged shooter, Raul Gomez-Garcia, shot Officer Donny Young in the back of the head and killed him and wounded another officer. We suspected that he would abscond to the sanctuary of Mexico and he did, and the plea bargain has already taken place. I am not certain if he is back in the United States under that plea bargain; but this policy, this sanctuary policy that exists in Mexico is a policy that requires us to plea bargain down the crimes in this country and tells the shooters, you can shoot and run to Mexico.

I will pose a hypothetical situation, but it is one that could happen.

Just suppose Osama bin Laden was picked up by Mexican police in Mexico City. There is no way that Mexico extradites Osama bin Laden to the United States until we plea bargain that down to something less than life imprison, no capital punishment, no life in prison. Can my colleagues imagine sitting on the parole board for Osama bin Laden and having to release him into the streets of the United States of America because of a sanctuary policy that exists in the state of Mexico?

□ 1945

That is the leverage that is out there now, and we are paying for these countries in foreign operations money to alter the crime and punishment policy in the United States. That must stop. It can stop with the Deal amendment.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would inquire as to how much time remains for me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we just dealt with another amendment that, in a similar way, tried to criticize at the country of Mexico for the problems that we have with extradition, and during that debate, I think I outlined what I think has been the rather substantial improvement in the cooperation that we have had with Mexico on this issue.

During the first 14 years of the extradition treaty with Mexico, from 1980 to 1994, Mexico extradited, a total of eight fugitives to the United States. In the next 4 years, they extradited an average each year of 13. But in the last 4 years, in 2001 they indicted 17; in 2002, 25; in 2003, 31; and in 2004, they extradited a record of 34 fugitives to the United States. So I think there is little doubt that we have great cooperation.

The problem I have with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia is it is not at all clear to whom this applies. I asked the gentleman, and he is not sure. We have asked the Department of State, and they are not sure. I know what his intention is and the country he is trying to effect, but we do not know it does not apply to other countries. There may well be other countries that it applies to.

I cannot say, for example, with certainty that this would not require us to cut off all of our counternarcotics efforts in Colombia. I am not sure it would not have some impact on a country like that. It could have an impact in Afghanistan. I do not know. Nobody seems to know for sure what the impact of this might be.

So for that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, and until we have a much clearer idea of how this would impact, I would urge that we not adopt this amendment and that it be defeated.

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment specifically excludes international narcotics control, and law enforcement money would not be subject to being withheld. That answers one of the concerns of the chairman. I do not know all the countries, but I can tell you some. Mexico, no sentence of life imprisonment or greater; Costa Rica, no sentence of more than 50 years; Spain, no life sentence; Venezuela, any sentence over 30 years; and Portugal, any sentence over 20 years.

Now, I gave the hypothetical of a 4-year-old girl raped and murdered and suspects fleeing over the border. In my county, this past weekend, a 4-year-old girl, about 3 feet tall, weighing less than 40 pounds, was brutally raped and murdered. The only suspect, the chief suspect, is now thought to have fled back across to Mexico. This is an individual who was deported from the United States less than 2 years ago and now is being sought again.

There is no way that our district attorney will be able to prosecute that case unless we agree that we are going to reduce it to substantially less than an American citizen would be charged with under the same circumstances.

I withdrew an amendment very similar to this last year in deference to the

chairman and upon the assurances that the State Department would work to change the situation as it relates to Mexico. There has been no change.

Mr. Chairman, they may say that they are proud of extraditing 30 individuals last year to the United States, but in any district attorney's office in Southern California alone, they can tell you of hundreds of murder cases where extradition has not been achieved. And so I urge the adoption of the amendment.

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

Let me just note that we have just been advised by the State Department that this would affect Colombia. Of course, as the gentleman said, it does not affect the international narcotics control and law enforcement account, which is one of the big sums of money that goes to Colombia, but this would affect foreign military financing, FMF, for Colombia. It would cut off the money for IMET, the International Military Education Training programs. And it would affect the anti-terrorism programs that come under the NADR category. So it would have an enormous impact on our efforts in Colombia.

I think for that reason, I would certainly hope that this body would not accept this amendment, and I urge its defeat.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL).

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. 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 Georgia (Mr. DEAL) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LEE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. LEE:

Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF HAITI

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT'' may be used to transfer excess property of an agency of the United States Government to the Government of Haiti.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

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

The goal of the Lee-Conyers-Kilpatrick-Waters amendment is to limit the transfer of free guns and other defense articles to the Government of Haiti which have been used to wreak havoc on the Haitian people. Many in the general public and here in Congress have been under the misconception that there is an arms embargo to Haiti. However, since 2004, close to 3,000 weapons have been transferred to Haiti from the United States and, in all probability, have gone to arm the Haitian National Police force.

This amendment requires a limitation on all transfers of excess property to the Government of Haiti because they are using excess arms and ammunition from the United States to arm criminals in the Haitian National Police force. This amendment specifically would prohibit all arms transfers by the State Department in accordance with all relevant sections of current law.

This limitation is critical, Mr. Chairman, because the people of Haiti are not safe, and they remain targets of political violence, torture, and, in many cases, murder. Unfortunately, too often the perpetrators of this violence are the Haitian National Police. There have been numerous reports in the news and firsthand accounts of human rights' and faith-based groups who have traveled to Haiti and seen the hostile environment Haitians face.

The Haitian National Police are intimidating, murdering, and executing the poor and political opposition with weapons transferred from the United States to the Government of Haiti. This is simply unacceptable. The Government of Haiti has access to weapons for police training and security and have paid for defense articles out of their own budget without our government and this Congress' free transfer of arms and ammunition.

This amendment is basically about accountability and saving Haitians' lives. The United States must not be complicit in helping to arm criminals, and that is why I urge my colleagues to support the Lee-Conyers-Waters-Kilpatrick Haiti arms limitation amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, but I will not oppose the amendment. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I would be prepared to accept this amendment, however, I think it is extremely important that we make it clear that we want to express that our congressional intent with this amendment is that this prohibition not extend to medical equipment or excess property that is used for humanitarian purposes.

I do not believe that is what the gentlewoman is intending to do. I know what she is trying to get at, but I think it is very important we make it very clear in our intent here that we are not trying to prevent the transfer of medical equipment and other kinds of property that would be used for humanitarian purposes.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the co-chair of the Haiti task force.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding me this time, and first of all, I want to assure the chairman that we are absolutely in agreement that medical equipment and supplies would not be affected by the reach of this amendment. I am glad the gentleman has put that in the RECORD, and I am sure we are all in total agreement.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, the Lee-Lantos-Conyers-Waters-Kilpatrick amendment is something that we regret that we have to do. Haiti is in such a difficult situation, politically, economically, and socially, and it is so important that we try to stem the level of violence. That is the sole purpose of all of us coming together to work on this. I am so proud of the chairman for agreeing to accept this amendment, because it means that he sees and understands the underlying circumstances that have caused us to come together in the first place.

We need less violence. The election is coming up. How we are going to have an election there under these circumstances I am not even sure of. We have tried, some of us have tried to get it delayed, but we have not been successful. We need the United Nations to implement an effective disarmament program, because as long as there is as much a level of violence as we find there, we cannot even go down there.

So, please, let us support this amendment. I thank the Members on both sides that see the importance of it.

Mr. Chairman, Today I rise to support the Lee-Lantos-Conyers-Waters-Kilpatrick amendment which would preclude the State Department from transferring any ''excess arms'' that the State Department may have in its possession to the Government of Haiti and the Haitian National Police. Even though the United States has an arms embargo against Haiti, U.S. law grants authority to the President of the United States to provide weapons to Haiti, without any Congressional input, as long as these arms are identified as ''excess.'' Recently, it has come to the attention of Congress that last August, the President transferred over 4,000 arms and ammunition to the Government of Haiti. These arms included hundreds of .38 caliber, .45 caliber, and 9 mm guns as well as M–14 rifles and sub-machine guns.

Presently, the Country of Haiti is in the midst of a political, economic and humanitarian crisis. As a result, many resources, financial and otherwise are sorely needed. However, the sending of arms to further the perpetration the violence is not the prudent course of action.

Specifically, the Haitian National Police, on numerous occasions, have not been described not as ''law enforcement'' but instead as ''law breakers.'' Many incidents have been reported where the Haitian National police are accused

of harassing, beating and killing Haitian citizens, including innocent children.

Due to the many problems plaguing the Haitian National Police, the policy of transferring "excess" weapons to them is particularly unsettling. I believe it is important we stop the flow of weapons to Haiti and work with the U.N. to implement an effective disarmament program. As long as violence is the way, the people will suffer. The passage of this amendment is one of life and death and is critical to the well-being of region, of a country and of a people.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I also want to thank the chairman for supporting this amendment, and I want to assure him that if we need to, in conference, make it explicit that no humanitarian assistance or excess property would be prohibited by this, we will definitely do that.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues from California, the co-chairs of the Haiti task force, for their important work on this issue. So many of us continue to look at the horrors that are occurring every day, and instead of being minimized, they seem to increase in intensity. In talking to friends who have been there recently, each day the violence gets more grim, and it affects the average person who just wants to go about their business living normally. That is impossible.

So I am very pleased that the chairman is accepting this amendment, and I hope that we can work closely with the Haiti task force to see if we can come up with some kind of positive recommendations that can have an impact on the lives of people.

So I thank my colleagues for introducing this amendment and I look forward to working closely with them so that perhaps the average family can look forward to a decent life one day soon.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time, and I thank the gentlewoman from New York and the gentleman from Michigan for their support and their very clear statements.

Also, if there are no other requests for time, I want to, once again, thank our chairman for his support and clarify again that the point he raised is certainly a concern all of us have, and we will make sure that humanitarian types of excess property that we all care about in getting to Haiti is excluded from this provision.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time and, again with the understanding that we are all in agreement that the intent of this prohibition is not to extend to medical equipment or other excess property used for humanitarian purposes, I accept 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 California (Ms. LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRADLEY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. 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. BRADLEY of New Hampshire:

Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO ROMANIA UNDER THE SUPPORT FOR EAST EUROPEAN DEMOCRACY (SEED) ACT OF 1989

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES'' may be obligated or expended for assistance to Romania under the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY).

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, let me begin by thanking the chairman of the committee as well as the ranking member, and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for cosponsoring this amendment with me.

It is not my intention to permanently withhold dollars that are appropriated under this bill from the country of Romania. It is my hope that by the time there is a committee of conference the issue that I will describe in just a moment will have been resolved.

□ 2000

That issue involves preapproved adoptions from the country of Romania.

A couple of years ago, I met a family in my home State of New Hampshire. The woman's name is Allyson Schaaf, and she had already adopted a Romanian baby and had a second child that had been approved by the Romanian authorities. She was one of about 200 Americans families that had their adoption cases already approved before a change in the law by Romania.

Under pressure by the European Union in order to gain acceptance to the European Union, Romania changed its adoption policy without releasing the 200-or-so adopted children that already had families assigned to them here in this country.

I have met with numerous Romanian officials, including the president of Romania, the prime minister and the ambassador on several occasions, and pressed the case not only for my constituent, Ms. Schaaf, but also for the other 200-or-so American families in this circumstance.

These are families that have invested love, time, energy, and all of the commitment to try to unite their families in this country. It is my hope that with this amendment that would withhold some of the money for Romania, that that will be the signal that will be necessary for the Romanians to deal with this situation, to release the 200-or-so cases that have been previously approved; and then by the time the conference committee has been formed, hopefully these adoptions will have gone forward, and this amendment will no longer be necessary.

Once again, I thank the minority ranking member and the chairman for working with me so hard to ensure that this amendment is the appropriate amendment in terms of the parliamentary procedure.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I will not be in opposition to the amendment for the purpose of this discussion, and I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) for bringing this amendment to the floor, and I thank him for his remarks. As the gentleman suggested, this is a very emotional issue which cuts deeply with a number of American families that have adoptions pending in Romania.

The development assistance accounts in our bill accounts for roughly $20 million for Romania. I want to make it very clear it is not my intent to limit assistance to Romania for the entire year. The assistance we provide is very important for local police forces, for HIV/AIDS prevention, and for fighting human trafficking, very much the kind of thing that the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) would want us to fight against. It helps fight corruption and money laundering and builds an independent media.

