

□ 1030

TRIBUTE TO RON UNDERWOOD,
UNITED STATES PROBATION OF-
FICER

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

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ron Underwood will conclude 23 years of distinguished service to the Federal judiciary as a U.S. Probation Officer on August 31 of this year.

He grew up in Charlotte, North Carolina and earned a Bachelor of Arts degree from UNCC and a Master's from North Carolina State. He put his education on hold while he went to serve his country in the U.S. Air Force from 1967 until 1971. He began his career as a U.S. Probation Officer on November 6 of 1978. As an officer, he showed great concern for his community and also compassion for the criminal offenders with which he dealt.

Throughout his military service, employment as a U.S. Probation Officer, family and civic responsibilities, Ron has been a model of integrity, hard work and professionalism. His service to his country has been outstanding and deserving of thanks by all of us in Congress.

THE FLETCHER BILL, THE BEST
HEALTH CARE PLAN FOR AF-
FORDABILITY AND ACCESSI-
BILITY

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the goals that I wanted to accomplish as a Member of Congress is to help make health care more affordable and more accessible.

This week we have a choice between two bills. One of them is the Dingell-Norwood-Ganske bill. That bill seems to be an inner baseball game, intramural game between the affluent trial lawyers, the affluent medical community and the affluent insurance companies on who can sue who. As a result, health care costs, of course, are sure to rise.

On the other hand, we have the Fletcher bill that, unlike the other bill, addresses the issues of affordability and accessibility. It offers a Medical Savings Account so that the insured individual will become responsible and have an incentive to save money on his or her health care. That is one element, a key element, that is missing in our health care delivery service today.

It also helps the uninsured. That brickmason back home who has two or three people on his crew, right now he is priced out of health care. Under the Fletcher bill, there will be more com-

petition and more opportunity for him to buy health care.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Fletcher health care bill for affordability and accessibility.

THE PRESIDENT'S ENERGY POLICY
WILL STEER AMERICA SAFELY
THROUGH ENERGY CRISIS

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, America needs more energy. The West needs more electricity. The East will need heating oil this winter, just like it did last year. The entire Nation needs more natural gas.

We saw natural gas prices quadruple last winter. We saw seniors and low-income families struggling to heat their homes and still afford groceries. It is likely to happen again this year.

We must conserve energy. Conservation efforts have already made a big difference. They are part of the reason gasoline prices have been dropping.

Yes, we must rely more heavily on clean, renewable fuels. Yes, we must build our energy future around emerging technologies. Yes, we must produce more energy. We must produce more oil. We must produce more natural gas. Our cars still run on gasoline, and many of our homes are heated with natural gas and heating oil. Virtually all of the new generating plants built in the last 10 years in this country use natural gas.

Next week, the House will consider a comprehensive package that does all of this. The bill implements the President's natural energy policy. It creates a blueprint for steering us safely through the energy challenges we face now and the energy challenges we will face this winter and next summer.

There is only one sure way to prevent spikes in energy prices that hurt us all: ample supply.

URGING THE PRESIDENT TO TAKE
MEANINGFUL ACTION ON GLOB-
AL WARMING

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago I was at the Arctic Wildlife Refuge, where the Bush administration wants to drill for oil.

While we will be debating whether to change that precious intact ecosystem, I wanted to advise Members that we are already changing the Arctic Wildlife Refuge. The reason we are changing it is that we are already causing global climate change, global warming.

What I found at the Arctic ocean is that the ice pack in the Arctic Ocean is shrinking significantly, almost a 50

percent reduction in depth, a 10 percent reduction in coverage.

I went to Denali National Park. The rangers told me that the tree line is moving north already due to global climate change. We are already changing the Arctic.

When the world met in Bonn 2 days ago to try to do something about it, the Bush administration sent the United States to the bench and did absolutely nothing. We as a leader in democracy abdicated, due to the Bush administration's ostrich like-proposals to do anything about global climate change.

I am urging the Bush administration to act, to lead the country and lead the world to do something meaningful about climate change so we do not destroy the world.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT
FINANCING, AND RELATED PRO-
GRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT,
2002

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Pursuant to House Resolution 199 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. 2506.

□ 1035

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. 2506) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, 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 on Thursday, July 19, 2001, the bill had been read through page 1, line 6.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—EXPORT AND INVESTMENT
ASSISTANCE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

The Export-Import Bank of the United States is authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such corporation, and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations, as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as may be necessary in carrying out the program for the current fiscal year for such corporation: *Provided*, That none of the funds available during the current fiscal year may be used to make expenditures, contracts, or commitments for the export of nuclear equipment, fuel, or technology to any country other than a nuclear-weapon state as defined in Article IX of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons eligible to receive economic or military assistance under this Act that has

detonated a nuclear explosive after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION

For the cost of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance, and tied-aid grants as authorized by section 10 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, \$753,323,000 to remain available until September 30, 2005: *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, 2020 for the disbursement of direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance and tied-aid grants obligated in fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act or any prior Act appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, or related programs for tied-aid credits or grants may be used for any other purpose except through the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated by this paragraph are made available notwithstanding section 2(b)(2) of the Export Import Bank Act of 1945, in connection with the purchase or lease of any product by any East European country, any Baltic State or any agency or national thereof.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 60 offered by Mr. VISCLOSKY:

In title I, in the item relating to "SUBSIDY APPROPRIATION", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

In title I, in the item relating to "ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES", after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND"—

(1) after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$18,000,000)"; and

(2) in the 4th proviso—

(A) after the dollar amount allocated for vulnerable children, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)"; and

(B) after the dollar amount allocated for HIV/AIDS, insert "(increased by \$13,000,000)".

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, what does the amendment that I and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) are offering do today? Our amendment will cut \$3 million from the Ex-Im Bank's administrative expenses and \$15 million for the Bank's subsidy appropriations.

I would, first of all, point out to all of my colleagues that the remaining subsidies and dollars in this bill for the Ex-Im Bank would still be \$100 million more than the President of the United States requested in his budget this year. So even given the cut that the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and I seek, we will be over the President's request by \$100 million.

It is my understanding that with the change in how we will score for loan subsidies, that the range estimated to be provided under this bill will be between \$12 and \$12.5 billion compared to about \$10.5 this year.

Why are we offering this amendment? We are offering this amendment because last year, over the objections of the administration and many Members of this House, the Ex-Im Bank approved an \$18 million loan guarantee to Benxi Iron and Steel in China.

This loan increases Benxi's hot roll steel capacity by 11.5 million metric tons at a time when the world capacity is in excess of 280 million tons. Benxi Steel is currently involved in an anti-dumping case before the International Trade Commission because the Department of Commerce has already found that Benxi has dumped steel, and their margin of dumping on hot roll carbon steel dumping is 67.44 percent. This is also the highest margin found by the Commerce Department of six Chinese companies currently being investigated.

The American Iron and Steel Institute in April of last year wrote to the Ex-Im Bank and explained that China is increasing its government subsidies to steel in preparation for that country's entry into the WTO.

What is the consequence of this loan guarantee? This is a bad loan, and it has put American citizens out of work. Since 1998, 23,000 steel workers have lost their jobs. We now have 19 steel companies that are in bankruptcy, interestingly enough, one of whom declared bankruptcy last Monday when the Ex-Im Bank said they should revise some of their rules as to how these loan guarantees are made.

Within those companies, 42,556 Americans are now in jeopardy. Over 21 percent of all the steel capacity in the United States today is in bankruptcy; and, again, I emphasize there is already a 280-million ton excess capacity on the world market; and the Ex-Im Bank completely ignored that.

The industry has done everything possible to help itself. They have modernized. They have invested billions of dollars. They have closed 30 million tons of steel in the United States of America.

Hot roll products today sell for less than they did 20 years ago. Where are these employees and these bankrupt companies? They are in States like New York, Georgia, Connecticut, Alabama, Missouri, South Carolina, Minnesota, Arizona, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Tennessee, Georgia, West Virginia, Texas, Utah, and now the State of California.

I find it interesting that Monday of last week, the week when people assumed this amendment would be debated in the House of Representatives, the President of the Ex-Im Bank proposed that they would sharpen their criteria in consideration of loans such as this. The President of the Bank said that they should apply to all products where there could be conceivable oversupply with the potential of harming domestic industry. What a terrific coincidence.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and I and others are offering an amendment today. Last Monday, the Ex-Im Bank found religion. The fact is, under their rules and under their policy handbook, they do not have to change the rules. The rules say they never should have made that loan guarantee in the first place, and they ignored their own handbook.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the gentleman has accomplished his mission here. He has gotten them, the Ex-Im Bank, to take seriously his point of view here on this particular matter.

It seems to me that to punish the Ex-Im Bank, this is what the gentleman would be doing, and they would be punishing the exporters of this country, many of which are small businesses who are struggling to stay in business, and take \$3 million of their funds, which are for salaries.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's argument is based on if we could count on the Ex-Im Bank to be serious about their reviews.

In February 9 of 2001, they wrote a letter to me saying that in 1999, the Ex-Im Bank amended its economic impact procedures to make them more restrictive in order to minimize any potential negative impacts on companies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) has expired.

(On request of Mr. DICKS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. VISCLOSKY was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Then they granted this loan guarantee. Then they came out and said, "Another review of this policy has already been planned to begin shortly."

We are waiting forever for the Ex-Im Bank to review its plans not to hurt American manufacturers as they finance this overcapacity around the world.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is an experienced legislator here. Obviously, if he is going to change the law, he has to change the substantive law here.

This is an appropriations bill, where we are trying to provide money to run the agency. What the gentleman needs to do is amend the legislation.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I have to reclaim my time.

I would simply respond to the gentleman that we want to drive home the point, because it is not a coincidence that the Ex-Im Bank found religion on Monday of last week. The fact is, and it is not a coincidence, that today and yesterday and last year the Ex-Im Bank, under their policy handbook and under the law, were prohibited from making a loan like that.

It is a fact that the Secretary of Commerce wrote to the Ex-Im Bank and said, "Do not make this loan. You have 280 million excess tons. You have lost 23,000 jobs in this country. You have 18 companies in bankruptcy, and another one went over the cliff last Monday."

They do not listen. The only thing they are going to understand is this entire House today voting to cut the recommendation that is contained in this bill, which I again would emphasize would leave the Ex-Im Bank at \$100 million more than the President of the United States asked for in his budget request.

I would implore my colleagues to vote for the Mollohan-Visclosky amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in opposition to this. I think, as the gentleman from Washington explained very well, this is an attempt to try to take a baseball bat and hit Ex-Im Bank over the head. I understand. We do that a lot around here. But it does not get at the substance of it. It does not really get at the issue that the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from West Virginia really want to address, because of course it does not deal with a specific loan to a specific entity at all.

As the gentleman from Indiana has explained, it would take \$18 million from the Export-Import Bank and transfer it to some other very worthy programs, like HIV/AIDS. It does so in the exact same amount as the Bank lent to the Benxi Iron and Steel Company in China.

Let me just address for a moment what the impact of this amendment would be on the work that the Ex-Im Bank does.

□ 1045

First of all, it needs to be noted that while the gentleman from Indiana referred to this as being still well above what the President had requested, this is the area that has taken the biggest decrease from last year in terms of what the President requested.

The President asked for a 25 percent cut to the Ex-Im Bank, \$229 million less than the 2001 level of \$927 million. We provided for \$118 million more than that, but it is still \$107 million less

than last year. So there is no question that this amendment will significantly cut in to the work that the Ex-Im Bank does.

Fewer funds are in the Ex-Im Bank in their subsidy program this year, because if there are fewer funds, it relates directly to a lower volume of bank export financing. In fact, we cannot translate this and say this is \$18 million, because the fact is this would result directly in \$275 million less in Ex-Im Bank loan guarantees for next year. That is the result of taking this amount of money, \$18 million of guarantees out, and what it translates into in terms of the impact on the Export-Import Bank.

We already have exporters in this country that are hurting because of the very strong dollar. A strong dollar is good for us, good for the economy, but it really hurts when it comes to our exporters, and we are hurt in that area. Alan Greenspan just last week testified in the Senate that the U.S. economy still faces a number of weaknesses. The capital spending is lagging, and unequivocally this demonstrates the pain we are feeling in today's economy. So this is not the time to be cutting one of the few tools that we have to help to promote exports and to help export-related jobs, specifically export-related jobs in the gentleman's district, and export-related jobs in all the other districts around this country.

