Mr. TRAFICANT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I will object, I ask unanimous consent that we suspend with the Andrews amendment, that we proceed with the votes, and then they have their 30 minutes to conclude the Andrews amendment, and that vote will be taken Monday.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending request is the unanimous consent request offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), limiting time on the pending Andrews amendment and amendments thereto for 15 minutes for each side. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the pending amendment by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) be suspended and that the Committee proceed with the votes that have been scheduled.

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, why does the gentleman from Ohio not first establish the amount of time of debate, and we will rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks all Members to suspend.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) would have to, by unanimous consent, withdraw his amendment and get permission in the full House, where a special order has already been entered on permissible amendments, to reoffer his amendment for such a procedure to be permitted in the Committee of the Whole.

The pending amendment is the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, and under the way the 5-minute rule works, that is, people come and it is not divided on each side of the issue, which is the way the 5-minute rule works, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and I have worked very hard to try to bring something that was honed down, with minimal controversy, to the floor.

Clearly, the House must work its will, and it is done largely with authorizing issues, I might add. I mean debates that have been carried over from the authorizing committee; and that is completely appropriate.

But recognizing all that we have been through today, I ask unanimous consent that each side of the amendment have 10 minutes, and then we take the vote and proceed with the other votes this evening.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the pending Andrews amendment be given an additional 30 minutes to be equally divided and that the debate take place after the House has completed its votes on the pending amendments; and any recorded vote, if called by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), would be heard on Monday as the first order of business.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would inform the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) that the Committee of the Whole does not have the authority that the gentleman is requesting.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, if we are still in the Committee of the Whole, I rise to speak in opposition to the Andrews amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of the Andrews amendment, which we really did not anticipate would be introduced, especially at this late hour of the night, comes at a surprise because we were of the understanding that he was not going to introduce it.

So with the misinformation that I had regarding that what someone thought was a commitment, I speak against the Andrews amendment because, effectively, what he does, he shuts down the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

The Andrews amendment would devastate the ability of our American companies from doing business in any foreign country. It would give such tremendous advantage to our foreign competitors, because every one of the G-7 Nations have, in effect, in their country an organization similar to this.

The sponsor of the amendment indicated that OPIC costs us money. In reality, Mr. Chairman, let me tell my colleagues that OPIC makes money. They intend to return nearly $200 million to the Treasury to help us continue to decrease our level of deficit spending. We should compliment organizations such as that.

It would hurt U.S. jobs, because when we have the inability to transfer our technology, to transfer our American interest to foreign countries, those jobs are going to go to other countries. So we are going to lose an estimated 70,000 U.S. jobs alone in the next 4 years.

It would hurt small businesses who contribute to the multifaceted involvement of our American firms doing business in foreign countries.

It hurts our competitiveness. It hurts everything that we stand for with respect to our ability to recognize that we are in a global economy, that if we are going to expand, if we are going to have exports, our American companies must have the same advantages, a level playing field, as does Japan, as does France, as does Germany, as does the Great Britain, and all of the countries that we are competing with for our businesses overseas.

For an example, if General Electric or Westinghouse, if we built a power plant that is not financed by, but guaranteed by OPIC, they do not put some type of Japanese generator there. They put an American generator there. As a result, jobs are created here in the United States of America.

This is not something that is new. It has come up in the past. I am sure it will come up in the future. But the sponsor of the bill, in my opinion, is making a very serious mistake in his amendment, which effectively shuts OPIC down entirely.

It tells the bank, OPIC bank, that they can continue to collect the monies that they are collecting now, but they cannot have any new deposits, they cannot have any new business at all coming in in the future.

So it is a very, very finite move, I think, in the wrong direction.

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. LAHOOD) 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. 2606) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Andrews amendment during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole of H.R. 2606, Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000 be suspended.

Mr. ANDREWS. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, one of
the things I wanted to make clear is that the chairman, I am sure in good faith, made a representation earlier there had been an agreement by me not to offer this amendment. That is not accurate. I did not make any representation to anyone to that effect, and I wanted to clear that up for the record.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), when the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2606, resumes its sitting on a subsequent day?

Mr. CALMANS. I am informed that we will begin debate on this issue at 4 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee of the Whole house in the Committee of the House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2606, resumes its sitting on a subsequent day?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), when the pending amendment would be reoffered at a subsequent time when the Committee resumes its sitting on a subsequent day?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I felt, Mr. Speaker, that the pending amendment would be the order of business at that time.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve the right to object, and just in protecting the rights of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), when we are talking about a subsequent time, is that the correct understanding?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), when the pending amendment would be the order of business at that time?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), when the pending amendment would be the order of business at that time, and that he knows, will this debate on his amendment begin the proceedings, at 4 o'clock on Monday; is that the correct understanding?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), when the pending amendment would be reoffered at a subsequent time?

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), when the pending amendment would be the order of business at that time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of my unanimous consent is to come back into session at 4 o'clock on Monday next, at which time, when the Committee of the Whole is reestablished, we would have the discussion on the Amendments. At that point there would be 30 minutes divided, 15 minutes on each side, when the Committee of the Whole was regruped.

Ms. PELOSI. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), when the pending amendment would be reoffered at a subsequent time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) on which further proceedings were postponed on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.