I have been working with the Romanian Government to address this issue, but I know not a great deal has been accomplished in this regard. I think by adopting this amendment this evening, we are impressing both on the State Department and I hope the Romania government, which I hope will get this message, how important it is to continue to work toward a solution. This does send a very strong signal to the Romanian Government. I am pleased to accept the amendment, but I do expect to work with the ranking member and the gentleman to work and revisit this issue in conference with the Senate and to find a solution that will not involve cutting off aid to Romania.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), and I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY) for clarifying the amendment. We understand the important purposes of our

aid to Romania, and I hope we can really make a change in the adoption policy. I look forward to working with the chairman.

Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for her gracious support and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his gracious support, and it is my hope that the 200-or-so families that have gone through the process, that they will be able, by us taking this action tonight, I hope we can help them expedite the process to unite their families into loving, caring homes in the United States.

I have met a couple of children adopted by American families, and it is a wonderful story. Anything that we can do to expedite that will be a significant step for those families. I thank both the ranking member and the chairman of the subcommittee.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I urge an ''aye'' vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BRADLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WATERS:

Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NATIONAL ELECTIONS IN HAITI

SEC. ____. It is the sense of Congress that national elections should not be held in the Republic of Haiti until conditions have been established to ensure that the elections will be free and fair. Such conditions should include the following:

(1) The disarmament of all gangs and illegally armed groups.

(2) An end to kidnappings of civilians.

(3) Security for all United States citizens working in Haiti.

(4) The establishment of security throughout Haiti in order to enable all candidates to campaign for office safely.

(5) Plans to provide security at all polling places.

(6) Plans to ensure security for United States and international election monitors.

(7) Fair trials or release for all persons in Haiti who are being detained without trial.

(8) Respect for internationally recognized human rights.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

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

One week ago today, the Canadian Government issued a travel advisory for Haiti, warning its citizens not to travel to the island nation unless they have critical or compelling business or family reasons. The advisory was issued after a Montreal woman said she was kidnapped in Haiti and beaten and burned with candles until her family paid a ransom.

The U.S. State Department issued a similar travel warning on May 26, urging all U.S. citizens to leave Haiti. The travel warning was issued the day after unknown gunmen fired five rounds of bullets at a U.S. embassy van traveling in downtown Port-au-Prince.

On May 31, unknown gunmen shot a French official and stole his car while he was driving from Cap-Haitien to Port-au-Prince. The official died at a hospital in Port-au-Prince several hours later. At least seven people were killed the same day when armed men opened fire and started a fire that spread throughout an entire market in Port-au-Prince.

By mid-June, the Peace Corps had suspended its operations in Haiti and evacuated 16 Peace Corps volunteers. The same week, gunmen wounded two U.N. peacekeepers during a shootout in Cite Soleil.

Mr. Chairman, the violence in Haiti has been escalating over the past year. Kidnappings are now commonplace, and security is nonexistent. The interim government of Haiti has been unwilling, unable, incompetent, has not disarmed the gangs that roam, enforced the rule of law, or provide security to citizens and foreigners.

But the government is creating as many problems as those gangs that are roaming the streets. The Haitian National Police contribute to the violence through their use of force and summary executions. On February 28, 2005, during a large nonviolent march for democracy, police officers opened fire on unarmed demonstrators in broad daylight in the presence of international observers and media.

Many Haitians do not trust the U.N. peacekeepers who stood by and watched while the police fired on the demonstrators. Police officers are widely considered to be corrupt; and Amnesty International has expressed concerns about arbitrary arrests, ill-treatment in detention centers, and other human rights violations. There are an estimated 700 political prisoners in Haiti, and most of them have been detained illegally for months without formal charges.

This is not an atmosphere that is conducive to the organization of free and fair elections. Nevertheless, the interim government of Haiti is persisting in its plans to hold elections in October and November of this year. If elections are held under the current conditions, candidates will be afraid to campaign for office, and individual Haitians will be afraid to leave their homes to vote.

My amendment expresses a sense of Congress that national elections should not be held in the Republic of Haiti until conditions have been established to ensure that the elections will be free and fair.

The amendment specifies that conditions should include the following: the disarmament of all gangs and illegally armed groups; an end to kidnapping of civilians, security for all United States citizens working in Haiti; the establishment of security throughout Haiti in order to enable all candidates to campaign for office safely; plans to provide security at all polling places; plans to ensure security for United States and international election monitors; fair trials or release for all persons in Haiti who are being detained without trial; and respect for internationally recognized human rights.

Mr. Chairman, until all candidates for office can travel safely throughout Haiti, they cannot be expected to campaign for office. Until American citizens can travel to Haiti without risking their lives, they cannot be expected to monitor the Haitian elections. And until the people of Haiti can walk outside of their homes in peace, they cannot expect to vote.

Mr. Chairman, we are fiddling while Rome is burning. Haiti is in an absolute mess. The police officers, many of them are corrupt who were rebels, who were part of the coup d'etat, who were in exile before this interim government took over, are now executing members of the Lavalos Party, are basically killing folks who belong to the party that will likely prevail if there are elections. This violence must stop.

This Congress must send a message to CARICOM and everybody else that we will not support elections in this atmosphere. We should stop this madness and help to stabilize Haiti.

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 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 proposes to state a legislative position.

Mr. Chairman, for that reason I would insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. WATERS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his interpretation of what I am attempting to do here. I do not know what law the gentleman is referring to. There is no law that would have us dictate when elections are to take place in Haiti. There is no law that we would be in violation of by not using our influence to make those elections happen.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, this is being driven by Mr. Noriega at the State Department because they have helped to create this chaos in Haiti with the removal of the democratically elected

president, and this democratically elected president will probably not be able to return to Haiti. That is not a problem. That is not something that anybody should worry about.

What we should be concerned about is why they are insisting on holding these elections in this atmosphere of violence, corruption, and complete chaos in Haiti. So I do not think the gentleman is referring to any law that he can reasonably point to that we are in violation of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) proposes to express a legislative sentiment of the Congress.

As such, the amendment constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

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:

Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS RELATING TO ATTENDANCE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AT CONFERENCES OCCURRING 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 employees of a Federal department or agency 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.

Members from either side of the aisle may disagree exactly how we got to the point we are, in general, and that is that our deficit is too high and that we spend too much money. But I think we can both agree on one thing, that we should work together to try to solve that problem.

I am offering, therefore, today what I consider is a commonsense approach to deal with a spending abuse. It is an approach that this House agreed to in similar legislation in the past.

In essence, it is a limitation on the number of Federal employees that may go overseas to international conferences. This has grown out of a growing tendency in the past by various administrations for sending various numbers to international conferences, spending upwards of millions of dollars. Back in 2004, for example, over 130 Federal employees attended an AIDS conference in Thailand.

□ 2015

Instead of spending all this money on sending personnel over there, instead we could have used it, in fact, to provide AIDS prevention and AIDS medicine; 216,000 newborns in Africa alone.

So this legislation grows out of a common problem in the past. Just sending too many people overseas, using taxpayers' dollars to do so.

Earlier in this session we had similar language which was approved by this House in the Interior bill, and I would encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to approve it now in this legislation as well.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition.

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.

I do not intend to oppose the amendment, but simply to say that I am willing to accept this amendment at this time and will revisit this and consider this, of course, in the conference.

But I appreciate the gentleman's bringing this issue to our attention, and I am prepared to accept the amendment.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to take this time to thank the chairman for his work this time, as well as in the past, to visit this issue through the conference process. So I thank the gentleman for accepting 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 New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAPUANO

Mr. CAPUANO. 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. CAPUANO:

Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

AUTHORIZATION TO USE ALL NECESSARY MEANS TO STOP GENOCIDE IN DARFUR, SUDAN

SEC. ____. Consistent with the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the President is authorized to use all necessary means to stop genocide in Darfur, Sudan.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

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

What this amendment does is it authorizes the President to use all necessary means to stop the genocide in Darfur, Sudan.

Before I start, I would like to comment very clearly that I know that the gentleman from Arizona has been very active on this issue and has been very supportive, understanding the rules and the difficulties they present. I respect the position he has to take tonight, but I also want to make it clear that I consider him a friend on this issue.

For those who do not know, the genocide in Darfur has been clearly documented. This Congress declared it a genocide in July of 2004. In September of 2004, Secretary of State Colin Powell stated: ''genocide has been committed in Darfur and that the government of Sudan and the Janjaweed bear responsibility.''

This Congress has passed enough money, I think it totals about over $400 million already, for the African Union Mission and the humanitarian relief in Sudan. We have done our job. The United States has supported financially and morally. The African Union has also stepped up. The African Union, in April of 2004, created a Cease-Fire Commission. They do not have the mandate to protect civilians, however, and that is the major problem. They do have 2,600 troops on the ground right now, but the job is not being done. In May they announced that they are going to send 7,700 troops to Darfur between July and September. NATO, the EU, and the United States are all supporting that effort.

Finally, the United Nations itself has taken action. Six resolutions have passed the Security Council to bring an end to the violence. Unfortunately, all of these efforts have failed to date. The violence has already claimed the lives of 400,000 people, and it is getting worse. For those who do not understand the concept of 400,000, that is the entire population of Oakland, California or Mesa, Arizona or Tulsa, Oklahoma or Omaha, Nebraska or Minneapolis, Minnesota. The violence has created 200,000 refugees and it has displaced 2 million people. That is the entire population of New Mexico.

What is going on in Sudan is a tragedy. The United States, I believe, has a moral obligation to step up and do whatever we can to stop this genocide. We have done it in other places for other reasons. We have failed to do it in other places for other reasons. We should not fail to do it here.

The government of Khartoum is a genocidal regime. They have demonstrated this policy again and again in every segment of their country. Reports of the fighting and the killing are getting worse, and this regime remains in power this whole time. We need to stand up and take some action.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but before I do so, let me say to the gentleman that I fully concur with what he is attempting to do here. I have been to Darfur. I went with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), and we have seen some of the terrible things going on there. There is no question about it. We need to do everything we can to stop this. And I believe that our legislation does do a lot of that. For one thing, we have $69 million in the legislation for the assistance to Darfur for humanitarian assistance as well as other moneys to implement the peace accords in the south.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a very broad amendment, and for that reason I must make a point of order against the amendment because it does propose to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

That rule states in pertinent part that:

''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law, modifies existing powers and duties.'' This does that, and for that reason it would not be in order.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mrs. LOWEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleague from Massachusetts for spending some time to discuss the genocide that is currently occurring in Darfur. He and I understand that the administration does currently have the authorization to take steps, and with his help and with the help of the Chair, I hope we can continue to keep this issue on the tops of our agenda so that the world does not actually watch what is going on without taking all appropriate action, and I want to thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that this amendment includes language conferring authority. 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 OFFERED BY MR. BONILLA

Mr. BONILLA. 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. BONILLA:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 601. Of the amounts provided in title I, under the heading ''EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES—ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES'', not more than $66,200,000 may be expended while there is a vacancy in position of the head of the Office of Inspector General in the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BONILLA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My amendment would do something very simple, and that is it would withhold 10 percent of administrative costs at the Ex-Im Bank until there is an Inspector General in place.

As we all know, Ex-Im Bank's mission is to assist in financing the export of U.S. goods and services to international markets. A by-product of this, of course, is the creation of U.S. jobs and the support of U.S. manufacturers. But all too often, it seems that the Ex-Im Bank is content to conduct operations in the shadows in a questionable manner. There appears to be a lack of official guidance in how credit worthiness is determined. There appears to be a lack of official guidance addressing the small business requirements that Congress has mandated. And more disturbing also is that we ask questions and we get no answers.

People empower us to keep an eye on these expenditures, and they are not being open with Members of Congress. All too simple questions sometimes that are set on basic policy either go unanswered or answered without any substantive information.

For example, in March of this year, I sent a letter to the Ex-Im Bank that, among other things, asked: ''Under what circumstances does EX-IM permit its employees to share information about an ongoing investigation with third parties? The bank has acknowledged that they received my letter. The Director of Legislative Affairs replied that my concerns have been forwarded to the Office of General Counsel, and the General Counsel's office has acknowledged receipt of the letter, but yet the questions remain unanswered. Obviously, their inability to answer basic questions on policy raises a concern that the bank may be operating subjectively and without internal policies or controls to prevent waste, fraud, or abuse.