Now, let me also point out the impact a \$3 million cut to the Ex-Im Bank's administrative expenses would have. It disproportionately hurts small businesses. We have already recommended a level that is \$2 million below what the President's request is. So this would cut into the technological upgrades that Ex-Im Bank is trying to do, and those are essential if we are going to process small business transactions, especially insurance transactions.

So let me summarize by saying that the gentleman's amendment is going to cut the work of the Ex-Im Bank. It is not going to have anything to do with the particular loan the gentleman is concerned about; but it is going to cut out jobs in his district, it will cut out jobs in West Virginia, it will cut out jobs around the rest of the country, because companies that want to do business overseas will not be able to compete with the work that other countries are able to do and to subsidize their companies in those countries.

So this is the wrong amendment at the wrong time, and I would urge we not do this.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. The gentleman has said this is about export-related jobs. Indeed, it is about export-related jobs. We have exported 23,000 steel workers'

jobs because of the insensitivity of the American Government, and particularly this institution, over the last 3 years.

This particular loan was egregious, and we should be expressing as much concern about the export of jobs from this country. That is what we ought to be interested in. Those are the export jobs we ought to be interested in.

Mr. KOLBE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, in the brief time that is remaining, I would just say I would challenge the figure that the gentleman has used as to whether that kind of job loss is a direct result of giving loans to the companies in question. But there is no doubt that cutting out Ex-Im all together, by cutting out the loans that they do, does result in a loss of sales and that does result in a loss of jobs.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join my colleague from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), who has done such a tremendous job in this area in offering this amendment. The substance of our amendment is simple: we are seeking to cut \$18 million in funds from the Export-Import Bank. Our amendment cuts \$3 million from the \$63 million provided for the administration expenses of the bank and \$15 million from the approximately \$753 million provided for the bank's subsidy.

Now, understand that the President only requested \$633 million for the subsidy account. The committee has appropriated \$753. So there is about a 120 million dollars between what the President requests. We are only taking \$18 million from what the committee has appropriated, far higher than the President's request is still remaining.

The Visclosky-Mollohan amendment then takes the \$18 million and places it in good places, Mr. Chairman, in the Child Survival and Health Programs fund, with \$13 million targeted to the HIV-AIDS subaccount and \$5 million targeted to the Vulnerable Children's subaccount that provides money for displaced children, orphans and blind children.

Mr. Chairman, why \$18 million? Why an \$18 million cut? The Export-Import Bank guaranteed an \$18 million loan made by the Deutsche Bank of North America to the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China for purposes of modernizing the Benxi Iron & Steel Company's hot strip mill located in China. The Benxi hot strip mill located in China.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce opposing this loan at the time it was being considered dated December 13, 2000, says "Imports of hot rolled steel from China have increased dramatically over the past several years from less than 6,000 metric tons in 1997 to possibly more than 450,000 metric tons by the end of 2000." We need to

loan money so that China can increase its capacity in hot rolled steel? I think not, Mr. Chairman.

I want to offer my colleagues here in the House the following time line, which explains the climate in which the Export-Import Bank approved this particular loan guarantee:

November 13 of 2000, nine U.S. companies who produce hot rolled steel, including five integrated producers, one of whom is in my congressional district, four mini-mills, the Independent Steelworkers of America, and the United Steelworkers of America filed antidumping cases against China and 10 other countries. Benxi was cited in the case as an exporter of a product dumped in the United States.

December 3, 2000, the U.S. Department of Commerce decided to initiate the case based on the belief that there was evidence of dumping.

December 19, 13 days later, the Export-Import Bank, in its wisdom, approved the \$18 million loan guarantee in spite of the evidence of dumping from China, and Benxi was a producer.

Two days later, December 22, the International Trade Commission made a preliminary determination that the imports of dumped hot rolled steel from China were causing injury to the United States industry.

Hello!

A Department of Commerce final determination will be issued in September, and the ITC will vote by the end of October on whether to impose duties. As my colleagues can see, the evidence of illegal dumping was overwhelming; yet nonetheless, the Export-Import Bank arrogantly ignored the fact that the world does not need any more steel capacity.

The steel report issued last July by the Department of Commerce correctly points out that there is significant overcapacity in the global steel industry. The report further points out that the London-based Iron and Steel Statistics Bureau estimated world excess capacity to be 250 and 275 million metric tons in 1997 and 1998. These figures have not fallen significantly, Mr. Chairman.

All of this information was available to the Export-Import Bank when they made this loan. We cannot allow an institution that is funded by American taxpayers' dollars to use that money to guarantee loans to support projects that put Americans out of work. Mr. Chairman, the 19th steel company has just declared bankruptcy, as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISLOSKY) pointed out a few moments ago, at the beginning of the week; 23,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs as a result of this crisis.

This loan was egregious, Mr. Chairman. This loan was outrageous, and we cannot let it stand.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Visclosky-Mollohan amendment to cut the Export-Import Bank, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise and to join me in voting against it.

The Export-Import Bank provides crucial support for America's exporting businesses, especially small businesses and the workers that those businesses employ. Support for Ex-Im means real jobs for real people. In fiscal year 2000, Ex-Im Bank financed more than 2,500 U.S. export sales, supporting \$15.5 billion of U.S. exports to markets worldwide. Eighty-six percent of these transactions directly supported small business.

In my district alone, since 1996, Ex-Im has supported 76 million in exports. Eleven of the 15 businesses supported are small businesses. Without Ex-Im, these transactions simply would not go forward. Ex-Im only gets involved when the private sector will not. Cutting Ex-Im means eliminating opportunities for American businesses and their employees.

Especially with our economy wavering, this is simply the wrong thing to do. Exports are crucial to the U.S. economy. Exports account for over one-quarter of U.S. economic growth over the last decade and support an estimated 12 million American jobs. In order to grow the U.S. economy and also to increase the number of jobs, export opportunities need to grow as well.

However, when it comes to international trade, the U.S. is falling rapidly behind. There are over 130 preferential-treatment trade agreements in effect in the world today. The European Union has 27, 20 of which they finalized in the last 10 years. Meanwhile, the U.S. is a party to only two, NAFTA and a free trade agreement with Israel. Exporting countries and other countries therefore have advantages in markets around the world that U.S. companies do not. In this environment, Ex-Im is increasingly important to support exports for U.S. businesses. Cutting Ex-Im will only push us further behind.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is especially troubling because it cuts \$3 million from Ex-Im's administrative budget. That is a direct blow to small business. Eighty-five percent of Ex-Im's administrative budget is comprised of fixed costs. Out of the remainder, Ex-Im uses a significant portion for seminars and other efforts to reach out to small business. In reality, transactions involving small businesses are the most labor intensive. Therefore, cutting Ex-Im's administrative budget has the real effect of cutting out export opportunities for small businesses.

I understand the sponsors of this amendment have concerns about a specific transaction. They want to make sure, and I understand this, that Ex-Im has appropriate economic impact protections in place. However, this amend-

ment is clearly not the means to achieve that goal. First of all, Ex-Im does indeed have economic impact protections in place. More importantly, Ex-Im has responded to the concerns raised by the sponsors of this amendment by going through an extensive review of its economic impact procedures. The methods of evaluating economic impact are being reformed. In fact, the bank has released new draft procedures that are currently open for comment. So there is a process under way to address the concerns being raised by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, cutting Ex-Im means cutting U.S. exports, and cutting Ex-Im's administrative budget means squeezing out opportunities for small businesses. I believe this is the wrong thing to do, is not necessary, and should be defeated. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against it.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me, and I appreciate the statistics that the gentleman cites, these general statistics about the benefit of exporting to the American economy. Obviously, the benefit of exports to the American economy are great and very important to its well-being. I will stipulate to that.

What does concern me when we have this debate and there are those who cite the statistics, and stand up and do so so eloquently, is when do we talk about the downside? When do we talk about concern for the 23,000 steelworkers who have lost their jobs because of this kind of importing and the outrageous impact of the loan?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just say to the gentleman that there is a review process in place. They are looking at the gentleman's concerns.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. They said that in February of this year.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Reclaiming my time, I think it would be out of line to cut now because that does not do anything for the gentleman's problem.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment, and I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

□ 1100

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong opposition to the Visclosky-Mollohan amendment. I believe my colleagues are well intentioned here today. I would argue that they should take their case to the authorizing committee, and I would join them in trying to change the law so we would not be in this position in the future.

I also think that the Department of Commerce in the anti-dumping case is already directing real attention at this problem. That is what we should be focusing on.

Mr. Chairman, to come in here today and take \$18 million out of the Export-Import Bank, \$3 million of which comes from the administrative funds which were only increased by \$1 million over last year's level, means an actual cut of 2 percent. This is salaries. This is health care. This is the fixed cost of the agency. I would say that is a very brutal cut.

The other money would come out of the money that is used by small businesses and large businesses to support U.S. exports. My concern with this amendment is we are punishing America's exporters who are also creating jobs. I feel for the gentleman for the loss of jobs to steelworkers. The gentleman has to admit that not all of their losses are due to the Export-Import Bank.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman gets me additional time, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, my concern is we are punishing another sector of the economy which is crucial to our economic health. In my State of Washington, one out of every three jobs is an export job. So my State would be punished by this amendment. In fact, we are \$100 million below last year's level in terms of the loan guarantees. This administration has cut it. I would also point out that this is a new administration that is not responsible for what the previous administration did on this particular loan; and they have said that they are going to review this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman he has won his victory here today. The gentleman has convinced the new administration that this is something which should not be done in the future; and so do not punish the Export-Import Bank where jobs in my State will be lost.

(On request of Mr. MOLLOHAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DICKS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, first of all, the gentleman speaks in terms that this cut is going to have a disastrous impact on exporters who are assisted by the Export-Import Bank and people in his congressional district, perhaps. Hardly. The President requested \$633 million. This committee is appropriating \$753 million, which is \$120 million more than the President requested. We are simply taking \$18 million.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time, but \$100 million less than last year.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, to follow up on the point of the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the word "cut" has been used here a lot. I used it myself.

Mr. Chairman, we are over the President's request; but my understanding is that the dollars appropriated, and the way it will be budgeted will provide for about 12 to \$12.5 billion worth of subsidies.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, if we had gotten last year's level, we would be at \$15 billion in export support, so it is about a \$2.5 billion cut which the gentleman will make worse with this \$18 million cut.

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

Mr. DICKS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, we have had, in the last 3 years, 19 steel companies go bankrupt. That is sobering. Nineteen steel companies in this country. We have had 23,000 steelworkers, real jobs for real people, laid off. This is here and now.

Mr. DICKS. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, if I may finish. When the gentleman talks about going to the authorizing committee, we are not talking about dealing with an imminent danger. The gentleman serves on the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Appropriations can make a statement here and now. If we were to go to the authorizing committee, it may be 2 more years and another 19 steel companies going bankrupt.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the gentleman makes a mistake if he does not consider trying to change the law so the Export-Import Bank has to take into account the impact on the domestic economy of these exporters.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to joining the gentleman in that effort.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I told the gentleman I would be glad to help in that effort. But the point here today is this is a meat-axe approach. Coming in here and cutting \$18 million out of Export-Import Bank does not make any sense. The new administration says they are going to take the gentleman's position into account. I would urge the gentleman to withdraw his amendment, he has made his point, and not hurt another sector of the economy.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman should urge something else because he knows that is not going to happen. Maybe the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) should urge his colleagues who might support his position to vote with him.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I always think my colleagues have good judgment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair requests Members follow regular order.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. This is a token amount of money being cut from the Export-Import Bank. The President asked for a \$120 million cut. This is only \$18 million. There was \$120 million added over the present request. This is not a project that is a favorite of the President, and he has referred to this as a form of corporate welfare.

This is just a small effort to rein in the power of the special interests, the powerful special interests. It has been mentioned that jobs could be lost. In the debate, there has been emphasis on jobs, and the truth is that it may happen. Jobs could be lost. But what Members fail to realize is that the jobs lost are special interest jobs. If my colleagues take that same funding, and we never talk about what would happen to that \$75 billion line of credit of the Export-Import Bank if it were allowed to remain in the economy. Other jobs would be created, so my colleagues cannot argue half of the case. We have to look at the whole picture. Special interest jobs would be lost. True market jobs would be increased.