This agency has existed far too long and with far too great an expense to the taxpayer to not have an Inspector General keeping an eye on it. It is time that this agency provide taxpayers with the assurance that their hard-earned tax dollars are being spent wisely. It is time the Ex-Im respects the role that this body plays in keeping an eye on them and an oversight on this agency, which is very important.

I ask the chairman for his support of this amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, but I will not oppose it.

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.

Let me just say that I think the gentleman's amendment is one that we can accept. The administration has requested $1 million to pay for an Office of Inspector General at the U.S. Export-Import Bank in addition to the $73 million that they have for regular administrative expenses.

For the past few years, the committee has not recommended separate funding for an Inspector General because we felt the bank was small. It only had 400 employees. The bank uses a private accounting firm to audit its books so a main function of the proposed IG is already being met.

Nonetheless, I understand the frustration that the gentleman from Texas has shown here this evening and has expressed. The bank should be responsive to the needs of U.S. exporters; so I do not intend to oppose the amendment.

I do want to say, however, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Texas that I am concerned about what might be the unintended side consequences of this amendment. The U.S. Export-Import Bank is not able to control the nomination and confirmation process of the Inspector General, as we know. That comes from the White House, the President; so they cannot have any control over that. And without doubt it would penalize U.S. exporters and the bank itself if there were a delay through no fault at the bank in nominating and confirming the Inspector General.

So I intend to work in conference to ensure that the bank is not unintentionally harmed with respect to the support that it gives to U.S. exporters, and I am sure that that would be the intention of the gentleman from Texas as well.

I urge support of this amendment.

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

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

I appreciate the chairman's support of my amendment and acknowledge his very thoughtful remarks. I would, however, point out that private accounting is not independent because they answer to the Ex-Im chairman and not the public. So, again, we are looking for answers. The public empowers us to keep an eye on how these funds are allocated, and they need to have the sun shine on them a little more, and the Inspector General would do that because obviously they are not being responsive at this time.

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

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 Texas (Mr. BONILLA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. INSLEE

Mr. INSLEE. 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. INSLEE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

SEC. 601. Of the total amount made available in this Act to the Export-Import Bank of the United States for the extension of credit for transactions related to energy projects, the Bank shall use—

(1) not more than 95 percent for transactions related to fossil fuel projects; and

(2) not less than 5 percent for transactions related to renewable energy and energy efficiency projects.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

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

Our amendment seeks to improve our investment internationally in renewable energy sources and energy efficiency technologies. There is a certain irony that while this amendment comes to the floor of the House now, the President is addressing the Nation about the Iraq War right now, a war in the middle of an oil-producing region that the world is largely dependent upon to sustain its economy. The instability of that region in and of itself ought to point out the need to use the Export-Import Bank to encourage the development not of the fossil fuel energy sources but renewable energy sources and energy efficiency standards. So our amendment would simply say that we have to use at least 5 percent of our energy products in renewable energy projects so we do not have to remain dependent on fossil fuel.

A couple of things that have happened to indicate the wisdom of this: In the last couple of weeks, oil has topped $60 a barrel. And since dinosaurs went to die in the Mid East, that is where the oil is. We have to break our dependence on oil internationally from any source.

Secondly, we have seen the effort by the Chinese government-owned oil company to buy a domestic United States producer as a precursor, a predecessor, of future disputes over this resource that we are now largely dependent on. We need to break our addiction to oil. We need to get serious about renewable energy.

And the third fact that has happened in the last several weeks is that we have learned that the debate about global warming is over. Debating whether or not global warming is occurring in large part or significant part during human activity is like now debating gravity. And just two facts that I hope that some Members who may be listening tonight may consider: A picture here of a glacier in Antarctica over a several-month period, showing a block of ice breaking off the Antarctic, 26 miles by 11 miles in width, breaking off, a phenomenon that is now occurring with, if not regularity, more frequency now as an indication of global warming.

I noticed seeing in the newspaper yesterday tourism is booming in Alaska because tourists say they want to see Alaska before it melts. We are now seeing with our own eyes the symptoms of global warming across our hemisphere. We need to do something about it.

□ 2030

The science behind that, this is not just anecdotal. I would ask anyone when they think about energy sources to consider the fact that carbon dioxide now is at levels that we have never seen before in the history of the planet.

I refer you to a chart which shows the changes in CO2 levels and temperature levels that have occurred on the globe over the last several thousand years. This chart basically shows that while there have been changes in the last several hundred thousand years, we have never seen spikes of carbon dioxide, the major global warming gas, like we have now.

Here is the present. We show that our carbon dioxide levels, over 376,000 parts per million, are the highest ever in global history since we have been able to ascertain, even looking at the trapped air bubbles at historical levels thousands of feet down in the glaciers.

What we see is the prediction, Mr. Chairman, that if this Nation and the world does not become serious about renewable and clean energy, those levels will spike to unprecedented levels, up to 980,000 parts per million by 2100. In the next century, we will have carbon dioxide levels, by 2100, three times higher than they have ever been in the history of the world, at least for several hundred thousand years.

We have to get serious about this issue. Our amendment would be one small step. I would like to pass it tonight. We will not, because a point of order has been raised against it. But I hope this is one small moment when Members can think that the next time we have an opportunity to get serious about global warming or respond to the needs of our grandkids, do not let this happen to this great Earth.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me just advise Members that might be listening that we are coming to the close of the end of the discussion here this evening and to the amendments, and I believe that we will be having votes in a very short period of time. I think the discussion that we have had here today, this evening, has been one that has been productive and I think has highlighted a number of the issues in foreign policy.

The foreign operations legislation appropriation bill is one which uniquely allows us to cover a broad range of foreign policy issues and allows the Congress of the United States to have its input on issues and give direction to the administration, as well as to other agencies, about how foreign policy should be conducted.

I think that some of the amendments which have been accepted here tonight have helped to strengthen the legislation that we have, and I think that the others that have not been accepted and will be voted on are ones that I hope will be defeated on the floor when it comes time to cast votes on these amendments.

So I would urge my colleagues to restrain themselves here at this late hour, and I believe that we can very quickly come to a conclusion on the bill and be able to conclude deliberations of this bill very quickly.

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 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO REDUCE OUTLAYS FOR THE RETURN OF DARFURIAN REFUGEES

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to return displaced persons from Chad to Sudan.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona reserves a point of order against the amendment.

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, I thank the ranking member and the chairman. I want to acknowledge the work that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has done and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has done on the Darfur crisis as relates to the refugees; and I hope that maybe as we discuss this matter, I can work with the distinguished gentleman and the distinguished gentlewoman on conference language that responds to my concern.

We originally had this amendment include the words ''not against their will.'' The reason, Mr. Chairman, is that in the time that I spent in Chad with the refugees that have been resettled in Chad, I saw that the crisis in Darfur and the surrounding border areas between Sudan and Chad still exist.

We have made great strides in providing resources to the region; but as I traveled to Chad and met with the leadership of Chad, they talked about the enormous challenges that they are presently having with their refugees and the refugees from Sudan and the need for resources. At the same time as I talked one on one to the refugees that were there, they expressed to me that the brutality was still going on.

Of course, in Chad we find that there is a lack of sufficient water, adequate medical supplies, and, of course, the possibility that the Janjaweed will come across the border and raid them at will. But at the same time, these refugees were frightened about the possibility of being returned to Sudan because the Government of Chad may be overwhelmed with the resources needed to protect them.

I believe, of course, that we can help provide the resources to Chad needed to protect those refugees, and the United Nations refugee resettlement effort was very much in force and very much an effective tool.

But as we know, the genocidal regime in Sudan has left 2.5 million people displaced and at least 380,000 people dead in Darfur. We also know that there is a continuing number of refugees that have come across the border.

Due to increasing violence, 15,000 innocent civilians continue to die each month. Genocide cannot continue on our watch. The United States must move forward towards an effective action against this terrible crime.

We are gratified that this Congress voted on a genocide initiative and declared that genocide was occurring. The United Nations, of course, has had a more difficult time dealing with that question. But we know that genocide has occurred. We know that these refugees are fleeing for a very important reason. The United Nations Secretary General has described the situation in Darfur as ''a little short of hell on Earth,'' and expert John Prendergast calls it ''Rwanda in slow motion.''

Under cover of a decade-long civil war that has claimed 2 million Sudanese lives, the government-backed Janjaweed continues their campaign to wipe out communities of African tribal farmers who live in the region.

I understand that there have been changes in the Sudanese Government. In Chad, I met with the Sudanese ambassador. I have met with the Sudanese ambassador, to the dismay of many here in the United States, trying to find common ground.

I want to applaud the work of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs, that has looked at this question and has fought it with great, great perseverance. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) provided additional dollars.

But I want to make sure that any Darfurian refugee that is in Chad is not forced to leave for any economic reason. Of course, we need more dollars to help Chad, more support of the United Nations Commissioner on Human Rights and Refugees. But we also need to ensure that resources here by this appropriation do not force anyone to go back to a place where they do not want to go.

Some refugees may want to go back. When I met with them one on one, they talked about their cattle being destroyed, they talked about there being no place for them, their villages had been destroyed. We looked and spoke with the African Union at the aerial footage that would show how large villages had been destroyed, so there is not much for them to return to.

I want to be able to say that we are working at all ends, the declaration of genocide, the negotiations with Sudan to stop the violence and stop the devastating destruction of these individuals in Sudan and stop the fleeing from Sudan.

But now that we are in the predicament that we are in, which is 380,000, up to 400,000 and growing, refugees in Chad, we want to make sure that there is no fear, no, if you will, requirement, no demand, no shuttling. Refugees who do not want to go back, they should not have to go.

Let me say this as well: if you speak to the women and the children that I had a chance to speak to, I can only say that tears would come to your eyes, the raping, the brutalization, the fear, the apprehension. I would ask my colleagues to consider an amendment that simply wants to give to those who are in fear of their lives the opportunity not to return if they desire not to return.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to preclude the use of funds made available in this act to force repatriation of Darfurian refugees from the Republic of Chad back to Darfur, Sudan against their will. This act could be deemed authorized under Section 12 of the Sudan Peace Act as an effort to assist the African Union in its peacekeeping efforts; however, it could prove detrimental or deadly for many Darfurians.

I traveled to the Republic of Chad last April and saw the devastation and suffering firsthand by the Sudanese refugees. They lack sufficient water, adequate medical supplies, and protection from Janjaweed militia who raid them at will.

As many of you know, the genocidal regime in Sudan has left 2.5 million people displaced and at least 380,000 people dead in the Darfur. Due to increasing violence, 15,000 innocent civilians continue to die each month. Genocide cannot continue on our watch; the United States must move toward effective action against this most terrible crime. The United Nations Secretary General has described the situation in Darfur as "little short of hell on earth." Expert John Prendergast calls it "Rwanda in slow motion." Under cover of a decade-long civil war that has claimed 2 million Sudanese lives, government backed Janjaweed continue their campaign to wipe out communities of African tribal farmers who live in the region. The government-backed Janjaweed are razing villages, systematically raping women and young girls, abducting children, poisoning water supplies, and destroying sources of food. Unlike the recent tsunamis in Southeast Asia, the situation in Darfur is manmade and therefore can be addressed.

In my visit to the region, I had the opportunity to meet with Lt. General Ansu of the African Union, which is the single peacekeeping force supported by the United Nations. During the meeting, the general noted that there is nothing they can do pursuant to the current mandate. As a result, I recently co-signed a letter, along with other Congressional Black Caucus members, to the President of Nigeria, Mr. Obasanjo, asking him to use his influence as chairman of the African Union to change the mandate of the AU in Sudan. Additionally, I am also a co-sponsor of H.R. 1424, "The Darfur Genocide Accountability Act of 2005." H.R. 1424, among other things, also calls for changing the mandate of the AU. While these are positive steps towards ending the genocide, they are clearly not enough.

In addition to my visit with Lt. General Ansu, I also had the opportunity to visit refugee camps and spoke with many of the refugees regarding what they have seen. According to them, many of the women and young girls have been raped, and many of the men have been violently murdered. Furthermore, water and food supplies have been completely destroyed making it impossible for many to survive.