Mr. Chairman, last week we had a vote on trade with China. I supported that vote. I believe in free trade and low tariffs. I believe in the right of people to spend their money where they please, and I believe it is best for countries to be trading with each other. But the very same people today arguing for these corporate subsidies claim they are for free trade. If my colleagues are for free trade, they should not be for corporate subsidies. They are not one and the same. They are different.

Free trade means there are low tariffs, but we do not subsidize any special interests. To me it is rather amazing, the paragraph that we are dealing with is called Subsidy Authorization. There is no pretension anymore. We just advertise, this as a subsidies. When did we get into the business of subsidies? A long time ago, unfortunately. I do not think that the Congress should be in the business of subsidies.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has something to do with campaign finance reform. I am in favor of some reforms, that is, less control. People have the right to spend their own money the way they want; and when we have the problem of big corporations coming here and lobbying us, that is a secondary problem.

If my colleagues look at the corporations that get the biggest subsidies from the Export-Import Bank, they really lobby us.

Mr. Chairman, what I say is let us have some real campaign finance reform and let us get rid of the subsidies and the motivation for these huge corporations to come here and influence

our vote. That is what the problem is. We do not need to get the money out of politics, we need to get the money out of Washington and out of the business of subsidizing special interests. That is where our problem is.

Last week we voted to trade with China, and I said I supported that. But anybody who voted against that bill because they do not like what is happening in China should vote for this amendment and also my amendment that is likely to come up.

China gets \$6.2 billion, the largest subsidy to any country in the world from the Export-Import Banks. China gets it. So why do we first want to trade with China, then subsidize them as well, and then complain? I would suggest that those who claim they believe in free trade, they need to support this amendment because we are getting into the interference and manipulation of trade, the subsidy to big corporations.

Those who do not like China should vote for this because there is a suggestion that the Export-Import Bank serves the interest of China. So to me it should be an easy vote. The only problem with this amendment is that it is so small. It does not really address the big subject on whether or not the Congress should be in this business. Obviously they should not be. Where do you find the authorization to give subsidy appropriations in the Constitution? It is not there.

This is a charade. This is fiction when it comes to looking at constitutional law.

I would strongly urge a yes vote on this amendment and do not support this effort to benefit the big companies and hurt the little guys. The little guys are the ones who lose this line of credit and push their interest rates up.

Who gets the risk under this situation? The taxpayer. There is a lot of insurance in the Export-Import Bank. The risk goes to the taxpayer, but the profits go to the corporations. What is fair about that? The big corporation cannot lose. So why would the banks not loan to the big special interest corporations?

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not seen such obfuscation in all my life as I have seen here this morning. Somehow they want us to believe that if we take \$18 million out of their budget, that the whole import/export budget will collapse. The President's budget has \$687 million in it. The House budget is \$805 million.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Visclosky-Mollohan amendment which cuts \$15 million from the Export-Import Bank subsidy appropriations and \$3 million from their administrative expenses. It troubles me that the Ex-Im Bank approved an \$18 million loan guarantee to modernize and improve

production for a Chinese steel company. Yes, you heard it correctly. We are using American taxpayer dollars to modernize a Chinese steel company so that it can produce more steel for import into the United States, thereby, putting more steel workers on the unemployment line.

To add insult to injury, Benxi, the Chinese steel company, is currently involved in an anti-dumping case before the International Trade Commission. Once again, you heard it correctly. We are guaranteeing a loan for a Chinese steel company which has been charged with dumping steel on the American market.

Does the Ex-Im Bank not know that our domestic steel industry has been hurting since the flood of imports began in the late 1990s? In fact, since December of 1997, 18 steel companies, and I understand one more steel company with a combined total of 36,000 employees, have declared Chapter 11 bankruptcy which means 36,000 steel worker jobs could be in jeopardy. Since 1998 over 20,000 steel workers have lost their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the competitiveness of the international marketplace, and I know our companies can compete if the playing field is level. In fact, we have the most efficient and productive steel workers in the world. However, not only do we lack a level playing field, but American taxpayers are now being asked to subsidize our competitors.

As John Stosel says on ABC's 20/20, "Give me a break." This must stop and Congress needs to send a message that it will not tolerate these misguided policies. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the Visclosky-Mollohan amendment.

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

Mr. MASCARA. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to point out that on December 15, 2000 the board of directors of Ex-Im approved a guarantee for an \$18 million credit to support export sales from General Electric in Salem, Virginia; Carlen Controls in Roanoke, Virginia; and CIC Company in Glenshaw, Pennsylvania for software control systems and main drive power supplies and it does go for this project. These are U.S. companies that got the loan guarantees.

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

Mr. MASCARA. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman just made our point.

The lack of wisdom is in paying off these companies to support investments of the Benxi steel facility in China in order to enable the production of tremendous excess capacity in that plant. The gentleman just made the point.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will continue to yield, the point I was trying to make was that the gentleman said that the guarantee was given to the Chinese company. It was not given to the Chinese company. It was given to these three American companies.

□ 1115

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Chairman, I think all of us agree that the Ex-Im Bank is valuable, that it is valuable to small businesses, that it is important for trade, but we are sick and tired of throwing it in our face. I represent steelworkers as well as the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and we are sick and tired of this country in our face, our workers being put out of work and using our taxpayers' dollars to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking all my colleagues to support the Visclosky-Mollohan amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Visclosky-Mollohan amendment as the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee on the Committee on Financial Services. The ranking member of that subcommittee is the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS). While I have served for 21 years on the Banking Committee, now the Financial Services Committee, this is the first year that I have been the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee that relates to the Export-Import Bank.

I would say to the gentleman from West Virginia and the gentleman from Indiana that the authorization for the Export-Import Bank expires on September 30, 2001 and there is broad and bipartisan concern with the case that the gentlemen have brought to our attention. It has also been brought to our attention by all of the members of the Steel Caucus. In fact, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and I introduced legislation last week at this time, H.R. 2517 and we have a section in that legislation specifically related to Benxi Steel and the transaction approved by the Export-Import Bank in December of 2000.

I would tell the gentlemen that the Export-Import Bank and Treasury, which has exercised veto authority over the transactions of the Export-Import Bank, also has this Member's attention, and I want to make changes. If the Banks think they are going to have a straight, clean reauthorization bill, they are not going to do it with my approval or my active involvement. I very much think we need to give some very specific direction to the Export-Import Bank in many areas, and I will welcome these gentlemen and other Members' concerns about this specific transaction and on other issues.

I also think it is crucial that the industries that uses the export credit guarantee programs of the Bank understand we need to build a base of support for the Bank within the small business community. Currently the small business community has about 18 percent of the transactions in dollars allocated. That is probably only because Congress pushed the Bank to move ahead in its 1996 authorization legislation.

Furthermore, the Export-Import Bank has this Member's attention because the Treasury stepped in earlier this year and vetoed two transactions, one of which is in my home State, on the use of the tied aid war chest. An Austrian firm got that contract for \$7-9 million; and we lost \$100 million worth of follow-up sales annually in irrigation equipment—all for no good reason.

So the Export-Import Bank deserves plenty of scrutiny. We need to give them very specific directions. The gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and I have begun that effort with section 16 in the legislation we introduced. If after examining it you do not think it is strong enough, we will listen to your ideas in a further way.

I also would say this, that you have had an impact already—at least potentially. As already pointed out, the Export-Import Bank is now going through a process of enlarging and clarifying and getting it right in terms of the Ex-Im Bank's impact procedures that they will consider. In short, and this is a quote from the Bank's statement of objectives, they want to make sure they have more information on the following: one, indicators of oversupply that could impact the long-term economic health of the potentially affected U.S. industries. They go on to clarify that objective. Secondly, to consider the broad competitive impact to U.S. industries. Here they are proposing to consider both direct and indirect impacts. And, third, to consider the views of interested parties, including the affected U.S. industry, labor organizations, U.S. manufacturers, Congress, nongovernment organizations and other U.S. Government agencies, to allow each group's view to be weighed in Export-Import Bank's deliberative process.

I cannot under House rules specifically speak about what the other body is going to do about this steel case, but let me just say it has their attention as well, and I think it should.

Now, I would like to ask my colleagues to think long and hard about what you are asking the House to do in addressing what is an appropriate redress of a very real grievance. Right now, the Export-Import Bank is dramatically underfunded, under-resourced as compared to our competitors. The rationale escapes me, but this administration proposed to further cut

the Bank's resources by 25 percent. The Committee on Appropriations has made up some of that difference.

One of the concerns I have is about the limit on the administrative budget of the Bank, not the transaction budget. The authorizing limitations are too skimpy. By this amendment you are cutting back the administrative account by \$3 million. It should be going the other way. In fact, in our legislation, I would establish a sub-line item for funds for the administrative activities and boost such an authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BEREUTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this agency also needs more information technology capabilities. They are obsolete. The past chairman and the present chairman will admit that is a reality. We need to make changes in that respect. We need to make sure that they upgrade. That is particularly important for small business. If small business is going to take advantage of the opportunities or resources of the Export-Import Bank, they are the ones that really need to have good information technology in place in this agency. We push the Bank directly ahead in that area through the authorization legislation we have offered.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I would simply ask the question that, with the bill that we have today, is it not true that the subsidies that are going to be able to be provided with the Ex-Im Bank, even though we have an amendment to cut \$18 million, is going to be increased substantially?

Additionally, I would ask the Member, is it not true that the Ex-Im Bank is required by law to assess whether its loans and guarantees are likely to cause substantial, direct injury to U.S. industry today?

I trust the gentleman's intention. I believe what he says. The law today says they are not supposed to do what they did last year. We need to drive home that point, and someone at the Ex-Im Bank ought to know what it is like to lose a job.

Mr. BEREUTER. I think the gentleman is accurately describing the language that is there. I think it does not go far enough. I think a clarification or elaboration or additional kind of limitations are appropriate. Now, they itemize in their proposed review process some of the things that might be considered. I hope that that gentleman, like this gentleman, will make his comments known to the Export-Import Bank during the comment period now underway.

Is there a cut in the resources of the Export-Import Bank? There is a dramatic cut in the resources proposed for the next fiscal year, despite the fact that the appropriators have restored some of that cut. A 25 percent cut was the original figure that came with the administration's budget. That would dramatically reduce our ability to compete with the export credit and guarantee agencies of other countries. It is the wrong direction. I can understand why these gentlemen want to see a change. I do, too.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BEREUTER was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. BEREUTER. We have this deadline coming up on the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank, September 30. This is an issue that has to be resolved. It is a time for us to make the kind of changes, not to do something which punishes the Bank and not some changes which they can ignore, anyway. We need to give very specific guidelines and make sure that in fact acting in a fashion which is beneficial to American industry. We need to assure that the Bank does create jobs in this country and that it does not have the opposite effect. We need to assure that the Bank is particularly attractive for the use of small business as well as for some of the largest firms in the United States.

I ask my colleagues, therefore, to reject this amendment and work with us when the authorizing legislation comes to the floor.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is always interesting to listen to these discussions about the Export-Import Bank. Every nation in the world, the industrialized world, has an equivalent organization. The United States has the least of that kind of organized support of the business community through the Export-Import Bank. I hear Members come out here on the floor and deplore the trade deficit, that the United States takes everything in and never exports anything.

One of the problems with exporting into the Third World or to even other parts of the industrialized world is the question of whether or not they can pay back the debt. Now, if a bank wants to lend money to General Electric to sell some equipment to whatever country, all the Export-Import Bank does is guarantee that if the money is not paid back, they will pay the money. They have not lost any money in this process. But they need the capital as a backup for all the loans that go out into the world.

We have changed the Export-Import Bank. When I came to the Congress

back in 1988, it used to be called the Boeing Bank. It is not the Boeing Bank anymore. It is a whole lot of other things. In fact, as we heard the list of people in this particular one, Boeing is not in it. It is General Electric and a lot of other things.

Last year, fiscal year 2000, there were loans to 2,176 small businesses. If you make one loan for Boeing for \$100 million, it only takes one person, but if you are going to take 2,176 small business loans and help small business people get into the international economy, you have got to have people who can help them through that process. That is why the staff has gotten larger and why taking money out of the staff simply makes no sense.

I see the reason for the size of this amendment, \$18 million. It fits the \$18 million that already went out the door for the Chinese loan guarantee. But we are not canceling the loan. It is still going to go ahead. This is not the place to fight the argument that you have here.