The time has come for the United States to take a substantive role in curtailing this situation. I ask that my colleagues support the Jackson-Lee amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Parliamentarian has made a decision that this would be in order, and, therefore, I would withdraw my reservation.

Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all sure what the gentlewoman is attempting to accomplish here, what the purpose of offering this amendment is. The only funds that would be affected by this, the only funds that we have in the bill that affect refugees is that we provide for the UNHCR, that is, the United Nations High Commissioner on Refugees.

I think it is quite apparent that when it comes to Darfur and the Sudan, the UNHCR would not support any kind of program of resettlement of refugees that had been, not displaced, but they are refugees that go from one place to another. Refugees that fled from Sudan into Chad, they would not support any program of resettling them back in Sudan if there were not a comprehensive peace settlement that would allow them to be resettled.

The effect of the gentlewoman's amendment would be to stop assistance for such an important program if there was to be a peace settlement that was to be achieved and everybody in Darfur and Sudan were to agree on it. I cannot believe that is what the gentlewoman really intends, because what she would be doing is taking a terrible human tragedy and simply compounding it and making it a much worse human tragedy.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope the gentlewoman would reconsider this amendment, because I do not believe that its intent is what she intends to do. Let me just make it clear, it would limit all money going to UNHCR for resettlement if there were a peace agreement in Darfur. If there were a peace agreement, we would want nothing more than to be able to return those refugees from Chad back to Darfur. I cannot believe that is what the gentlewoman intended.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentlewoman very much for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if I might engage the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, I think the amendment can be interpreted in the way the gentleman has offered, but I think it can be interpreted in the way I have offered it. The problem is as we visited, first of all I want to thank Chad for what it has offered to the refugees and, of course, refugee resettlement efforts with the United Nations, where Chad is hosting the United Nations and welcoming them for the many refugee camps that are there.

But there is a terrible economic burden on Chad as well, and this is simply language that suggests that we are monitoring or ensuring that our funds are being used to, in fact, provide for those refugees who are in fear of their lives.

Now, I would be happy if the gentleman would work with me to include this in report language, so that we would have at least that protection from what might happen or what might be thought of or what might cause, if you will, some sort of pressure to return those refugees because of the economic imbalance. When we were there, though Chad was very hospitable, and all of us have gone to Chad and gone through Chad to go to Sudan, but if, for example, the financial burden became so extensive, then there might be some pressure, Mr. Chairman.

□ 2045

So I would hope that we find common ground to realize that it is a concern. I would not have brought it to the floor if it was not. I think it is an important point to make, that we understand the brutality that these refugees have experienced, and because they have experienced such devastation, we want to cross the T's and dot the I's.

So that was the explanation I wanted to make. If I can work to get a commitment on precise report language, which I think answers the concern, then I think that that is a way of addressing a definitive concern that I saw, and I think it is real, and I think my interpretation clarifies that it is not in any way undermining the funding for the U.N. Refugee Resettlement Program, but it is to make clear that even if there is an economic burden on the host country; in this instance, Chad, and again, I repeat, I thank them for their hospitality to these refugees. They should be, as we have supported their efforts, but there would not be that intent to resettle these refugees beyond the time of them wanting to go back, or for those who do not want to go back.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I know the chairman's clear concern and commitment to focus on the severe issues in Darfur, and I certainly would be delighted to work with the chairman to see if we can come up with some report language that would clarify the intent of the gentlewoman from Texas' concerns as expressed in this amendment.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I understand then what the gentlewoman from Texas is suggesting. Certainly, none of us would want to require forced repatriation of people from Chad back to Sudan. That is certainly not what any of us would want. But this amendment, as it is drafted, would be overly broad and would simply not allow us to do any kind of program that would help to resettle refugees that have fled from Darfur to return them to their homes, and I know that is not what the gentlewoman desires.

So, therefore, I agree with the point she is making, and we are certainly willing to work with her when we get to conference and the statement of manager's intentions in conference to work on language that will make it clear that we would oppose any kind of forcible repatriation of refugees from one country to the other.

If that is acceptable, I would hope the gentlewoman would then withdraw this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. LOWEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas for a concluding statement.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me try to understand the gentleman. I guess we differ whether it is overbroad, but I am welcoming of the gentleman's generous offer, in understanding that he would work with me on report language that helps us not have forced repatriation back to Sudan.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from New York would continue to yield to me, the House report for the House bill is completed, but in conference, yes, we could work on language in conference.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman from New York would continue to yield, that is the clarity that I was trying to secure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) has expired.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has remaining time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I am completed with my remarks and I am prepared to yield back the balance of my time, if the gentlewoman is prepared to withdraw the 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, with that kind of offer and the understanding that the amendment was drafted to ensure that we did not have the forcing of refugees to return, I will look forward to working with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) to have language in conference on this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. 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. HEFLEY:

Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

REDUCTION IN TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. ____. Total appropriations made in this Act (other than appropriations required to be made by a provision of law) are hereby reduced by $202,700,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

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

Mr. Chairman, this is no surprise to anyone. I rise again today to offer an amendment to cut the level of funding in this appropriation bill by 1 percent, 1 cent on the dollar. This amounts to $202.7 million.

I have offered this kind of an amendment on a number of these bills, and it is because I feel so strongly about the need for us to come to a balanced budget which we once had, and we have gotten very far away from.

The committee has done a good job in the sense that the amount of this bill is $2.5 billion less than what the administration called for. However, it is still an increase of $750 million over last year's Foreign Operations budget.

My sense is that if you do not have the money, you do not spend more than last year. That is the situation we are in right now. I will not go into this whole thing; I simply encourage an ''aye'' vote on behalf of the amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today already cuts the President's request, and the gentleman from Colorado has mentioned this; it cuts the President's request by $2.6 billion. That is 11 percent, and that is the largest cut in terms of any of the appropriation bills that we have had on the floor or will have on the floor this year.

We have cut all of the fat I think, and then some, from this bill. I am sure everybody can find something that they do not like, but there are a lot of programs that I think are very valuable that did not get funded in this because of the 11 percent cut over the President's request that we had, certainly things that the President thought were important and should be done.

I think if my colleagues were to peruse the bill, they would see that there is a $1.4 billion dollar cut from the President's account for the Millennium Challenge Corporation. That has been a priority of the President and mine in this bill. We have cut all of the new programs that the President requested. We zeroed out the Global Environmental Facility. We withheld 25 percent of the funds from the World Bank and conditioned funds of the Global Fund to fight HIV/AIDS until detailed reforms are met.

So this is a fiscally conservative bill of which I am very proud, and I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment that is offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for every one of the cuts that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) mentioned, and they have done a good job where that is concerned, but I still hope we will get a positive vote on this amendment.

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

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 Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. HEFLEY. 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 Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. 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. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING ASSISTANCE FOR VIETNAM

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING'' may be used to provide assistance for Vietnam.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order, and I do so until we have had a chance to see the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I intend to withdraw this amendment, and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) has been kind enough to agree to engage in a colloquy with me on the issue of International Military Education and Training, or IMET, funding for Vietnam.

I strongly support the IMET program. Sitting on the Committee on Armed Services, I understand that it is a vital tool for furthering regional security cooperation and promoting United States interests overseas.

Vietnam held off on agreeing to participate in the IMET program for quite a while because they were concerned about scrutiny of their human rights record, and those concerns are well-founded. Vietnam is responsible for a broad range of human rights abuses, including the repression of ethnic minorities, detention and torture of political dissidents, and the repression of religious freedom.

The U.S. designated Vietnam as a ''Country of Particular Concern'' in 2004 because of its violations of religious freedoms. With this designation, Vietnam joins a club including Burma, China, Iran, and North Korea.

So, should the United States provide IMET for these countries? Why should Vietnam be any different?

The Vietnamese military has reportedly been involved in numerous cases of human rights violations, including violence and brutal suppression of the peaceful Montagnard people in demonstrations in April of 2004.

Providing humanitarian assistance to a country is one thing. Establishing trade relations is yet another. But military assistance such as IMET requires an even higher standard. Why would we want to establish military relations with a repressive regime, one in which our potential counterparts are directly involved in that repression? I think Vietnam should not be eligible for IMET assistance until it has demonstrated a willingness to treat all its citizens with the fundamental dignity and respect that they deserve.

Can the chairman provide me with assurances that Vietnam's human rights record and the record of its military in particular will be taken into consideration as part of Vietnam's eligibility for IMET funding?

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, first, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I appreciate the gentlewoman's concern about the human rights situation in Vietnam. I share those concerns, and I believe our foreign policy should stress its importance.

I can assure the gentlewoman that improved relations between the United States and Vietnam, particularly in the area of military relations, will not ignore our objectives for improved human rights protection in that country. However, I do not wish to make engagement through IMET contingent on a specific action by the Vietnamese. I think it could have very well the opposite effect if we were to do that.

One purpose of IMET funds is to provide English language instruction to the Vietnamese military. In a fundamental way, it thus serves as a tool to give the Vietnamese military exposure to U.S. instructors, to professionalism, to progressive ideas, and to the role of the military in civil society. IMET would promote mutual understanding and provide an additional context for the Vietnamese to understand how important it is for the United States to see improvements in human rights. Besides providing this context for understanding, I believe that IMET for Vietnam will help us address transnational issues such as counterterrorism and counternarcotics and contribute to greater security and regional stability in Southeast Asia.

I thank the gentlewoman for raising this issue and look forward to working with her in the future on this.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his interest in the issue, and I am glad to hear that our policy towards Vietnam will not ignore human rights objectives. I sincerely appreciate the chairman taking the time with this important matter.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

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 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE IN CONTRAVENTION OF THE CHILD SOLDIERS PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING'' or ''FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM'' may used in contravention of the child soldiers protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) 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.

I have worked on this issue for a long time, and I hope to be able to withdraw this amendment and engage the chairman in a colloquy.

I think all of us are reminded of the terrible wars in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Rwanda. And, in addition to the enormity of the loss of life, one of the most troubling and very sad aspects was the use of child soldiers. In fact, even now, there are programs on the continent of Africa to restore the childhood to these children, children who had guns instead of soccer balls or basketballs or baseballs; children who had guns instead of sitting in classrooms and learning about science and math and the study of the stars.

So, it is unfortunate that even today, in 2005, we find the fact that child soldiers are still utilized. They are utilized in places like Burma, in the Republic of the Congo, and other places where wars arise.

I would think in this day and time of terrorism, we know that child soldiers are being used as terrorists around the world.

On June 18, 2002, the U.S. Senate gave unanimous consent to U.S. ratification of the Child Soldiers Protocol which was the optional protocol to the convention on the rights of children on the involvement of children in armed conflict.

□ 2100

This decision meant that the United States would not put anyone under the age of 18 in combat, nor would we approve or sanction any such activity. However, despite that fact, there are many nations throughout the world that sign and ratify the protocol. The problem of children being put into combat situations is still prevalent in many regions of the world. Despite gains in awareness and better understanding of practical policies that can help reduce the use of children in war, the practice persists; and globally the number of child soldiers, about 300,000, is believed to remain fairly constant.

In some continued armed conflicts, child recruitment increased alarmingly. And I have cited some of the countries where they are being used to fight wars, boys and girls, which is enormously tragic. They have even been used as laborers and sexual slaves. We know that the governments of Burma, Burundi, the DRC, Liberia, and Sudan and other governments have used children to fight wars. Burma's National Army alone includes an estimated 70,000 child soldiers, which is nearly one quarter of the world's total and routinely sends children as young as 12 into battle against armed ethnic opposition groups.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope that this Congress would go on record in some manner. Even as this amendment may be subject to a point of order, I believe it was worthy of our discussion that we oppose the use of children as soldiers. We have certainly opposed violent conflicts around the world and we wish to promote peace; but we will do everything we can to ensure that our children of the world, the ones who can be leaders for peace if given half the chance, if given the chance to live in a free and open society where they can be children and learn to be the best that they can be, I would hope that these children would not be put to the test of fighting in battles.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support my Amendment to this Foreign Operations Appropriation bill, which states that none of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''INTERNATIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION AND TRAINING'' or ''FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM'' may be used in contravention of the child soldiers protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The nations known to use child soldiers do not deserve military assistance from our nation.