If you want to make a change, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) has said it more correctly, get in the authorizing bill and decide which industries you are not going to lend to. "We are not going to lend to any foreign steel industry because they compete with the United States." Then General Electric will not bother going out trying to sell anything to them. They will know at the beginning.

But this coming in afterward and saying to the bank, "Well, you lent to the wrong people so we're going to take your money back," I do not know what message they get out of that. I guess the message is, we should not loan to anybody who makes steel. Maybe we should not loan to anybody who makes cars. I mean, the Koreans make cars, the Indonesians make cars and other people. Maybe we should never lend any money to a country that has carmaking because it competes with Detroit.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I think the message is that you do not approve a loan guarantee that undermines an industry that is being already devastated by imports.

A point that we made earlier in the debate that Secretary Mineta made when he was Secretary of Commerce to the Export-Import Bank on this very subject was that China has gone from 6,000 metric tons in 1997 of hot-rolled production to 450,000 tons, and they did not need any more capacity. In that same time period we had nine bankruptcies and 23,000 unemployed steelworkers. That is the message that we are trying to send.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Reclaiming my time, I understand the gentleman's

point, but the fact is the message has been sent and received. We have heard the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) already talk about it. That is going to be dealt with. But taking this money out of the bank is only going to cripple their ability to aid small businesses.

Big businesses can take risks. They do. It is nice to have the comfort of the Export-Import Bank. But little businesses who make a deal in some country, in Africa or Asia, are very much at risk and they need the capital. I do not see, unless you want to say that the Export-Import Bank cannot lend to any industry that is in competition with the United States, anything made in the United States, why pick on steel? Why should you protect steel? I do not think that you should protect steel any more than you should protect anybody else. We can do that in the authorizing bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) has expired.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I just want to put Members on notice, we have been very generous here in extending the 5-minute debate continually here. At some point we are going to have to insist that each Member get their 5 minutes and speak. But I will not object at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 1 additional minute.

There was no objection.

□ 1130

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, we are not trying to protect the steel industry in the sense the Member has used. I think, to my understanding, he has used that phrase. We are trying to protect the steel industry from unfair foreign competition, on the one hand; and we are definitely trying to protect it from an agency that is funded with the people's money going out and empowering China, which has a tremendous excess capacity at this point, from developing greater excess capacity.

Yes, we are trying to protect them from that kind of conduct and a major American agency that we fund being instrumental in making that possible.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman knows that a 201 case has been filed on steel, and Benxi Steel is one of the companies named in that pending International Trade Commission case on steel products being imported into the U.S. from a variety of countries. So I think there is another potential area where redress can be pursued. A ruling is to be made on August 17, 2001.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), we are glad we have the attention of his committee and other Members of the Congress with regard to the steel industry.

I hail from the great city of Cleveland, the home of LTV Steel. Let me just give you some statistical information about how important LTV Steel is to my community and the fact that it, along with 17 other steel companies in the United States, are currently in bankruptcy.

It is estimated that \$2.27 billion of the 2001 gross State production in Ohio comes from LTV, an impressive amount given the total gross State product of Ohio is about \$400 billion.

LTV employs 5,200 persons in Cuyahoga County and 6,600 Ohioans, including both organized and exempt positions.

Based upon the 2000 tax rates, LTV has 3,607 employees in local municipalities and provides tax revenue of \$4,474,276 generated from the workers at LTV.

Based upon estimates, an additional 12,970 Cuyahoga County jobs are dependent on LTV operations and employees. Statewide, 27,020 jobs are relying on LTV. These jobs generate an additional \$1.1 billion in wages.

LTV pays \$338 million in annual wages and salaries and \$68 million in benefits to current employees in Cuyahoga County, which amounts to about \$406 million annually in the county.

Statewide, LTV represents \$430 million in annual wages and \$85 million in benefits to employees.

More than 34,000 employees, retirees and dependents across northeast Ohio rely on LTV for more than \$72 million in medical benefits annually.

There are 15,000 retirees in Greater Cleveland alone receiving pension benefits.

Annually, LTV purchases \$1 billion in goods and services from 1,600 Ohio companies.

The steel industry has about 1.75 percent of all the jobs in northeast Ohio, with LTV providing nearly 22 percent of the region's steel jobs, according to the latest information.

Why are we standing in support of the Visclosky-Mollohan amendment?

Because we are standing in support of the steel industry in this country. The real dilemma is, and I heard someone talk about Alan Greenspan talking about the fact that the steel industry, or industry, was not in a dilemma. Alan Greenspan is the one who said last week that we should get rid of minimum wage.

Why are we talking about this issue right here on the floor of the House? Because where else do we stand up for workers in the United States but on the floor of the House of Representatives of the United States?

There have been a rising tide of layoffs and bankruptcies, driven in large part by our government's failure to enact trade policies that are important and support the steel industry.

Why are we after Ex-Im Bank? Because it has in fact supported the steel industry in another country while the steel industry is dying in the United States. Steelworkers built our country, and we need to let the steelworkers continue to work and the steel industry to continue to prosper. In other countries, they subsidize the steel industry. In our country, we do not. Therefore, we should not be using public dollars in these United States, other United States taxpayers, to subsidize a country, a steel industry in another country like China.

Now, you are arguing to me these dollars go to American companies in the United States to support a steel company in China. I say to you we should not subsidize American companies that subsidize steel companies in foreign countries when we are in fact at a trade deficit in the steel industry.

Let me give you just a few more statistics. By the end of last year, the industry was operating at less than 65 percent of its capacity in the United States, the lowest operating level in more than 15 years.

Steel imports, which totaled less than 16 million tons in 1991, more than doubled in 10 years to an annual total in 2000 of 39 million tons. Where are they making the 39 million tons of imported steel? In companies like Benxi, which is subsidized by money from Ex-Im Bank.

More than 15,000 steelworkers have lost their jobs since January of 1998; 84,000 in the last 6 months.

Mr. Chairman, I say support the Visclosky-Mollohan amendment.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by thanking my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), for the work that he has done as chairman of the authorizing committee. The problem is that while he has conducted that subcommittee in a very nonpartisan way, and I think we have done some very, very good work to fundamentally reform the Export-Import Bank in

terms of making it more responsive to American workers rather than multinational corporations, it remains to be seen whether the effort that we have labored for will in fact become law or even be heard. We were supposed to have a meeting of the subcommittee, which was canceled, I gather by the chairman of the committee. So we will learn more about that later.

Having said that, I rise in support of the amendment, because I am not at all sure that the reforms that need to be happening will in fact happen. Let me basically talk about the main concern that I have and why I support this amendment.

This amendment is right unto itself, but it touches on a broader issue. If American taxpayers are going to be laying out money to create decent-paying American jobs, then we have a right to expect that the companies who receive that money in fact are expanding their American workforce. That is not a very difficult proposition. The truth of the matter is that many of the major recipients of Export-Import funds have been some of the major companies in this country who are laying off American workers. In fact, according to Time Magazine, the top five recipients of Export-Import subsidies over the last decade have reduced their workforce by 38 percent.

So you take large corporations who go running to the Export-Import Bank, and they say, hey, we need this corporate welfare, and they get the support. And the next day they say, oh, by the way, thank you for the money; but we are now moving our factories to China or Mexico and laying off tens of thousands of American workers.

Our current trade policy, in my view, is a disaster. We have over a \$400 billion trade deficit. We have close to a \$100 billion trade deficit with China. To the degree that American taxpayers' money is to be used to subsidize American companies, the taxpayers of this country have a right to know that those companies are doing everything they can to increase jobs in the United States.

If a company like General Electric, and let me be specific about General Electric, says, and they advertise it to the world, they say, gee, we wish that we had a barge so that we could take all of our factories to the cheapest-labor countries in the world and layoff more American workers, that is what we want to do, that is what they say. And then they come to the Export-Import Bank and they say, here is a check for you. Go out, take your jobs to China, take your jobs to Mexico, use American taxpayer dollars for that purpose. The average American taxpayer is outraged by this behavior.

What the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and I have attempted to do is to craft legislation which does two things: it says to companies that

are hell-bent on taking our jobs to China and Mexico, you can do it; but do not come in and ask taxpayers of this country to subsidize it.

Second of all, we believe that small businesses are the engines for job creation in this country, and Export-Import has got to put more money into small businesses.

The issue of the steel company in China is just one of many examples. Taxpayer money, American taxpayer money, should not be used to hurt American workers.

In my view, in terms of the Export-Import Bank, we could do one of two things: we could kill the whole thing and say we are not giving any more subsidies, because it is corporate welfare. That would not be an irrational thing to do. The other thing that we can do, and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and I are attempting to do that, is to make the Export-Import Bank work for American workers, to support those companies that want to grow American jobs.

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

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would say to the gentleman, over the last few years the Export-Import Bank has created \$60 billion of exports from the United States. That means that those were jobs created.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Let me say, this has been a spirited debate; and I want to first say that the gentleman from Indiana, I have great respect for, and I am a member of the Steel Caucus and I come from a steel State. But I have to tell you, this does not help the steel industry. It does not help our ability to create export-related jobs. This is an amendment that would severely cripple the Export-Import Bank's ability to create jobs, particularly in small business.

We have to understand that 80 percent of the transactions of the Export-Import bank deal with small business and help small business creating export markets all over the world. Every dollar of taxpayer money that is invested in Export-Import's program has seen historical returns of some \$15 for every \$1 in credit support for export transactions.

So the result of this amendment, whether we like it or not, and it is great to get up here and waive the bloody shirt about the steel industry, is it is going to cost us jobs, it is going to shrink our ability to export in other markets; and while this budget that we are dealing with is critical to creating export jobs, the amendment does quite the opposite.

Let us not try to punish the Export-Import Bank or do what we are trying to do here because of one controversial loan. I would say to my friend from Vermont, that was an aberration, not certainly something that is business as usual in regard to the China steel issue.

As the chairman of the authorizing committee, I am here to say that our committee is working assiduously on Export-Import reauthorization with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER); and I fully expect that we will report a bill that is balanced and fair and promotes exports all over the world.

Let me just say also to my friend from Vermont, who pointed out General Electric specifically, let me tell my friend from Vermont about a plant that I have in my congressional district in Bucyrus, Ohio, that is a General Electric plant. They make fluorescent lighting tubes. They currently create and build millions of those that are exported to Japan. They make a specific kind of smaller tube than that used over here that fits into the Japanese architecture and their homes and businesses; and, as a result of using Export-Import facilities, they are able to increase that market substantially. Those General Electric jobs in my congressional district are very, very important to me and to our community.

I would point out before the gentleman from Vermont makes what would appear to be a bad example of General Electric, I would say that the General Electric situation certainly that I pointed out is a very positive one and points out how good the Export-Import Bank can be.

□ 1145

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

Mr. OXLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just wanted to mention to my friend that between 1985 and 1995, the workforce, the American workforce of General Electric went down from 245,000 to 150,000, precisely because it is the policy of General Electric to take American jobs to China and Mexico in order to get cheap labor. Does my friend not agree with me that we should use institutions like the Export-Import Bank to tell General Electric to reinvest in America so that we can create more good jobs like the one the gentleman referred to?

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think the last thing the Export-Import Bank needs, and certainly the private sector needs, is micromanaging on the part of Congress dealing with a worldwide global economy.

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

Mr. OXLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the point I would like to make is what they are doing here today with this amendment is punishing the export segment of the economy that creates thousands of jobs. In the State of Washington, the Boeing Company is the Nation's largest exporter. We are in a life and death struggle with Airbus. Airbus is subsidized by foreign governments. They have all kinds of loan programs to sell their exports all over the world.

What we are trying to ask for here is a level playing field. Let our American exporters compete. I want to protect the steel workers, but not at the expense of the machinists in the State of Washington. That is what we are talking about here.

Let us protect them both. Let us protect the steel workers and the machinists.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me thank the gentleman from Washington for his strong comments. Indeed, we are trying to expand the pie here. We are not trying to get in a situation, hopefully, that the gentleman from Vermont wants, which is the Congress determines what private industry hires and fires and then punishes the Export-Import Bank or successful exporters as a result.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) has expired.

(On request of Mr. MOLLOHAN, and by unanimous consent, Mr. OXLEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. The gentleman describes the situation, I think, inaccurately; and I would like to calibrate his comments a little bit. The gentleman suggests and uses the word "cripple"; that the gentleman's amendment would severely cripple the Export-Import Bank.