On June 18, 2002 the U.S. Senate gave unanimous consent to U.S. ratification of the child soldiers protocol, which was the optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict. This decision meant that the United States would not put anyone under the age of eighteen in combat. However, despite that fact that many nations throughout the world signed and ratified the protocol, the problem of children being put into combat situations is still prevalent in many regions of the world. Despite gains in awareness and better understanding of practical policies that can help reduce the use of children in war, the practice persists and globally, the number of child soldiers—about 300,000—is believed to have remained fairly constant. In some continuing armed conflicts, child recruitment increased alarmingly. In Northern Uganda, abduction rates reached record levels in late 2002 and 2003 as over 8,000 boys and girls were forced by the Lord's Resistance Army to become soldiers, laborers, and sexual slaves. In the neighboring Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), where all parties to the armed conflict recruit and use children, some as young as seven, the forced recruitment of children increased so dramatically in late 2002 and early 2003 that observers described the fighting forces as ''armies of children.''

However, it is not just non-governmental armed opposition groups who continue to use children to fight wars. Governments including those in Burma, Burundi, the DRC, Liberia, Sudan, and Ugandan have continued to recruit and use children in armed conflict. Burma's national army alone includes an estimated 70,000 child soldiers, which is nearly one-quarter of the world's total and routinely sends children as young as twelve into battle against armed ethnic opposition groups. Both Uganda and the DRC have ratified the optional protocol, but flout their obligations by using child soldiers. The Ugandan People's Defense Force has recruited children who escaped or were captured from the rebel Lord's Resistance Army, and has trained and deployed children recruited into local defense units. The government of DRC maintains children in its ranks despite a 2000 presidential decree calling for the demobilization of child soldiers.

While none of these nations are specifically targeted to receive any military assistance in this Appropriation, it is important that this amendment is passed so that a message against the use of child soldiers is sent throughout the world. Regardless of how unlikely it is that such funding may ever take place, we as a nation can not allow even the slightest possibility that taxpayer money may go to pay for military assistance to other nations who continue to use child soldiers. It is also important to note that these military assistance funds do not cover any humanitarian assistance, only funds under the International Military Education and Training and Foreign Military Financing Programs. It's a travesty that here in America we talk of holding our children above all else, but around the world children are being used as tools for war. I urge support for the Jackson-Lee Amendment to prohibit military assistance to nations that continue to use child soldiers.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order. I hope this will not be necessary. I think the gentlewoman's concern is certainly a very real one. None of us want to see child

soldiers. None of us want to see this kind of child labor and abuses of children. And I would hope that this is a priority as far as I think the United States policy is concerned. I think the United Nations agencies, I think all of them have this as a policy. But I just would hope that the gentlewoman, we will continue to work with her on the right language here. But I hope the gentlewoman would withdraw this amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if I might, to the gentleman, I would simply say I would like to work with the Chair and the ranking member. Again, I would like to call on your good graces to look at language during conference and work with you and have the language that is appropriate and of course acceptable to all of us and acceptable to the Chair and the ranking member.

I do think that silence on child soldiers is not helpful because there is continued recruitment, and so I would like to withdraw the amendment. I would like to yield to the gentleman, just to say can we work together on it.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, she has the assurance of the chairman that we will work with her on language in conference that would address this issue. I obviously cannot commit with the Senate exactly how that language would be worded, but certainly we will take this issue to the Congress, and we will work on language in the report language for the conference.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the chairman and let me ask and thank the chairman for his reservation of point of order. But let me thank him for entering into a discussion on this matter and allowing me to discuss it and bringing it to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

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. 6 by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), amendment by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ), amendment by the gentleman New York (Mr. WEINER), amendment by the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), amendment by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL), amendment by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) 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 189, noes 234, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 329]

AYES—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Ford
Gordon
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pitts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rohrabacher
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—234

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Cox
Doolittle
Hayes
Hinojosa
Kingston
Lynch
McIntyre
McKinney
Ortiz
Ross

□ 2127

Mrs. NORTHUP and Messrs. BACA, KENNEDY of Rhode Island and HOSTETTLER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 329, had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEAUPREZ

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) 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 327, noes 98, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 330]

AYES—327

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—98

Ackerman
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berman
Blumenauer
Boucher
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Conyers
Cummings
Davis (FL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dingell
Dreier
Ehlers
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gillmor
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hobson
Holt
Honda
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Maloney
Matsui
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Olver
Oxley
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Rogers (KY)
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherwood
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Sweeney
Tauscher
Thomas
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—8

Diaz-Balart, L.
Doolittle
Hayes
Kingston
Lynch
McIntyre
Ortiz
Ross

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2136

Mr. CUMMINGS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. NORTHUP and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 293, noes 132, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

AYES—293

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)

Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norwood
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shuster
Simmons
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—132

Aderholt
Allen
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cunningham
Delahunt
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Dreier
Ehlers
Etheridge
Everett
Foley
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Granger
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Leach
Lewis (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
Mica
Mollohan
Murphy
Murtha
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oxley
Pastor
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sessions
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Stark
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Weller
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—8

Doolittle
Hayes
Kingston
McIntyre
Meehan
Ortiz
Ross
Shays

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2144

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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 313, noes 114, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—313

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Drake
Duncan
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Musgrave
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shuster
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—114

Alexander
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bonilla
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Case
Castle
Chocola
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
DeLay
Dicks
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Etheridge
Feeney
Frelinghuysen
Gilchrest
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall
Hart
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Keller
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
McCrery
McMorris
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Myrick
Oberstar
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Ros-Lehtinen
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Schwarz (MI)
Sessions
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tauscher
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Upton
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—6

Doolittle
Hayes
Kingston
McIntyre
Ortiz
Ross

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 2151

Mr. LEACH changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DEAL OF GEORGIA

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote

on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) 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 294, noes 132, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

AYES—294

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dent
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Honda
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—132

Ackerman
Allen
Baldwin
Becerra
Berman
Biggert
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonilla
Boucher
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Cantor
Capuano
Carson
Carter
Castle
Clay
Cleaver
Conyers
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gilchrest
Granger
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hooley
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Nadler
Napolitano
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Oxley
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherwood
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Stark
Sweeney
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Walsh
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Wexler
Woolsey

NOT VOTING—7

Doolittle
Hayes
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kingston
McIntyre
Ortiz
Ross

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are reminded 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2158

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 333, I inadvertently voted "aye" when I intended to vote "no." Please have the RECORD reflect that I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) 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 117, noes 309, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

AYES—117

Akin
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonner
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Cannon
Cardoza
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Diaz-Balart, M.
Duncan
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hostettler
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCotter
McHenry
McMorris
McNulty
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rahall
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Stearns
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Tiberi
Upton
Walden (OR)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—309

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards

Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Ford
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Doolittle
Hayes
Kingston
McIntyre
Ortiz
Ross
Waters

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 2204

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not rising because it happens to be my 19th wedding anniversary.

Mr. Chairman, it is my privilege to express my great appreciation for the fantastic work done by the chairman and the ranking member on this bill, and for all of us to come together to recognize the birthday of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. It is a few more than 19, too.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Let us all join in extending happy birthday wishes to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the last three lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2006''.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3057) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 341, 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 393, nays 32, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—393

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)

Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—32

Bartlett (MD)
Berry
Cubin
Davis, Jo Ann
Duncan
Flake
Franks (AZ)
Gibbons
Goode
Goodlatte
Hefley
Hostettler
Hulshof
Jenkins
Jones (NC)
Keller
Lucas
Miller (FL)
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Petri
Pombo
Rahall
Rohrabacher
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Stark
Stearns
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)

NOT VOTING—8

Doolittle
Hayes
Kingston
Lewis (CA)
McIntyre
Mollohan
Ortiz
Ross

□ 2226

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was not present on votes held earlier this morning. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on H.R. 458, rollcall No. 324; and ''no'' on the previous question on H.R. 341, rollcall 325.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I joined local community leaders from my district on behalf of Fort Bragg, Pope Air Force Base, going to the BRAC hearing in Charlotte and thereby missed a number of rollcall votes.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall votes 322, 323, and 324, and would have voted ''no'' on rollcall votes 325, 326, 327, and 328.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 140

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 140.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, tonight President Bush talked with America about the great struggle and the suffering that our country has endured since September 11. It is clear that these memories are seared for us of that horrific day, and our hearts break for the soldiers that we have lost and the families that they have left behind.

But the President reminded us that when tragedy struck, we pulled ourselves together; got to work, as we always do; and that we have taken this war to those who attacked us, to be sure that our children never suffer through another September 11.

We do not believe in appeasing terrorism. We do not believe in turning a blind eye as evil gathers, hoping it will strike someone else. We are Americans. It is not our way to let bullies and thugs intimidate and destroy what we and other free nations have worked so hard to build. That is why we are in Afghanistan and that is why we are in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the front lines of this war are on America's main streets. They are also in Kabul and Baghdad. We are in this together and we will win together.

□ 2230

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and did not vote on the Deal amendment during consideration of H.R. 3057. Had I been present, I would have voted no.

## A POOR AND FLAWED INTERPRETATION OF THE CONSTITUTION

(Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, five U.S. Supreme Court Justices yesterday strained the credibility of the court, ignored America's founding principles and denigrated the importance of the Ten Commandments and the Judeo-Christian faith in American culture and history. Allowing Texas to display the Ten Commandments on State property but disallowing Kentucky courthouses from doing the same is a poor and flawed interpretation of the U.S. Constitution.

This schizophrenia departs from the clear intent of our Founding Fathers. The court must remember that the first amendment says we should have freedom of religion, not freedom from religion.

American government was founded on a belief and a faith in God and in doing what is right and just. I would hope that in future cases the court will interpret the U.S. Constitution with a less jaundiced eye and heed the original intent of our founders.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b) note), and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the National Council on the Arts:

Mr. MCKEON, California;

Mr. TIBERI, Ohio.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE HON. NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Nancy Pelosi, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
*Washington, DC, April 28, 2005.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b) note), I hereby appoint Rep. Betty McCollum of Minnesota to the National Council On The Arts.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI.

## APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF TRUSTEES, JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to Section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), amended by Public Law 107–117, and the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts:

Mr. KENNEDY, Rhode Island.

## MAKING IN ORDER CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TOMORROW

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar be in order tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, 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 Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT 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 Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas 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.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 1-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF IRAQI SOVEREIGNTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 1-year anniversary of Iraqi sovereignty, I would like to take the time to express my gratitude and appreciation for the men and women of the United States military who are fighting for freedom in Iraq and around the world, both those still fighting and those who have fallen. These soldiers of liberty are following the tradition of what Franklin Delano Roosevelt described as ''the greatest arsenal of democracy.''

From Bunker Hill to Gettysburg, and from the beaches of Normandy to the rice paddies of Vietnam, no nation has lost so many in the name of liberty. Indeed, never before in the history of mankind has one people acted to free so many of the world's oppressed, both within and beyond its borders.

America does not fight for land, glory or riches. No, Mr. Speaker, we fight to free those who live on the land, to spread the bounties of freedom, and to bring the riches of liberty to those who cannot do the job alone. So it has been, and so it is in Iraq. Our brave soldiers and support personnel are engaged in a battle as important as any the United States has ever before waged, for the success of democracy in Iraq is a crucial test of the ideals this Nation was founded upon.

Our founding texts all proclaim freedom's universalism. Liberty is not the unique right of Americans or even Westerners, but is mankind's right. Indeed, it is a right that according to our Declaration of Independence is unalienable.

We went to Iraq because Saddam Hussein's dictatorship was a threat to his neighbors, the Middle East, the United States and his own people. We remain in Iraq because we know that sometimes liberty needs some nursing before it can grow on its own. We have not abandoned other people of the world after their liberation, and we will not abandon Iraq. We will continue fighting for freedom's survival.

And while we know that the men and women who are lost to freedom's cause will never be forgotten, that knowledge can never fully heal the pain of their families. The hole left in their lives by their lost loved-one can never be fully filled. Still, from their sacrifice, much solace can be taken.