I would like to point out to the gentleman in the short time we have that the President requested \$120 million in the subsidy account less than the House appropriated. We are taking \$18 million from the House. So, therefore, there is about \$100 million left more in this bill than the President requested to do the good things that the gentleman is talking about and that the gentleman from Washington is talking about so that the government can support Boeing in its efforts against Airbus around the world.

We are not getting at the good things and the good jobs that are created by the Export-Import Bank. What we are getting at are the policies that undermine domestic industries that are extremely vulnerable at this period of time by financing projects that incredibly enhances capacity.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have come to the floor on the abstract, ideological, theoretical underpinnings of this debate which others have been eloquent on. I have just come to a very parochial, prosaic but, in my district, very meaningful position: this amendment is going to cost jobs of people who do work and export products around the world if it passes.

Now, I know that does not sound like a very high-falutin' argument couched in great economic theory, but the fact of the matter is, we are truly, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) said, in a life and death struggle in the aeronautics industry to see whether we are going to remain dominant internationally, or whether we will lose the dominant position in the world. It is just real simple. It is meat and potatoes. The fact of the matter is, if this amendment passes, we are going to lose the opportunity to export \$275 million worth of products which means thousands of jobs.

Because the fact of the matter is, this is, and since a lot of people look at the Ex-Im Bank and think, if we just cut the Ex-Im Bank, these other entities will not have products. People are not going to just stop buying airplanes if we cut the Ex-Im Bank. They are just going to buy them someplace else. This is help for the American worker, not the foreign worker.

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

Mr. INSLEE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from West Virginia has talked about all the steel companies that are gone. McDonnell Douglas used to build commercial airplanes; they are gone. Lockheed used to build commercial airplanes; they are gone. We have suffered in this area. We have one commercial airplane producer left in America: the Boeing Company. And they are in a life and death struggle against four governments that underwrite Airbus. I wish my friend from Vermont were as passionate in supporting the American companies trying to export as we are trying to protect the steel companies. I want to protect them as well.

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

Mr. INSLEE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, is the gentleman suggesting that all of the money that we are funding in the Export-Import Bank is going to go to Boeing?

Mr. INSLEE. Well, that would be acceptable, of course.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure how many votes the gentleman can get for it. Does the gentleman know how much money the committee is appropriating?

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, clearly, Boeing and Boeing workers are not the only ones who have a stake in this controversy.

What I am trying to point out is that this has an immediate, real-life ramifications for people who this morning got up and went to work in an industry that we are going to have a great chance of losing if we do not use the one very modest tool in our tool box to compete with this international conspiracy, if you will, to gain international dominance in this industry. And this is a very small tool we have. If we look at this compared to the subsidization of Airbus by the European community, this is almost nothing. Yes, Boeing is not the only player in this. But I came here to say that I have people in my district who care about it.

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

Mr. INSLEE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to answer the gentleman's question. Twenty-five hundred small businesses last year got Ex-Im Bank loans, totaling about \$2.3 billion. Yes, the Boeing Company is a major user of this thing, and we finance sales that could not be financed any other way and the money is paid back. So what is wrong with that? I want to support the gentleman. I hope some day the American steel industry can export as well, and then the gentleman will be with me in supporting the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the other thing I want to point out is, although Boeing is a significant player in this, there are small businesses, we are talking 5- and 20-person shops, who can avail themselves of this benefit. Those jobs are just as important as the machinist jobs in Seattle. They may not be as visible, but they are just as important.

I also want to point out that I believe the future of the Ex-Im Bank is not just manufacturing, it is services. Because when we design various functions for financial services, insurance and the like, those are going to be small businesses as well dealing with intellectual capital. I believe that is more in the future of the Ex-Im Bank.

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

Mr. INSLEE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman describes legitimate purposes and missions of the Export-Import Bank. What the gentleman may not understand if he did not hear the very beginning of the debate is we are going after with this amendment some egregious decisions made by the Export-Import Bank in subsidizing three of these small companies that empowers the Chinese.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 56 offered by Mr. PAUL: Page 2, strike line 21 and all that follows through line 17 on page 3.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes the paragraph on page 2, line 21 entitled "subsidy appropriation." I do not believe this Congress should be in the business of subsidizing anyone. We should be protecting the American taxpayer, and we should be protecting the individual liberty of all American citizens, not dealing in subsidies.

This paragraph is found in the bill which is called "foreign operations." It is a subsidy to large corporations, and it is a subsidy to foreign entities and foreign governments. The largest foreign recipient of the foreign aid from this bill is Red China, \$6.2 billion. So if one is for free trade, as I am, and as I voted last week to trade with China, one should be positively in favor of my amendment, because this is not free trade. This is subsidized, special interest trade, and I think that is wrong.

There has been a lot of talk today on the previous amendment dealing with jobs, and jobs are important. We have an economy now that is turning downwards and jobs are being lost. In this bill, this particular paragraph and the Export-Import Bank does deal with jobs.

Those in opposition to my amendment make the point that jobs are enhanced in the big corporations like Boeing. That is true, to a degree, but there is a net loss of jobs because the same entity, the Export-Import Bank, literally exports jobs by subsidizing and loaning money to foreign entities that compete with us. Not only does some of this money end up in the hands of our competitors and hurt us here at home, but it ends up in the hands of our potential enemies. This is the reason why we should be out of the business of the Export-Import Bank.

It has been said that this is a benefit to so many small corporations. In the last 2 years, more than half of the Export-Import Bank money went to Boeing. So it is not surprising that the gentleman early on mentioned that yes, he would not mind it if all of it went to Boeing. It is said that 85 percent of the money in the individual

loans goes to smaller corporations. That is true, but 86 percent of the money goes to the giant corporations. So the big bucks serve the big interests who lobby us and spend a lot of time influencing Washington.

There is a lot of mal-investment in the economy, misappropriation of money and investments that generates overcapacity, which is a consequence of monetary policy. It is a serious problem; and we are today facing the consequence, because we are now moving into a rather severe recession. But at the same time, export financing compounds that problem. It adds on to it because it is an allocation of credit.

This argument that we create jobs is fictitious. We do not create jobs; we shift jobs, from the weak to the powerful. We do not create a new job by stealing, taking out \$75 billion worth of a line of credit from the banks and giving it to special interests. Yes, it looks like they are getting a benefit, but the little guy does not have access to that amount of money. Why should the banks not loan Export-Import Bank money to the large corporations. They are protected. They are insured. Who insures them? The taxpayer. It is a rip-off. The taxpayer suffers all of the risks.

Now, if the deal is successful and there is no economic calamity in the country where we go and there is no political crisis, then who makes the profits? Corporations make the profits. It is the best deal going for large corporations.

If we oppose corporate welfare and think we ought to address it on principle and decide whether or not the Congress and the U.S. Government and the taxpayers should be in this type of business, we have to vote for my amendment to get us out of this business. This does not serve the interests of the general welfare of the people. This is antagonistic toward the general welfare of the people. It costs the taxpayers money, it puts the risk on the taxpayer, it serves the interests of the powerful special interests. Why else would they come with their lobbying funds? Why else would they come with their huge donations to the political action committees, unless it is a darn good deal for them?

□ 1200

They say it is a good deal for Boeing workers, but in 1995 there was a strike by the machinists against Boeing because Boeing agreed to buy the tail portion of the 737 from Red China.

We are certainly losing jobs to Red China, Mexico, and other places. I do not mind it if that is a market consequence, but when it is done at the expense of the American taxpayer and it hurts us, we should not do it.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The Export-Import Bank is a vital tool for

helping United States businesses export United States goods. It should not be eliminated.

In an ideal world, governments around the world would not subsidize their exports, and the United States would not, as well. However, we all know that other countries sometimes engage in ruthless trading practices, and we must give the United States exporters the tools to compete. As long as exporters in Europe and elsewhere are getting assistance, the Export-Import Bank will be a vital tool for American exporters.

Recent trends show that export financing is becoming more, rather than less common, and major trading nations increased their government-provided export credit by 30 percent between 1993 and 1998. Total credit reached \$488 billion in 1988 from other nations, while Export-Import Bank credits totaled just \$14 billion.

Given the huge and growing trade deficits we face, it is imperative, in my judgment, that we give our exporters assistance to remain competitive in world markets.

I have questioned and will continue to question some of the Bank's practices and procedures, and the committee will continue to recommend appropriate funding levels for the Bank based upon our oversight and review of these practices.

However, eliminating them entirely, as this amendment proposes to do, would inflict serious harm on United States exporters, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from New York has just given some of the reasons, with data, to oppose this amendment. This is a draconian amendment. It eliminates the Export-Import Bank's transaction program altogether. It ends it. It is abject, total, unilateral disarmament.

Mr. Chairman, the American Export Credit and Guarantee Agency of the Export-Import Bank is already underfunded as compared to the similar institutions from other major export countries of Europe, Japan, and even elsewhere. We are outstripped as it is.

In a perfect world, we would not have to have subsidy, but we are dependent to a major extent in our economy on our job base, on being able to export. We have negotiated, with some success, rules for the use of subsidies by the major export countries through the OECD. We have not completely tied that down, if I may use that down, on tied aid. We still have to have a war chest the administration is about to use.

But this is not a perfect world. If our exporters are to compete, if we are to build and sustain a job base in this country, we must have an effective, properly funded Export-Import Bank in

this country. This would totally eliminate it.

I would say that the gentleman is not guilty of doing things halfway. He goes all the way on a proposal.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PAUL. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

The gentleman makes the point that we fund in our Export-Import Bank less compared to other nations. That possibly is true.

Mr. BEREUTER. In absolute terms.

Mr. PAUL. The gentleman argues for an increase. But is it not true that the United States has had a healthier economy in the last 10 years than most of our competitors, indicating that it probably has not done us that much harm by not doing the same things that other countries do by penalizing their people with high taxation and making these subsidies?

Mr. BEREUTER. Reclaiming my time, our economic health relies on a lot of things, but we cannot confuse cause and effect. If we lost our export sector, we would be in deep trouble.

Take my own home State, for example, agriculture being one of the two major largest exporters. One-third, maybe even more, of everything we grow, like the rest of this country, is export. If we lose that base, if we would write off 95 percent of the world's people, we are in a hopeless condition.

I would say to the gentleman, I understand his ideological reasons for offering this. I happen to dramatically disagree. I think American citizens do not support the unilateral disarmament.

Mr. PAUL. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, why is it assumed that there would be no export funds available to export goods if we did not subsidize the exports?

Mr. BEREUTER. I would say to the gentleman, it does not totally cut off exports, but it does cut off a very significant base if we unilaterally disarm. Because in many areas, of course, we are competing for third-country markets where the subsidy from the French or the Germans or Japanese or some other major export company make the difference.

Without us being there, we certainly do not have a chance to effectively compete for those jobs, for those products to be exported abroad.

Mr. Chairman, I urge strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I will be brief. Let me just say that I think the arguments have been laid out by my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the arguments against this.

I have a lot of respect for the gentleman from Texas; and his position on

these matters. He is very consistent on these kinds of amendments. I do appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself conflicted in the sense that I am a free trader and I oppose many of the things that many of my colleagues around here do endorse. However, in this case, the case of the Export-Import Bank, I do not go as far as the gentleman from Texas. The reason for not doing so I think is fairly simple.

As the gentleman from Nebraska pointed out, in a perfect world, in a perfect world we would not have an Export-Import Bank. The Europeans and the Japanese and all the other countries would not have the kinds of export subsidies that they have.

But the world is not perfect. The world of trade between countries is not perfect. There is taxation, there are regulations, there are export subsidies, there are a whole variety of things that go into making it a totally imperfect world.

So in this imperfect world, we have to deal with the reality of what we have. I believe that the Export-Import Bank helps us, helps particularly our small- and medium-sized businesses, not only the very large who ones who do get some of the money. They are not the ones who would not have access. They would have access. But it is the small and medium businesses that I think are very important to the United States, and it is very important particularly to smaller communities around the country that they are able to have access to this export financing credit that enables them to make a sale overseas, to close the deal.

The final thing that closes the deal is this Export-Import Bank subsidy. It enables them to do that where they would not otherwise be able to do it. Many of the other countries in the world use their aid very much as tied aid, and we have gotten away from that.