In times of war, it is often best to look to our history to see how past generations of Americans dealt with the loss of their countrymen in just causes. During the civil war, the most trying time in this Nation's history, hundreds of thousands of families lost their sons as they tried to save the union.

At the height of the casualties, President Lincoln sought to reassure a wounded nation. The Gettysburg address was a clarion call to those who heard his immortal words. In memory of the soldiers lost at the Battle of Gettysburg, Lincoln delivered the greatest 2 minutes in American oratorical history.

The speech's poignancy may never again be matched, as in just over 20 words Lincoln honored the dead for their service, ensured that their sacrifice would not be in vain, and captured the essence of the American experiment.

But I am afraid that too often Lincoln's words are forgotten, so I would like to read them aloud now so that all Members might hear them and take them to heart when considering our current conflict. For Lincoln's words are as true for our lost men and women in Iraq as they were for the fallen at Gettysburg:

''Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new Nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

''Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of it as a final resting place for those who died here that the nation might live. This we may, in all propriety do. But in a larger sense, we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground.

''The brave men, living and dead who struggled here have hallowed it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here.''

This is the most appropriate part: ''It is rather for us the living, we here be dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they here gave the last full measure of devotion, that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, that this nation shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the Earth.''

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled by Lincoln's words. And while I cannot match their eloquence, I can heed their meaning. From the commitment of the fallen in Iraq, I will take increased devotion to the cause of liberty, the cause for which they fought, and I hope so too will all Members of this body.

President Lincoln used the Gettysburg address to honor the dead not by shirking from conflict, but rather by issuing a clarion call to continue fighting in their stead.

As we approach the Fourth of July, it is fitting that we celebrate Iraq's fledgling democracy, and remember those who fought for freedom's dawn there, and in other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the men and women of our Armed Forces, and hope they will return home soon with the knowledge that they have served in the tradition of America's Great Emancipator, and brought freedom to those who would otherwise never have known its glories.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## INVESTIGATING GUANTANAMO DETENTION CENTER

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, whenever we approach this microphone in this institution, we do it with the greatest of respect. I respect my colleague who just spoke of the great duty and service given to America by the men and women on the front lines all over the world, but in this instance, particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This weekend I had the opportunity to see another fine example of servicemen and women, soldiers and sailors, working together at Guantanamo. But as we respect and appreciate their service, I have also had the opportunity to engage in conversation with these brave young men and women, Reservists, National Guard, and the one thing they understand is that what they are fighting for is freedom, and they are fighting for the availability and the opportunity for there to be public disagreement, dissent. That is the basis of our Constitution. That is why we love America.

So I rise today to simply raise questions; to applaud the improvement that has occurred in Guantanamo, but also to suggest that there needs to be transparency, there needs to be an understanding that there was a before and now an after. We need to be able to investigate thoroughly allegations of inappropriate behavior, abuse, by those in the FBI, the media and non-governmental agencies, to be able to clear the stain that might be on those who are working hard now.

A bipartisan commission could investigate by way of talking to the detainees; understand fully what the military tribunals mean and how they operate; whether or not detainees have a right to counsel; why they are being held indefinitely; why there are no charges; why there has not been a prosecution and a conviction; and to emphasize the Rasul case, which talks about access to the courts through habeas corpus proceedings.

Again, what I said very clearly is progress has been made, and I applaud that progress. But progress will be greatly made if we have an understanding through a bipartisan process of what Guantanamo means, and ultimately to prosecute the bad and horrific terrorists, for none of us want to see terrorists released. But for those who are able to return home, to be detained at home, to be held at home, to be kept off the battlefield so that those in Guantanamo do not pose a threat to our soldiers on the battlefield and to be held against them if they happen to be caught by the enemy.

□ 2245

I ask for a simple point that freedom means airing, freedom means the opportunity to ask questions and to get answers. I say that again tonight, as we heard the President speak to the American people.

First, I applaud the fact that the President has come to the American people; it is something that I have asked for time and time again. But, Mr. Speaker, let me simply say this: we need a success strategy in order to be able to have our troops come home. It is not a cut-and-run strategy, and I resent the interpretation that those of us who have asked for a success strategy that will bring dignity and respect to our troops and freedom to the Iraqi people are in any way cutting and running.

The strategies that the President offered tonight do not lead us on that pathway. The relating of the war in Iraq to the 9/11 tragedy, the horrific terrorist act, does not comport, if you will. We are fighting a War on Terror. We need all of our allies to help us fight it. We need the Iraqis, we need the Jordanians, we need the Saudi Arabians, we need all of them. But this ongoing conflict and war in Iraq with our soldiers entrenched where the Iraqi people and the Iraqi government has not reached out to diversify their government to include the Sunnis, to make sure that they are fighting collectively against the bad elements in a unified force, that is what is keeping us from peace. Embedding our soldiers and Iraqi forces is a good military strategy, but it is not a political end to this war. And, yes, we are looking for the writing of a Constitution, the voting on a Constitution, but we need a success strategy, a time that we can look toward for our troops to be able to come home.

It would be well to give military strategies that include training our national Iraqi forces, which I agree with, and I offered an amendment on the Floor of the House, working with conferees on the Defense Appropriation, to ensure that that occurs. I support the Skelton-Harman bill that talks about reinforcing the Iraqi forces, but that is not a success strategy. Again, there is no fear to being able to talk about the time of our troops coming home, acknowledging the brave stand that they have taken and the success that they have had in initially toppling Saddam Hussein.

I disagreed with this war from the beginning because I believed that it was not a constitutional war because Congress had not declared war. But I am prepared to work with the President now, to work with our colleagues in order to develop a success strategy that comes with honor and dignity.

What we had tonight leaves us empty because, in fact, I would hope that we could believe that the insurgency would go down. But we cannot expect that, in the backdrop of Secretary Rumsfeld clearly saying that the insurgents would be active for 12 years, and tonight we did not hear any solution to the violence of the insurgents. I believe that with the presence of military forces with the United States there, the insurgents will continue to rise.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to bring peace to this crisis in Iraq. We cannot do it without an effective success strategy for our troops and for America.

## EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR PEACE IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, my colleague was just talking about the President's speech tonight and I happen to disagree with her. I thought it was a strong, resolute speech that we heard from the President. America needs to hear from him and America needs to know that this President will not cut and run. The world needs to know that the Americans are not going to cut and run.

I think that for the past few months Americans, and probably a lot of folks around the world, have heard far too much from the cut-and-run caucus on this Hill. It is time that we make certain that they know we are committed to freedom. We have a President that is not going to give in to the terrorists, and that is exactly as it should be.

Some say that by being aggressive, that by taking this War on Terrorism to the Middle East, that we are helping the terrorists and helping the insurgent recruitment efforts. These naysayers count every single person who goes out and joins and becomes a part of the insurgency but, somehow, they forget something, and they forget this: that as we are over there fighting and working to bring democracy and freedom to Afghanistan and to Iraq, that there are hundreds of thousands and millions of people that are joining us in working toward freedom, working to build a democratic ally for our children there in the Middle East, and that they are going to see a different life than the hundreds of thousands that have found themselves in mass graves in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, it is also interesting that many times, those on the left come in and they want to talk about a time line, give us a time line. Tell us exactly when we are going to get out of there. I always find that interesting, because many times I think that the liberals want a time line because they want to control it. They want to know exactly what is going to happen when, so they can micromanage it. Our military leaders need the ability to make those decisions that need to be made right there on the front lines. They do not need Congress micromanaging this war.

Also, we do not need to tell the terrorists, this is what we are going to do and this is when we are going to do it. We need to trust that leadership of our military and we need to believe in those men and women in uniform that are fighting.

My colleague also mentioned a trip that was made to Guantanamo Bay this weekend. I was also on that trip, and I will tell my colleagues, it is one of those things that kind of gets under my skin when I hear them say progress is being made at Guantanamo Bay. That insinuates that our men and women in uniform have done something wrong, and they have not, Mr. Speaker. I think it is important that the Members of this body, and also that the American people, know what Guantanamo Bay is about.

Guantanamo Bay is a detention center, and in that detention center are

held 520 enemy combatants. Now, an enemy combatant is not somebody that got picked up for shoplifting or for running a traffic signal. An enemy combatant is a person that has ties to known terrorist groups: the Taliban, al Qaeda. They are people that have participated in trying to tear us down. They are people that have participated in the September 11 attacks, the Khobar Towers, the first World Trade Center bombing. That is what we have at Guantanamo Bay.

We hear that we should send them back to their country. There is a reason we do not, and that is because an enemy combatant is not a uniformed soldier in an Army fighting for a country. An enemy combatant is a terrorist and, many times, we do not know what country they are from. The reason we do not send them back is because there is not a country that we are going to be sending them back to. It is an important distinction that we need to make.

Mr. Speaker, as we go through this week, as we talk about the President's remarks tonight, as we talk about the time at Guantanamo Bay, it is important to remember that it is our men and women that we need to thank for our freedom. It is their families we need to thank for their support.

## AMERICA IS LOSING HER INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, some people have loosely thrown the word ''freedom'' around here tonight. Well, America's freedom is declining because we are so increasingly dependent on imported petroleum. As oil prices rise, for super it is over $2.50 a gallon now at the pump and historic levels of $60 a barrel, I must rise tonight to say how sick I am of imported petroleum governing this economy. Look what it has done to our beloved republic economically, politically, environmentally, strategically. Rising oil prices control this economy. The lack of growth, every time that price ticks up, the stock market becomes very uncomfortable.

Oil prices keep us strategically locked to dictatorships all across this globe. That causes limitation in freedoms. What about the impact that oil prices have binding us to China and Iran now, looking at what is happening there, and the proposed Unocal purchase by China right at the ankles of Unocal's investments in Afghanistan right next door, as we become players in this 21st century oil market. America, wake up. Look at who gets the profit from your expenditures out of your wallet. Rising oil prices makes our economy vulnerable here at home. We lose more jobs, and the stock market remains very, very unsteady.

Rising oil prices mean we knock points off economic growth. Think about who gets those profits off those rising prices as our young men and women in the armed forces occupy the Middle East and Central Asia where most of our imported oil comes from. Now, over 60 percent of what we consume is imported from abroad; a majority of what is used in this country is imported. We are not free.

In fact, our soldiers are guarding more and more every day oil and gas pipelines from Afghanistan to Georgia to Turkey to places most Americans have not been very familiar with. U.S. foreign policy and military involvements in these areas parallel that of our global oil corporations. Unocal is not the only one. Chevron, Exxon, Arco, the names go on.

Now, this week, the Communist-owned oil company of China has decided it wants to pay more for Unocal than it is worth. Unocal does not drill anything in this country anymore; their investments are all over the world. Remember, Afghanistan was a key transit route before we got there with the military, the 18,000 of our soldiers who are stationed there now; Afghanistan was a key transit route from Unocal from the Caspian Sea Basin. They have been at this a long time. Sadly, U.S. foreign policy in that country has mirrored Unocal's satisfaction with the Taliban government there. They tried to be friends.

In fact, Unocal had plans for a new pipeline winding a far-ranging path from Turkmenistan's gas fields to the Arabian Sea. The giant oil company built cooperative relationships with the Taliban government in Afghanistan, as did the United States Government. When we supported the Taliban, as recently as 1999, U.S. taxpayers paid the salary of oil-hungry Taliban government officials. Ask yourself about that.

But as soon as the Taliban began making things a little difficult for Unocal, demanding more money for infrastructure and access to some of the oil themselves in the summer of 2001, well, our government's position began to change on the Taliban. Shortly thereafter, the Taliban became much more vulnerable after the September 11 attack, and the Bush administration was able to secure support for invasion of that country, but then maneuvered a former Unocal consultant named Khalized to be the first ambassador to Afghanistan and, guess what? Now he was just nominated and confirmed as ambassador to Iraq. Strange coincidence.

Ask yourself, who gets the profits off the rising gas prices you are paying for. China has raised its bid to purchase the U.S. oil giant Unocal, and what a twist of fate this is. It was U.S. oil dependency that drew us to secure Central Asia for oil, and now we find ourselves in the awkward position of having China buy us out. China is trying to trump our energy investments in that area because it is right next door to them, trying to buy Unocal to access what the U.S. had hoped to gain by the Central Asian invasion.