But the idea that you would have a specific loan given only if it buys a product from that country, we have tried to get away from doing that with our economic assistance, and I am glad to see that we have. The export financing, however, is absolutely critical for our companies that try to do this business overseas and are dealing in the imperfect world out there.

So I think it is very important that we keep that. Abolishing it completely, as the gentleman from Texas would have us do, abolishing that completely and taking away all of our ability to do that I think would simply be the wrong thing for us to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and for us to continue to reform the Export-Import Bank, to continue to reform the whole process worldwide so we can rely less on these kinds of subsidies.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I just want to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks and rise in strong opposition to the Paul amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) will be postponed until disposition of all perfecting amendments to this paragraph.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON 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 No. 48 offered by Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 36, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the amendment restores \$25 million that was cut by the Committee on Appropriations from the administration's request of \$107.5 million for the Global Environment Facility administered by the World Bank.

In considering this amendment, Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind my colleagues of the motto "Think globally, act locally."

The GEF was established to forge international cooperation and help to finance efforts to address four environmental threats that transcend borders: climate change, degradation of international waters, biodiversity laws, and ozone depletion. It is administered jointly by the World Bank, the U.N. Development Program, and the U.N. Environmental Program, with a mission of bringing together governments, developing institutions, the scientific community, the private sector, and the NGOs toward a common goal of bringing about sustainable economic development.

In the period 1991 to 1999, GEF oversaw more than \$2.7 billion in grants, which helped to leverage billions more in co-financing from partners, that is, recipient nation NGOs, the private sector, et cetera. More importantly, these projects are usually small in scale. However, when we add them altogether, they have a large, cumulative benefit to the global environment.

The United States is the leading donor to the GEF, and it is essential that we continue to lead the way in fostering sustainable development and sound environmental practices in developing countries.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would help to ensure that the U.S. pays its full 2002 contribution of \$107.5 million. GEF funding is especially critical in the area of global climate change, where we have tended to focus on alleged flaws in the Kyoto Treaty that place too much of a burden on industrialized nations, such as the U.S., and not enough on developing countries.

Whether one agrees with this proposition or not, we should all be in agreement when it comes to providing funds to help the developing world to do their part in reducing the risk of global climate change while providing the energy that is necessary for vigorous, sustainable economic development.

The GEF also will play a critical role in the implementation of the Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants. So-called POPs include PCBs, DDT, and dioxins. Most have already been banned or are severely limited here in the U.S. However, since these chemicals do stay in the environment for a long time and have a tendency to spread around in the food chain, our own restrictions will be undermined if we do not also help developing nations reduce their use of these chemicals.

My amendment is supported by the leading environmental groups and organizations, including the NRDC, Friends of the Earth, US PIRG, LCV, Environmental Defense, American Oceans Campaign, and the World Wildlife Fund.

My proposed increase for the GEF is offset by the cuts to the Export-Import Bank subsidy appropriation. I am proposing this offset not because I have any particular animus toward the Export-Import Bank. I have always supported it. I personally come from a State that relies heavily on exporting goods to other countries.

However, we are putting more in that budget than the administration requests, and we are cutting this part of the budget below the administration request. The administration seems to believe that the Export-Import Bank can successfully carry out its mission with less funding, and I am willing to go along with that recommendation.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that I appreciate the comments that the gentlewoman from Texas has made and the substance of her amendment. I know what she is looking for, as she has said, is a full request for the Global Environment Facility.

Mr. Chairman, I would just say that I think this matter is one that is going

to continue to be discussed between the House and Senate. Historically, the other body has usually funded this at a higher level, and I know we are going to be reviewing this in conference.

Certainly the issue is an important one, as recent debate worldwide and on the Kyoto matter just this last weekend has highlighted the importance of environmental issues; and having a body that looks at these issues and also one that helps to fund some of the projects dealing with the environment, I think that is very important. So I would just say to the gentlewoman that I believe that we will be reviewing this matter in the conference. I think she is probably going to be much happier when the conference report comes back as it relates to the Global Environment Facility.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in view of that commitment and interest, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

□ 1215

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. CROWLEY:

Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1)".

Page 11, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 25, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment in conjunction with my colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT). As cochairmen of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) have been leaders in their work with India and the Indian-American community.

Mr. Chairman, in January of this year, the Indian state of Gujarat was decimated by a devastating earthquake that killed thousands of people and turned its infrastructure into rubble. In the aftermath of this tragedy, there was a lot of Monday-morning quarterbacking as to why so many people were killed and why so much damage was inflicted. The answer, Mr. Chairman, is simple: the Gujarat Government was not prepared to deal with a disaster of such magnitude, despite the fact that this region and the south Asian region as a whole is routinely subject to such natural disasters.

The Crowley-Royce-McDermott amendment seeks to provide sorely needed funds to the U.S. Agency for International Development Office of Foreign Disaster Relief, the Kathmandu office, so that it may work with the governments and communities of Southeast Asia to develop emergency response and disaster preparedness capabilities.

There is no FEMA in India, there is no FEMA in Bangladesh, there is no FEMA in Nepal, there is no FEMA in Sri Lanka. In many Indian states like Gujarat, there is a serious lack of emergency equipment such as ambulances and fire trucks; and as a result, many thousands of people in Gujarat died needlessly because of such shortages in sorely needed equipment.

The Gujarat earthquake was but one more in a long series of natural disasters that have plagued South Asia. South Asia is in a geographical and geological crossroads that makes it very vulnerable to disasters. Massive cyclones regularly batter not only Gujarat, but also Orissa, Maharashtra, Andhra, Pradesh, and Sindh. Drought is a periodic way of life in western India and Pakistan as well. Every season, countless thousands die in Bangladesh due to flooding. The instability of the Himalayan Mountains forces Nepal in northern India to constantly dig out from avalanches and other slides.

Earthquakes have been a fact of life not only in Gujarat but all across the subcontinent for years. No country in the region fully has the capability to institute disaster preparedness and response programs in a manner that will be sufficient to deal with these disasters. Several countries of the region have approached the United States Government for technical assistance in order to establish their own agencies for disaster management. The establishment of FEMA-like organizations in South Asia would greatly increase the capacity of nations to deal with such disasters.

USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, OFDA, currently has a representative based in Kathmandu, Nepal, who is charged with covering the entire region. Over the past 15 years, OFDA has developed a strong working relationship with these countries to help them identify the best response and preparedness system for each of these countries. An increase to OFDA's funding will allow that representative to expand and enhance programs in the region to help these nations prepare the appropriate response and preparedness capability to deal with past and future natural disasters.

The \$10 million for this enhancement would be offset by a \$10 million decrease in the Andean initiative. This is a small price to pay to enable the people of South Asia to survive natural disasters. The countless lives that could be saved by enhancing disaster

preparedness in South Asia far outweigh the small amount of arms and military training that would be sent to South America for the same funds.

The consequences of natural disasters are varied. They may be considered in terms of human lives, material goods, economic activities, political impacts, associate or psychological factors. Societal and economic consequences of such natural disasters are too countless to mention. The severe cyclone that developed in the Bay of Bengal in October of 1999 hit the eastern coast of India with tremendous force, causing floods and wind damage in Orissa, Andhra, Pradesh, and West Bengal states.

A second, larger cyclone, the worst storm in almost 30 years, struck India's eastern coastline further impacting those states and the Bengal states.

The Indian Ministry of Agriculture's Central Disaster Mitigation Center reported 9,465 persons killed, 2,260 persons injured as a result of the two cyclones. Infrastructure destruction was catastrophic. More than 15 million people were impacted, 1.5 million homes completely destroyed, and damage to the power grid totaled more than 300 million rupees. There was a loss of substantial grain storage and limited access to safe drinking water, as well as damage to sewer systems.

Basically, Mr. Chairman, the country was decimated. If we do not do this, there will be economies that may never recover.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment; and I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who serves with me as the cochairman of the Congressional Caucus on India and Indian-Americans. I want to thank them for their leadership on this amendment.

The three of us have introduced this amendment basically to add \$10 million to the international disaster assistance fund for USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance. And the reason we have done this is really in the wake of that earthquake that struck Gujarat. Our hearts go out to the people of Gujarat. We had a chance to visit Gujarat and see the devastation caused by a quake of a magnitude of 6.9. There was one town we were in, the town of Bhuj, where literally every building seemed to have collapsed. In Ahmadabad, apartment complexes had collapsed like accordions on the people inside.

I think we know of more than 17,000 people that lost their lives in Gujarat. There are at least 600,000 homeless. I had, as I said, the opportunity to visit the people there after that quake; and it is hard to put into words the feeling one gets seeing block after block of homes collapsed, seeing the fact that the relief work did not get in early enough to save the people, many of the

people whose lives could have been saved. And the tragic fact is that natural disasters come often to South Asia, to that subcontinent. And after the disaster, to add insult to injury, comes the monsoon season. Summer brings those monsoon rains and the cyclones whipping through the coastal regions. And so in western India and Pakistan, where this quake occurred, drought is a constant.

And now in the wake of this earthquake, we have the destruction of the dams and so thousands now will die from flooding, and thousands will die from flooding in Bangladesh as well. And, unfortunately, no country in the region has the capability, Mr. Chairman, to institute disaster preparedness and response programs in a manner sufficient to deal with these catastrophes. If they did, if they did, tens of thousands of human lives would be saved.

Now, we are in a position to help ensure that the nations of South Asia will be prepared to deal with its next natural disaster, and let there be no doubt there will be another one, by passing this amendment. This amendment would enable south Asian nations to establish a FEMA-type organization that would greatly increase their capacity to deal with any of the disasters of this type.

When I traveled to India shortly after the earthquake, I heard from Indian Government officials and relief organizations about the importance of a long-term disaster management plan. There was great interest in India in developing a disaster response agency and learning from FEMA's expertise. Currently, USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance has a single representative in South Asia, only one, charged with covering the entire region of South Asia.

This increase in the budget in OFDA's funding would allow for the expansion and enhancement of our efforts to help these nations develop this much-needed program. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. It honors America's humanitarian interests; it also reflects America's growing political relations with this area of the world.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of this amendment, which would help mitigate the effects of future disasters in South Asia.

We witnessed with horror the devastation caused by the recent earthquake in Gujarat, India; but this was not the first nor will it be the last such occurrence in Southeast Asia. As reconstruction from the earthquake continues, we must look to improve the capacity of countries in the region to deal with similar events. The central purpose of our foreign assistance program is to help other countries build the capacity to help themselves.

We help build vibrant NGO networks in the developing world, we help ministries of education train teachers and develop curricula to educate their children, and we help create health care infrastructures to allow poor countries to deliver medication and care efficiently and effectively. We should also be helping other countries build their capacity to handle unavoidable natural disasters.

FEMA does a wonderful job dealing with crises in the United States. Our friends in India, Bangladesh, and elsewhere in the region require similar agencies to help them manage the devastation wrought by earthquakes, cyclones, avalanches and other disasters. Better disaster management will save lives. It will allow countries that have experienced tragedies to recover and reconstruct expeditiously. In the long run, it will lessen the massive need for United States foreign disaster assistance. I urge my conclusion to support this amendment.

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in this discussion of India, and I appreciate the sensitivities of it and feel great sympathy; but I have been watching on television this morning the debate that is occurring on the Ex-Im Bank and I really am very alarmed. So at this moment I rise in concern over the several amendments, two of which we will be voting on to cut or eliminate the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Chairman, it is vital to restore this amount of money that already has been reduced by \$107 million from the 2001's budget allocation. It is also important for us to think in terms of loans rather than subsidies. The Ex-Im Bank provides loan guarantees, not subsidies, to foreign nations. But the Ex-Im Bank support particularly is critical to the world's developing and emerging markets and nations that otherwise would not be able to receive private commercial lending guarantees to finance their sales.

I think anybody who lives in the Pacific Northwest has to be known as a fan of Boeing, and I am one of those. In fiscal year 2000 alone, the Export-Import Bank guaranteed aircraft loans for the sale of more than 60 aircraft to airlines in 15 different countries. In the last 2 years, Ex-Im Bank has guaranteed loans for 185 aircraft that are worth \$11 billion. In my corner of the world, that means 17 percent of Boeing's commercial business.

The Ex-Im Bank is indispensable to the global competitiveness of United States exporters like Boeing and many other companies. I think this bank helps in its loan guarantees to level the playing field with our European competitors in many overseas markets. So I would certainly hope that the Members of this body, in their great wisdom and with great thoughtfulness, would

maintain our competitive edge by opposing these amendments when they come to a vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Crowley amendment to the foreign ops bill that would add \$10 million to the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance at USAID.

It is my understanding that this amendment is going to be changed somewhat so that it is \$1 million instead of \$10 million but that we will try in conference to get the larger amount. I know that there is likely to be more money available at that level in conference, so I commend the author of this amendment for his efforts here.

I think this is very important, and let me stress that those of us who have been around here for a few years know that there are many natural disasters that befall the South Asia area, whether it be cyclones in Bangladesh, or earthquakes in India, or some of the other natural disasters that we have seen over the years. And, of course, the U.S. is always there to help out and to provide assistance when those disasters occur in India and surrounding countries. But the bottom line is what we are trying to do here today is, I think in many ways, much more important than disaster relief, and that is preparedness.

□ 1230

The idea of having a FEMA-type organization in place in South Asia to address a long-term disaster management program is probably the best idea I have seen around here in years in trying to cope with these natural disasters.

I can tell you from my experience as I live along the shore in New Jersey, we have had FEMA many times coming down and helping us with hurricane or Northeasterner preparedness. It has saved millions of dollars and so many lives over the years because we have FEMA and we have preparedness in place.

I have to imagine that in the case of South Asia, this will make a tremendous difference. That is why I encourage this effort whether it is \$1 million or the \$10 million that we hopefully will get eventually.

Let me say South Asia's geographic location makes it very vulnerable to disaster. The Gujarat earthquake in January was just one in a long series of natural disasters that has plagued the subcontinent. In fact, many states in India alone are continually ravaged by massive cyclones; and drought is a way of life in western India. Bangladesh sees thousands die in flooding, and the instability of the Himalayan Mountains force Nepal and Northern India to constantly dig out from avalanches and other slides.

India, and certainly no other country in this region, fully has the capability

to institute disaster preparedness and response programs in a manner that will be sufficient to deal with these disasters. Several countries in the region have approached the U.S. for technical assistance in order to establish their own agencies for disaster management. The establishment for a FEMA-like organization in South Asia would greatly increase the capacity of nations to deal with such disasters.

USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance currently has a lone representative based in Kathmandu, Nepal who is charged with covering the whole region. An increase in that office would allow that representative to expand in and enhance our programs in the region to help these nations develop the needed programs.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very important. I cannot stress how important it is. I offer my full support to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), and other Members of our India caucus and encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in reluctant opposition to the gentleman's amendment to increase the amount available for international disaster assistance for South Asia for earthquake monitoring. While the Crowley initiative is important and well-intentioned, it is regrettable that he intends to find the needed resources by reducing the money set aside for the Andean Counterdrug Initiative. That portion of this initiative I cannot support.

The Andean Drug Initiative is critical to fighting the movement of illicit drugs coming into our Nation. Every community in our America has been touched by the pain and suffering that accompanies illicit drug usage. Having indicated these concerns, I understand that a compromise has now been worked out to reduce the \$10 million portion to \$1 million; and I will reluctantly support that compromise.

The recent earthquake in India did kill thousands of people and cause millions of dollars of damage. I would hope an appropriate amount is found to fund this much needed program.

If our Nation can help develop a monitoring system that will forecast future quakes, we would be greatly contributing to the safety of millions of South Asians. This is an important and worthy goal to achieve. Accordingly, I fully support the Kolbe compromise agreement.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor because I want to tell a tale of two cities. Seattle and Bhuj in Gujarat had earthquakes of about the same strength. Seattle lost one life, and a few buildings

had some cracks here and there. There was quite a bit of physical damage but nothing like what happened to the city of Bhuj, the area in which Bhuj exists, that is, Gujarat, had somewhere between 25,000 and 100,000 people die. About 100,000 homes were flattened, and it had to do with the system of preparedness we have in this country for disasters and the absence of such a system in India.

As you heard from a previous speaker, USAID presently has one person sitting in Kathmandu to cover all of the subcontinent, and it is clearly not enough when you are looking at situations like this.

It used to be, the first years I was in Congress, we were out here every year giving money to some disaster here or there or another place. Hurricane Mitch or the Mozambican floods or a whole bunch of things. But this administration has said there will be no disaster relief for India or for El Salvador, and they are cutting down the use of money from the Surplus Commodities Program. All of those used to be programs that were used to deal with human misery.

I originally started with \$100 million for earthquake rehabilitation to help them build homes that would survive this kind of an earthquake. I am down to \$10 million now, and I cannot get it into that. But at least we can help them establish a system of earthquake preparedness like our own.

One of problems when you have buildings fall down like that is, how do you get to the people who are underneath it? What is required is saws that will cut concrete. One of things we know in the United States is if we have a disaster anywhere, we can have cement cutting saws there within a few hours. The ones that went to India came from Switzerland. You can imagine how long it took them to get organized in Switzerland, get them on a plane, and fly them. By that time people have been lying in rubble for 12 to 24 hours.

Mr. Chairman, a person can only survive in most of these situations for about 72 hours. Occasionally they find somebody after 4 or 5 days; generally, however, it is a very short window. So the Office of Disaster Preparedness is really to have a list and a cataloging of where are the things that we can use for this.

Mr. Chairman, we also need cranes. If workers are going to lift a 20-ton slab of concrete, they have got to have cranes available. All of these things in the United States, we do not have them sitting someplace, but FEMA knows where they are. If there is a problem, the calls go immediately, and the equipment comes in. That is what we are talking about here with this money for India.

Mr. Chairman, I hear there is perhaps a compromise in the works for \$1 mil-

lion. I only have this to say about \$1 million. We are the richest country in the world. For us to look at a country of a billion people and say hey, we can find \$1 million, that is not even a rounding error in this place today.

In my view, \$10 million is a minimal contribution that we should be able to make to this. I hope the chairman and the ranking member, when they get to conference, will see if they cannot get the number up.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Crowley, Royce, McDermott Amendment. This Amendment will add \$10 million to the International Disaster Assistance fund for USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance to help six South Asian nations prepare and increase response capabilities for natural disasters. In turn, a heightened state of readiness will help the governments of India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, Nepal, and Bhutan save much-needed monetary and natural resources as well as countless lives.

The earthquake that hit India in January was the latest in a long series of reminders that South Asia is in a geological crossroads, which makes it especially vulnerable to disasters. The 7.9-magnitude earthquake in the State of Gujarat shook office buildings 900 miles away in New Delhi and was felt 2,000 miles away in Calcutta. The deaths of 15,000 people were a sobering illustration of the lack of disaster preparedness in India and South Asia.

As the world's two largest democracies, India and the United States have enjoyed a common commitment to the rule of law and basic freedoms as well as longstanding cooperation in the economic, commercial, and agricultural fields. The U.S.-India friendship extends to the fight against terrorism, the protection of the environment, and the expansion of trade.

Furthermore, India's unwavering dedication to democracy; universal suffrage; freedom of religion, speech, and the press; and a deep-rooted tradition of nonviolence and tolerance, have demonstrated that nation's progress on human rights. As a linguistically, religiously, and ethnically diverse nation—home to more than one billion people—India presents its leaders with daunting challenges. Nevertheless, India's leaders have confronted all problems directly and have shown the world how to live with differences under trying circumstances. They have demonstrated that tolerance and respect are often the keys to our mutual survival.

At the dawn of the 21st Century, as India and the United States continue to grow closer in terms of economic and trade relations, joint efforts on counter-terrorism, and strategic cooperation, let us extend our hand of friendship and our commitment to strong relations to all South Asian nations.

As a member of the Congressional Caucus on India, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the Crowley, Royce, McDermott Amendment.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and I want to thank my colleagues from the International Relations Committee—Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. ROYCE—as well as Mr. McDERMOTT, the co-chair of the

India Caucus for introducing this amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. This amendment would add \$10 million to the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance at USAID to fund a disaster preparedness and prevention program in South Asia.

Mr. Chairman, we have seen over the last two years a series of natural disasters that have wreaked havoc in the countries of South Asia—everything from the droughts, cyclones and floods that regularly afflict the subcontinent to the devastating earthquake that hit India and Pakistan earlier this year.

The South Asia region is one of the most disaster prone parts of the world has some of the poorest and most densely populated countries. Experts believe that there is a very high likelihood that an earthquake similar to the Bhuj earthquake will strike Nepal within the decade. Pakistan and Afghanistan are even now experiencing a severe drought that is causing thousands to flee their homes and abandon their farms.

And yet we have first hand experience in how effective response and early warning systems can save lives and minimize destruction from natural disasters.

Our Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) has established a worldwide reputation for fast and effective disaster response. When disaster strikes in America, FEMA works with state and local governments, non-governmental organizations like the Red Cross and the Salvation Army, military and police authorities, and a myriad other actors to coordinate an effective disaster response. Such capacity is clearly needed in South Asia.

By working with each of these countries individually and collectively, OFDA can help these countries improve their response capacity and reduce the devastation and loss of life that inevitably follow natural disasters in South Asia.

Furthermore, by helping to establish greater regional cooperation in disaster management will help the countries of South Asia access and deploy much needed assets in a more cost effective way and could lead to greater cooperation in other areas.

Mr. Chairman, clearly all of the countries of South Asia could benefit enormously from better emergency preparedness and mitigation programs.

However, USAID's Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) currently has a lone representative based in Kathmandu, Nepal who is charged with covering the whole region. An increase to OFDA's funding would allow that representative to expand and enhance programs in the region to help these nations develop the needed programs.

These programs will help save thousands of lives and will ultimately save U.S. taxpayer money over the long run as the countries of South Asia improve and build their own disaster management and response capacity, thereby reducing their need for American assistance when disaster strikes—as it inevitably will.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Crowley-Royce-McDermott Amendment. It is difficult for

us to imagine the magnitude of destruction and loss caused by India's devastating earthquake in Gujarat. With over 30,000 dead, 500,000 homeless, and over \$5.5 billion worth of damage, Gujarat desperately needs the resources to begin rebuilding and recovering from this tragic event. As India's largest trading partner and investor, the United States has a duty to help the people of Gujarat and ensure that natural disasters do not fracture the foundation of the world's largest democracy.

The key to avoiding the unnecessary deaths of thousands of individuals is to institute disaster preparedness and response programs throughout India. Many South Asian countries have asked our government for technical assistance so that they can develop disaster management programs. In order to be successful, however, these efforts need sufficient funds and resources. An additional \$10 million in aid, a relatively modest contribution for the U.S., would not only provide relief to victims of the recent earthquake, but also help prevent future deaths should another earthquake strike this geographically vulnerable region.

With the proper resources, India can harness its manpower to surmount nature's greatest obstacles including cyclones, droughts, floods, and earthquakes. We cannot afford to see a repeat of January's tragedy, and we cannot watch as a nation which accounts for a quarter of the world's poor experiences needless suffering. I am certain that Congress will recognize that it would be inhumane not to vote in favor of this highly cost-effective amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KOLBE AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. CROWLEY

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KOLBE as a substitute for amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. CROWLEY.

In lieu of the pending amendment:
Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1)".

Page 11, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 25, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the remarks that have been made here on the floor, most notably by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY); and I associate myself fully with the remarks about the importance of providing disaster relief to India and South Asia and planning for this kind of thing in advance so the number of lives lost can be reduced so the damage can be reduced so that the recovery can be greatly speeded up. I think the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) has proposed an excellent idea.

Mr. Chairman, let me say why I have my amendment here. First of all, we have \$200 million in the disaster assistance account. Whether we add \$1 million or \$10 million more is not going to direct \$1 more to India or South Asia. There are adequate monies in that fund to handle the disasters that are likely to occur during the course of the year.

My second point is our report has language in it that urges them to give attention to this problem of disaster mitigation. I think the discussion we have had here today reinforces that. My substitute amendment, by adding the \$1 million that is included in our report language into this account, makes it even more abundantly clear.

Mr. Chairman, I think the substitute amendment avoids us getting into the issues such as the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has pointed out, all of the issues where this money comes out of, and we will have those debates shortly, and still makes the point that we expect the Agency for International Development and the Disaster Assistance Program to look carefully at this issue of mitigation of disasters.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's bringing this to our attention and would hope that Members would be able to support our amendment.

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

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the gentleman's amendment to increase the funding for AID from \$200 million to \$201 million?

Mr. KOLBE. That is correct.