China is also courting favor with Iran. They are trying to trump us there to gain an energy edge as the Bush administration creates more barriers with Iran. Ask yourselves, who is getting the profits and why has the Bush administration made us more dependent on foreign oil, up another 10 percent, up to 63 percent now.

Mr. Speaker, America is losing her independence.

## HONORING THE LIFE AND FRIENDSHIP OF STAFF SERGEANT JOSEPH BEYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, June 21, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), our distinguished subcommittee chairman of our great Committee on Armed Services, introduced H.R. 256 in remembrance of the brave servicemen who perished in the disastrous April 24, 1980 rescue attempt of the American hostages in Iran. That was called Operation Eagle Claw.

I appreciate the gentleman for bringing this legislation to the Floor, mainly because it is such an important resolution, but also, Mr. Speaker, because it prompted me to call an old friend.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to pay tribute to the selfless service of that old friend from my childhood and a true American hero, Air Force Staff Sergeant Joseph J.J. Beyers.

□ 2300

I was reminded of my friend JJ because he was part of that rescue attempt, and he was one of the fortunate few who lived to tell about it. I had pretty much lost track of JJ after high school, although I knew, Mr. Speaker, that he was part of that rescue operation and I knew that he had been injured severely, burned severely, in critical condition for months, but that, thank God, he survived, and he recovered. But we had really lost track of each other for these many years until last week, after Mr. SAXTON introduced his resolution. I had an opportunity to track JJ down and to give him a call and to spend about 45 minutes talking to him about that operation and his life and what it meant to him and what it has meant to this country.

I want to share, Mr. Speaker, a little bit of JJ's life, our life as kids together growing up in North Augusta, South Carolina. We were both altar boys at Our Lady of Peace Catholic Church. JJ and I went to school together from the first grade.

Back in those days, Mr. Speaker, there was no pre-K or kindergarten. Everybody just showed up when they were 6 years old in the first grade. That is how long I have known that great American hero.

And a little bit later on, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, JJ Beyers and myself actually played in the same pony league baseball organization. He was a great athlete. He was a wonderful baseball player, an all-star in that pony league. We had some great athletes, and I would be remiss if I did not mention one who, like JJ Beyers, is another American hero, our age, our contemporary who gave his life for our country in another conflict, Vietnam.

But JJ Beyers and I went on to high school together to St. Thomas Aquinas High School in Augusta, Georgia where again we were both playing baseball and football. But after that, I went off to college. I went to Georgia Tech to college; and JJ joined the Air Force and was in the process of spending his entire adult life in the Air Force. He was a C–130 radio operator and had been assigned to Eglin Air Force Base in 1980, when Operation Eagle Claw was planned.

JJ volunteered for that duty, Mr. Speaker, to take the place of someone who had to drop out because of a sick parent. And JJ Beyers at that time was a single parent who had custody of his five children. And yet he stepped up to the plate and volunteered to fill in the gap to go on this dangerous mission, telling his commander at Eglin that his neighbors would take care of his children; that he wanted to go and do what was necessary to rescue these hostages in Iran. That is the kind of guy JJ Beyers is, and this opportunity tonight to share that with my colleagues, I think, is of tremendous importance.

Mr. Speaker, JJ, as I say, lived through that infamous collision between a Navy helicopter and that C–130 cargo plane. But he was trapped in that fuselage by raging flames after the crash and pulled to safety by two Delta Force pilots. And JJ has severe burns today and little use of both hands. He has been totally disabled. But here is what he says: ''There is no doubt in my mind everybody involved would have gone again.''

JJ is remarried now. He lives in Niceville, Florida. I just want to say one thing, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion. Something that happened in high school, I was a snapper for punts. I rolled that snap back to JJ Beyers in the biggest game of the year, the punt was blocked. The coach chewed my good friend JJ Beyers out. He never said a word. He took it like a man. I did not own up to the fact that it was my fault. JJ was a true hero then. He was a true hero in 1980, he is a true hero as we speak today, and I want to take this chance to thank him for his friendship and sacrifice.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCHENRY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

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

There was no objection.

---

## APPRECIATION TO AMERICA'S TROOPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time. And just having returned from Fort Bragg, the epicenter of the universe, home of the 82nd Airborne, I want to relate to you and others the speech that the President made tonight. And let me begin by saying that our heartfelt thanks and appreciation go out to the men and women in uniform everywhere tonight: Iraq, Afghanistan or wherever they may be. The President outlined very clearly tonight that this is a war against terror and terrorists that we are winning, that we must win, and that we will win. His resolve, as well as his appreciation for the troops, was most apparent.

Mr. Speaker, interestingly, I received a message early this morning from a good friend, 82nd trooper in Iraq, in which he said, we are winning. We will win. We must win. But he also cautioned us, the American people, that this is a difficult fight and we must be patient. His closing words were, a time line is a terrible idea and we must not rush to failure. Patience, honoring the sacrifice and the men and women who have given their lives so that Iraq could be a free and sovereign Nation is vitally important.

As we look at the upcoming drafting of their Constitution, starting on August 15, followed by ratification October 15 and then elections held by and for Iraqis on December 15, it is very clear that what we are doing is the right thing.

As I shared the night with Senator DOLE, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE), Senator BURR, and those wonderful troopers of the 82nd Airborne Division, it was just so clear to me how vitally important this mission is. The Western way of life and freedom itself is at stake in this war against bloodthirsty, ruthless, ideologically incredibly wicked killers. That is the stake.

We are winning. We can win. The timetable is clear. We owe it to the members and to the families with whom President Bush spent several hours tonight consoling, praying, and, yes, shedding tears with them for the sacrifices they made so you and I and all Americans and others around the world can be free.

So, Mr. Speaker, my sincere love, gratitude, and appreciation to the men and women in uniform who serve us now who have given their lives to the families that support them, the heartfelt thanks of a Congress, a grateful Nation, and freedom-loving men and women around the world. God bless these men and women.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. STRICKLAND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

## THE HISTORY AND WORKINGS OF THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to set forth some of the history behind, as well as describe the workings of the Private Calendar. I hope this might be of some value to the Members of this House, especially our newer colleagues.

Of the five House Calendars, the Private Calendar is the one to which all Private Bills are referred. Private Bills deal with specific individuals, corporations, institutions, and so forth, as distinguished from public bills which deal with classes only.

Of the 108 laws approved by the First Congress, only 5 were Private Laws. But their number quickly grew as the wars of the new Republic produced veterans and veterans' widows' seeking pensions and as more citizens came to have private claims and demands against the Federal Government. The 49th Congress, 1885 to 1887, the first Congress for which complete workload and output data is available, passed 1,031 Private Laws, as compared with 434 Public Laws. At the turn of the century the 56th Congress passed 1,498 Private Laws and 443 Public Laws—a better than three to one ratio.

Private bills were referred to the Committee of the Whole House as far back as 1820, and a calendar of private bills was established in 1839. These bills were initially brought before the House by special orders, but the 62nd Congress changed this procedure by its rule XXIV, clause six which provided for the consideration of the Private Calendar in lieu of special orders. This rule was amended in 1932, and then adopted in its present form on March 22, 1935.

A determined effort to reduce the private bill workload of the Congress was made in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Section 131 of that Act banned the introduction or the consideration of four types of private bills: first, those authorizing the payment of money for pensions; second, for personal or property damages for which suit may be brought under the Federal tort claims pocedure; third, those authorizing the construction of a bridge across a navigable stream, or fourth, those authorizing the correction of a military or naval record.

This ban afforded some temporary relief but was soon offset by the rising postwar and cold war flood for private immigration bills. The 82nd Congress passed 1,023 Private Laws, as

compared with 594 Public Laws. The 88th Congress passed 360 Private Laws compared with 666 Public Laws.

Under rule XXIV, clause six, the Private Calendar is called the first and third Tuesday of each month. The consideration of the Private Calendar bills on the first Tuesday is mandatory unless dispensed with by a two-thirds vote. On the third Tuesday, however, recognition for consideration of the Privrte Calendar is within the discretion of the Speaker and does not take precedence over other privileged business in the House.

On the first Tuesday of each month, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table for reference only, the Speaker directs the call of the Private Calendar. If a bill called is objected to by two or more Members, it is automatically recommitted to the Committee reporting it. No reservation of objection is entertained. Bills unobjected to are considered in the House in the CommIttee of the Whole.

On the third Tuesday of each month, the same procedure is followed with the exception that omnibus bills embodying bills previously rejected have preference and are in order regardless of objection.

Such omnibus bills are read by paragraph and no amendments are entertained except to strike out or reduce amounts or provide limitations. Matters so stricken out shall not be again included in an omnibus bill during that session. Debate is limited to motions allowable under the rule and does not admit motions to strike out the last word or reservation of objections. The rules prohibit the Speaker from recognizing Members for statements or for requests for unanimous consent for debate. Omnibus bills so passed are thereupon resolved in their component bills, which are engrossed separately and disposed of as if passed separately.

Private Calendar bills unfinished on one Tuesday go over to the next Tuesday on which such bills are in order and are considered before the call of bills subsequently on the calendar. Omnibus bills follow the same procedure and go over to the next Tuesday on which that class of business is again in order. When the previous question is ordered on a Private Calendar bill, the bill comes up for disposition on the next legislative day.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to describe to the newer Members the Official Objectors Committee, the system the House has established to deal with the great volume of Private Bills.

The Majority Leader and the Minority Reader each appoint three Members to serve as Private Calendar Objectors during a Congress. The Objectors are on the Floor ready to object to any Private Bill which they feel is objectionable for any reason. Seated near them to provide technical assistance are the majority and minority legislative clerks.

Should any Member have a doubt or question about a particular Private Bill, he or she can get assistance from objectors, their clerks, or from the Member who introduced the bill.

The great volume of private bills and the desire to have an opportunity to study them carefully before they are called on the Private Calendar has caused the six objectors to agree upon certain ground rules. The rules iimit consideration of bills placed on the Private Calendar only shortly before the calendar is called. With this agreement, adopted on June 28, 2005, the Members of the Private Calendar Objectors Committee have agreed that during the 109th Congress, they will consider only those bills which have been on the Private Calendar for a period of seven (7) days, excluding the day the bill is reported and the day the calendar is called. Reports must be available to the Objectors for three (3) calendar days.

It is agreed that the majority and minority clerks will not submit to the Objectors any bills which do not meet this requirement.

This policy will be strictly enforced except during the closing days of a session when the House rules are suspended.

This agreement was entered into by: The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr BOUCHER), the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

I feel confident that I speak for my colleagues when I request all Members to enable us to give the necessary advance considerations to private bills by not asking that we depart from the above agreement unless absolutely necessary.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ETHERIDGE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 27 and until 5:00 p.m. June 28 on account of official business.

Mr. HIGGINS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today before 5:00 p.m. on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 1:00 p.m.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of a BRAC hearing.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today from 10:30 a.m. until 5:30 p.m. on account of official business.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today from 11:45 a.m. until 6:30 p.m. on account of a BRAC hearing in his district.

Mr. DOOLITTLE (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. KINGSTON (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and June 29 until 1:00 p.m. on account of illness in the family.

---

## 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STRICKLAND, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GINGREY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BLACKBURN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. COBLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, June 30.

Mr. MCHENRY, for 5 minutes, June 29.

Mr. GINGREY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HAYES, for 5 minutes, today.

---

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 260. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide technical and financial assistance to private landowners to restore, enhance, and manage private land to improve fish and wildlife habitats through the Partners for Fish and Wildlife Program; to the Committee on Resources.

---

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 29, 2005, at 10 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2470. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-119, ''Anacostia Waterfront Corporation Board Expansion Amendment Act of 2005,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2471. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-102, ''Board of Real Property Assessment and Appeals Reform Temporary Act of 2005,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2472. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-103, ''Closing of Public Alleys in Squares 5579, S.O 04-10134, Act of 2005,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2473. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 16-101, ''Adams Morgan Business Improvement District Temporary Amendment Act of 2005,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GUTKNECHT (for himself, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. LATHAM):

H.R. 3081. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to increase the production and use of renewable fuel in the United States and to increase the energy independence of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Government Reform, 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. BOOZMAN (for himself, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. EVERETT):

H.R. 3082. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to require that 9 percent of procurement contracts entered into by the Department of Veterans Affairs be awarded to small business concerns owned by veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 3083. A bill to protect homes, small businesses, and other private property rights, by limiting the power of eminent domain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BASS, Mr. UPTON, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 3084. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to issue regulations requiring testing for steroids and other performance-enhancing substances for certain sports associations engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, 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. WAMP (for himself, Mr. BERRY, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BOREN, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. COLE of Oklahoma):

H.R. 3085. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to update the feasibility and suitability study originally prepared for the Trail of Tears National Historic Trail and provide for the inclusion of new trail segments, land components, and campgrounds associated with that trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. LEACH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. STARK, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. ESHOO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DICKS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3086. A bill to reduce health care costs and promote improved health by providing supplemental grants for additional preventive health services for women; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GINGREY:

H.R. 3087. A bill to protect homes, small businesses, and other private property rights, by limiting the power of eminent domain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 3088. A bill to provide mortgage payment assistance for certain employees who are separated from employment; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HOBSON:

H.R. 3089. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,3-bis(4-Aminophenoxy)benzene (RODA); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBSON:

H.R. 3090. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pyromellitic Dianhydride (PMDA); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBSON:

H.R. 3091. A bill to extend temporarily the duty suspension on 4,4′Oxydiphthalic Anhydride (ODPA); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBSON:

H.R. 3092. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on 4,4′-Oxydianiline (ODA); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBSON:

H.R. 3093. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3,3′,4-4′-Biphenyltetracarboxylic Dianhydride (BPDA); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 3094. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to improve the fairness and accuracy of voter registration in elections for Federal office, establish a uniform standard for the treatment of provisional ballots cast at an incorrect polling place, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. LINDER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 3095. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that wages paid to unauthorized aliens may not be deducted from gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Ms. HART, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3096. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payment under the Medicare Program for more frequent hemodialysis treatments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PLATTS:

H.R. 3097. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify which disclosures of information are protected from prohibited personnel practices; to require a statement in nondisclosure policies, forms, and agreements to the effect that such policies, forms, and agreements are consistent with certain disclosure protections; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. CANTOR):

H.R. 3098. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for premiums on mortgage insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNEY (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLT, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KIND, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LEE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. STARK, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 3099. A bill to reform the financing of Federal elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Government Reform, 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. MELANCON (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas):

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the display of the Ten Commandments in public buildings does not violate the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States; 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. 98: Mr. SULLIVAN.
H.R. 111: Mr. CARTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 188: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 213: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 282: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 284: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 303: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 405: Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 484: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 551: Mr. DOGGETT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 559: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 577: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 583: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 602: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 615: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 633: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 736: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 747: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 771: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 790: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 839: Mr. SNYDER, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 871: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 893: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 896: Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SANDERS, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 923: Ms. HARRIS.
H.R. 934: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 963: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 967: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 987: Mr. BACA and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 997: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1000: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1070: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. POE.
H.R. 1132: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1136: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1182: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1184: Mr. SABO.
H.R. 1200: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1204: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1232: Mrs. MCCARTHY.
H.R. 1241: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 1246: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 1248: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 1272: Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 1290: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 1298: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 1402: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 1409: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1424: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1426: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 1431: Mr. STARK and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1440: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1449: Mr. GALLEGLY.
H.R. 1468: Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 1471: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 1547: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 1582: Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 1589: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1608: Mr. GOODLATTE and Mr. GUTKNECHT.
H.R. 1621: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. MURPHY.
H.R. 1645: Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1667: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1736: Mr. AKIN, Ms. MATSUI, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 1819: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1850: Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1861: Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. WEINER, Mr. STARK, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. LEE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN Schultz, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1898: Mr. BONILLA.
H.R. 1951: Mr. CUMMINGS and Ms. HART.
H.R. 1980: Ms. HART.
H.R. 2063: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2106: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 2121: Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, MR. CARDIN, and Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2206: Mr. BAKER and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 2207: Mrs. MCCARTHY and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 2229: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2231: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. HERSETH, and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2238: Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. MALONEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2320: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 2330: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H.R. 2338: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2350: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2355: Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 2409: Mr. HONDA, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2410: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. OLVER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 2457: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2471: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2526: Mr. PITTS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 2533: Mr. RUSH and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2567: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2617: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2648: Mr. OTTER and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 2746: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2793: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. GORDON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2794: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 2802: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 2803: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 2830: Mr. OTTER.
H.R. 2835: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2874: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2876: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2877: Mr. PITTS and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 2932: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 2952: Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 2968: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 3000: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3041: Mr. SABO.
H.R. 3059: Mr. KIND and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 3064: Mr. OWENS and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 3073: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 3079: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H. J. Res. 53: Mr. NEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. FOXX.
H. Con. Res. 27: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. FATTAH.
H. Con. Res. 59: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SERRANO, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H. Con. Res. 85: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H. Con. Res. 133: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
H. Con. Res. 140: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. REYNOLDS.
H. Con. Res. 168: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. LEACH.
H. Con. Res. 172: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H. Con. Res. 175: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. MENENDEZ.
H. Con. Res. 187: Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 191: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. POE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. REGULA Mr. PITTS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. SANDERS. and Mr. SANDERS.
H. Res. 67: Mr. SHERMAN.
H. Res. 214: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.
H. Res. 215: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 276: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H. Res. 297: Mr. GILLMOR and Mr. BACHUS.
H. Res. 323: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. TERRY.
H. Res. 325: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H. Res. 326: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. LANTOS.
H. Res. 328: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. WATSON.
H. Res. 335: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. ISRAEL.
H. Res. 340: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. WOLF, and Mrs. CUBIN.

## DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsor were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H. Con. Res. 140: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MR. BEAUPREZ

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES THAT REFUSE TO EXTRADITE TO THE UNITED STATES ANY INDIVIDUAL ACCUSED IN THE UNITED STATES OF KILLING A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Department of State may be used to provide assistance to any country the government of which has notified the Department of State of its refusal to extradite to the United States any individual accused in the United States of killing a law enforcement officer, as specified in a United States extradition request.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MR. BRADLEY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE TO ROMANIA UNDER THE SUPPORT FOR EAST EUROPEAN DEMOCRACY (SEED) ACT OF 1989

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated in this Act under the heading ''ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES'' for assistance to Romania under the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (except $15,000,000 of such funds) may be obligated or expended before January 15, 2006.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MR. DEAL OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 132, insert the following after line 13:

GOVERNMENTS THAT HAVE FAILED TO PERMIT CERTAIN EXTRADITIONS

SEC. 583. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Department of State may be used to provide assistance to any country with whom the United States has an extradition treaty and whose government has notified the Department of State of its refusal to extradite to the United States any individual accused of committing a criminal offense for which the maximum penalty is life imprisonment without the possibility of parole, or a lesser term of imprisonment.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLEY OF COLORADO

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

REDUCTION IN TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. ____. Total appropriations made in this Act (other than appropriations required to be made by a provision of law) are hereby reduced by $202,700,000.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 29, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 29, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)''.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MS. LEE OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT OF HAITI

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT'' may be used to transfer excess property of an agency of the United States Government to the Government of Haiti.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MR. OTTER OF IDAHO

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Page 132, after line 13, insert the following:

LIMITATION ON ASSISTANCE FOR PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY AND THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE

SEC. ____. (a) 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 2006; 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 2006 unless the Secretary of State determines that the Palestinian Authority has not provided support for acts of international terrorism during the three-month period preceding the first day of that quarter.

(b) In this section, the term ''quarter of fiscal year 2006'' means any three-month period beginning on—

(1) October 1, 2005;
(2) January 1, 2006;
(3) April 1, 2006; or
(4) July 1, 2006.

H.R. 3057

OFFERED BY: MR. SIMPSON OF IDAHO

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VI—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS BY THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK TO SUPPORT EXPORTS TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SEC. 601. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to guarantee, insure, extend credit, or participate in the extension of credit in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by the People's Republic of China or any agency or national thereof.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. DAVIS OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 224, insert the following after line 8:

SEC. 948. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the amendments made to section 515.560 or 515.561 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to travel-related transactions incident to travel to Cuba and visiting relatives in Cuba), as published in the Federal Register on June 16, 2004.

(b) The limitation in subsection (a) shall not apply to the implementation, administration, or enforcement of section 515.560(c)(3) of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. GINGREY OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 77, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000) (increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. LATOURETTE

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 2, line 10, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $17,339,000)''.

Page 2, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,052,000)''.

Page 2, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,910,000)''.

Page 2, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $1,422,000)''.

Page 3, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $11,895,000)''.,

Page 3, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $60,000)''.

Page 4, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $31,583,000)''.

Page 6, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''.

Page 9, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $59,000,000)''.

Page 29, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $26,325,000)''.

Page 30, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $657,000,000)''.

Page 42, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $6,592,000)''.

Page 51, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 164, line 12, after the first dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $745,409,000)''.

Page 164, line 12, after the second dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,500,000)''.

Page 165, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $9,500,000)''.

Page 166, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $568,409,000)''.

Page 166, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $133,417,000)''.

Page 167, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $434,992,000)''.

Page 169, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $150,000,000)''.

Page 171, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $17,500,000)''.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. HEFLEY

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of $669,350,000.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MRS. MALONEY

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 150, line 1, strike ''$750,000'' and insert ''$3,000,000''.

H.R. **3058**

OFFERED BY: MR. GARY G. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 57, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $24,000,000)''.

Page 77, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $24,000,000)''.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. NADLER

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 76, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 95, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. NADLER

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 63, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

Page 63, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

Page 63, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $100,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 23, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $36,000,000)''.

Page 95, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $65,000,000)''.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. POE

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 7, lines 8, 9, and 11, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $24,875,000)''.

Page 30, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $24,875,000)''.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. SHUSTER

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 164, line 12, insert after the first dollar amount ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 166, line 9, insert after the dollar amount ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 167, line 12, insert after the dollar amount ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 171, line 4, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. SIMMONS

AMENDMENT NO. 14: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into, implement, or provide oversight of contracts between the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, and private collection agencies. Notwithstanding this provision, the Secretary of the Treasury, or his designee, may continue to utilize any private collection contract authority in effect prior to October 22, 2004. Nothing in this provision shall impact the administration of any tax or tariff.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE–BUSINESS SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION'' is hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. SIMMONS

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to make taxpayer identification numbers (TINs) or social security numbers available to private collection agencies for the purpose of collecting taxes.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. SOUDER

AMENDMENT NO. 165: In title V, in the item relating to ''Federal Funds—Federal Payment to the District of Columbia'', insert the following:

(a) None of the funds contained in this Act may be expended for any action to enforce section 7–2502.01, District of Columbia Code, in relation to possession of a firearm; section 7–2506.01, District of Columbia Code, in relation to possession of ammunition; section 7–2507.02, District of Columbia Code, in relation to the keeping of a firearm; or section 22–4504, in relation to carrying a pistol, if—

(1) the person against whom the provision is sought to be enforced is not otherwise prohibited by section 922(g) or (n) of title 18, United States code, or by section 22–4503, District of Columbia Code, from possessing a pistol or other firearm, and would not be prohibited from receiving a registration certificate under section 7–2502.03(a), District of Columbia Code; and

(2) the pistol or other firearm involved is not a firearm described in section 5845(a) of title 26, United States code); and

(3) the possession, carrying or keeping of the pistol or other firearm occurred within such person's place of residence.

(b) This restriction shall not apply to any case in which a penalty could be imposed under section 924(c) of title 18, United States code if the defendant were tried and convicted in a court of the United States.

H.R. 3058

OFFERED BY: MR. SOUDER

AMENDMENT NO. 17: In title VI, in the item relating to ''FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS—OTHER FEDERAL DRUG CONTROL PROGRAMS'', after each of the first and second dollar amounts, insert the following: ''(increased by $25,000,000)''.

In title VII, in the item relating to ''GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION—REAL PROPERTY ACTIVITIES—FEDERAL BUILDINGS FUND''—

(1) after the aggregate dollar amount preceding paragraph (1), insert the following: ''(reduced by $25,000,000)''; and

(2) after each of the dollar amounts in paragraphs (4) and (5), insert the following: ''(reduced by $12,500,000)''.