Mr. CROWLEY. And the gentleman has agreed to allocate through the conference process to work to ensure that \$10 million will be allocated from the AID fund that will be directed to the South Asia region, the Kathmandu office?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would use the word "direct" rather than "allocate." We do not earmark. We have a direction that they make this money available, and they look carefully at the mitigation issues in South Asia. I believe it accomplishes exactly what the gentleman is asking us to do.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOLBE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to accept the gentleman's substitute. I appreciate my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) expressing my views on the importance of the ability to respond to emergencies such as happened in India and Gujarat, and I am very pleased to work with the chairman to direct AID to direct the funds of \$10 million towards this account. We both acknowledge the very important work of FEMA and the ability to respond to emergencies such as occurred in Gujarat, and working with countries to build that capacity.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this must be a real affirmation. As the gentleman recalls, we dis-

cussed this issue last week, and I support the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) and thank him for his leadership and thank the gentleman for this amendment.

There are a number of Indo-Americans who have worked so hard on this disaster in India, among other places, and I think this is a very important step to help them in their efforts, and I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

The amendment offered as a substitute for the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

□ 1245

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan and insurance programs, 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, \$63,000,000: *Provided*, That necessary expenses (including special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the collection of moneys owed the Export-Import Bank, repossession or sale of pledged collateral or other assets acquired by the Export-Import Bank in satisfaction of moneys owed the Export-Import Bank, or the investigation or appraisal of any property, or the evaluation of the legal or technical aspects of any transaction for which an application for a loan, guarantee or insurance commitment has been made, shall be considered nonadministrative expenses for the purposes of this heading: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding subsection (b) of section 117 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1992, subsection (a) thereof shall remain in effect until October 1, 2002.

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 \$38,608,000: *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

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, \$50,024,000, to remain available until September 30, 2003.

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. 60 offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY); amendment No. 56 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) 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 258, noes 162, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 260]
AYES—258

Abercrombie	Brown (SC)	Doyle
Ackerman	Buyer	Duncan
Aderholt	Cannon	Edwards
Akin	Capito	Emerson
Allen	Capps	Engel
Andrews	Capuano	English
Armey	Cardin	Etheridge
Baca	Carson (IN)	Evans
Bachus	Chabot	Everett
Baldacci	Clay	Farr
Baldwin	Clayton	Fattah
Barcia	Clement	Filner
Barr	Clyburn	Flake
Barrett	Coble	Foley
Barton	Condit	Ford
Bass	Conyers	Fossella
Becerra	Costello	Frank
Berkley	Coyne	Frost
Berman	Cramer	Gekas
Berry	Crowley	Gephardt
Bilirakis	Culberson	Gibbons
Bishop	Cummings	Goode
Blagojevich	Davis (IL)	Gordon
Boehlert	Davis, Jo Ann	Graham
Bonior	DeFazio	Green (TX)
Borski	DeLauro	Green (WI)
Boucher	Deutsch	Grucci
Boyd	Diaz-Balart	Gutierrez
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Gutierrez
Brown (FL)	Doggett	Hall (OH)
Brown (OH)	Doolittle	Hart

Hastings (FL)	McInnis	Sandlin	Northup	Schrock	Terry
Hayworth	McIntyre	Sawyer	Norwood	Sessions	Thomas
Hill	McKinney	Schaffer	Nussle	Shadegg	Thornberry
Hilleary	McNulty	Schakowsky	Osborne	Shaw	Tiahrt
Hilliard	Meek (FL)	Schiff	Ose	Shays	Tiberi
Hinchey	Meeke (NY)	Scott	Otter	Simmons	Toomey
Hinojosa	Miller, George	Sensenbrenner	Oxley	Simpson	Vitter
Hoefel	Mink	Serrano	Pitts	Skeen	Walden
Hoekstra	Mollohan	Sherman	Pomeroy	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Holden	Moran (KS)	Sherwood	Portman	Smith (WA)	Watson (CA)
Holt	Murtha	Shimkus	Pryce (OH)	Snyder	Watts (OK)
Honda	Nadler	Shows	Putnam	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Hostettler	Napolitano	Shuster	Ramstad	Stenholm	Weller
Hoyer	Neal	Skelton	Roukema	Stump	Wilson
Hulshof	Ney	Slaughter	Ryun (KS)	Sununu	Young (FL)
Hunter	Oberstar	Smith (MI)	Sanchez	Tauscher	
Jackson (IL)	Obey	Smith (NJ)	Sanchez	Tauzin	
Jackson-Lee	Olver	Solis	Saxton	Taylor (NC)	
(TX)	Ortiz	Spratt			
Jefferson	Owens	Stark			
Jenkins	Pallone	Stearns	DeGette	Hutchinson	Sabo
John	Pascarell	Strickland	Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Scarborough
Johnson, E. B.	Pastor	Stupak	Gallegly	Lipinski	Spence
Jones (NC)	Paul	Sweeney	Hastings (WA)	Meehan	
Jones (OH)	Payne	Tancredo	Horn	Reyes	
Kanjorski	Pelosi	Tanner			
Kaptur	Pence	Taylor (MS)			
Kelly	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (CA)			
Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (PA)	Thompson (MS)			
Kennedy (RI)	Petri	Thune			
Kildee	Phelps	Thurman			
King (NY)	Pickering	Tierney			
Klecicka	Platts	Towns			
Kucinich	Pombo	Traficant			
LaHood	Price (NC)	Turner			
Lampson	Quinn	Rahall			
Langevin	Rahall	Udall (CO)			
Lantos	Rangel	Udall (NM)			
Largent	Regula	Upton			
LaTourette	Rehberg	Velázquez			
Lee	Reynolds	Visclosky			
Levin	Riley	Wamp			
Lewis (GA)	Rivers	Waters			
Lowe	Rodriguez	Watkins (OK)			
Lucas (KY)	Roemer	Watt (NC)			
Luther	Rogers (KY)	Waxman			
Maloney (NY)	Rogers (MI)	Weiner			
Markey	Rohrabacher	Weldon (PA)			
Mascara	Ros-Lehtinen	Wexler			
Matheson	Ross	Whitfield			
Matsui	Rothman	Wolf			
McCarthy (MO)	Roybal-Allard	Woolsey			
McCarthy (NY)	Royce	Wu			
McCollum	Rush	Wynn			
McGovern	Ryan (WI)	Young (AK)			
McHugh	Sanders				

NOES—162

Baird	DeMint	Johnson (CT)
Baker	Dicks	Johnson (IL)
Ballenger	Dooley	Johnson, Sam
Bartlett	Dreier	Keller
Bentsen	Dunn	Kerns
Bereuter	Ehlers	Kind (WI)
Biggett	Ehrlich	Kingston
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Kirk
Blunt	Ferguson	Knollenberg
Boehner	Fletcher	Kolbe
Bonilla	Forbes	LaFalce
Bono	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (WA)
Boswell	Ganske	Larson (CT)
Brady (TX)	Gilchrest	Latham
Bryant	Gillmor	Leach
Burr	Gilman	Lewis (CA)
Burton	Gonzalez	Lewis (KY)
Callahan	Goodlatte	Linder
Calvert	Goss	LoBiondo
Camp	Granger	Lofgren
Cantor	Graves	Lucas (OK)
Carson (OK)	Greenwood	Maloney (CT)
Castle	Hall (TX)	Manzullo
Chambliss	Hansen	McCrery
Cramer	Harman	McDermott
Combest	Hayes	McKeon
Cooksey	Hefley	Menendez
Cox	Herger	Mica
Crane	Hobson	Millender-
Crenshaw	Hoolley	McDonald
Cubin	Houghton	Miller (FL)
Cunningham	Hyde	Miller, Gary
Davis (CA)	Inslee	Moore
Davis (FL)	Isakson	Moran (VA)
Davis, Tom	Israel	Morella
Deal	Issa	Myrick
DeLauro	Istook	Nethercutt

Northup	Schrock	Terry
Norwood	Sessions	Thomas
Nussle	Shadegg	Thornberry
Osborne	Shaw	Tiahrt
Ose	Shays	Tiberi
Otter	Simmons	Toomey
Oxley	Simpson	Vitter
Pitts	Skeen	Walden
Pomeroy	Smith (TX)	Walsh
Portman	Smith (WA)	Watson (CA)
Pryce (OH)	Snyder	Watts (OK)
Putnam	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Ramstad	Stenholm	Weller
Roukema	Stump	Wicker
Ryun (KS)	Sununu	Wilson
Sanchez	Tauscher	Young (FL)
Sanchez	Tauzin	
Saxton	Taylor (NC)	

NOT VOTING—13

DeGette	Hutchinson	Sabo
Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Scarborough
Gallegly	Lipinski	Spence
Hastings (WA)	Meehan	
Horn	Reyes	

□ 1310

Messrs. GANSKE, GILCHREST, WELLER and DEMINT changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. SPRATT, RANGEL, SANDLIN, BISHOP, RUSH, BACHUS, EVERETT, PETERSON of Pennsylvania, JENKINS and WHITFIELD, Mrs. KELLY and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. HORN. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 260 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6, rule XVIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. PAUL

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 47, noes 375, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 261]

AYES—47

Akin	Burton	Crane
Armey	Chabot	Culberson
Barr	Coble	DeLay
Bartlett	Conyers	Doolittle
Bass	Cox	Duncan

Edwards
Flake
Gibbons
Goode
Hayworth
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter

Jones (NC)
McInnis
McKinney
Ney
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Platts
Pombo
Rohrabacher

NOES—375

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenthauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeMint

Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gillman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Hefley
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Insee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins

Royce
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Smith (MI)
Tancred
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Traficant
Wamp

John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourrette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCreery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal

Nethercatt
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman

NOT VOTING—11

DeGette
Delahunt
Gallegly
Hastings (WA)
Kilpatrick
Lipinski
Meehan
Reyes

□ 1319

Mr. HERGER changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

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, 2002, unless otherwise specified herein, as follows:

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of chapters 1 and 10 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and title I of Public Law 106-570, for child survival, reproductive health, assistance to combat tropical and other infectious diseases, and related activities, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, \$1,387,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this amount shall be made available for such activities as: (1) immunization programs; (2) oral rehydration programs; (3) health, nutrition, water and sanitation programs, and related education programs, which directly address the needs of mothers and children; (4) assistance for displaced and orphaned children; (5) pro-

grams for the prevention, treatment, and control of, and research on, tuberculosis, HIV/AIDS, polio, malaria and other infectious diseases; and (6) 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 programs: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not to exceed \$125,000, in addition to funds otherwise available for such purposes, may be used to monitor and provide oversight of child survival, maternal health, and infectious disease programs: *Provided further*, That the following amounts should be allocated as follows: \$295,000,000 for child survival and maternal health; \$25,000,000 for vulnerable children; \$434,000,000 for HIV/AIDS; \$155,000,000 for other infectious diseases; \$120,000,000 for UNICEF; and \$358,000,000 for reproductive health: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, up to \$60,000,000 may be made available for a United States contribution to the The Vaccine Fund and up to \$10,000,000 may be made available for the International AIDS Vaccine Initiative: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading and under the heading “Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund” in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2001, up to \$100,000,000 may be made available for a United States contribution to a multilateral trust fund to fight HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available in this Act nor any unobligated balances from prior appropriations may be made available to any organization or program which, as determined by the President of the United States, supports or participates in the management of a program of coercive abortion or involuntary sterilization: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used to pay for the performance of abortion as a method of family planning or to motivate or coerce any person to practice abortions; and that in order to reduce reliance on abortion in developing nations, funds shall be available only to voluntary family planning projects which offer, either directly or through referral to, or information about access to, a broad range of family planning methods and services, and that any such voluntary family planning project shall meet the following requirements: (1) service providers or referral agents in the project shall not implement or be subject to quotas, or other numerical targets, of total number of births, number of family planning acceptors, or acceptors of a particular method of family planning (this provision shall not be construed to include the use of quantitative estimates or indicators for budgeting and planning purposes); (2) the project shall not include payment of incentives, bribes, gratuities, or financial reward to: (A) an individual in exchange for becoming a family planning acceptor; or (B) program personnel for achieving a numerical target or quota of total number of births, number of family planning acceptors, or acceptors of a particular method of family planning; (3) the project shall not deny any right or benefit, including the right of access to participate in any program of general welfare or the right of access to health care, as a consequence of any individual’s decision not to accept family planning services; (4) the project shall provide family planning acceptors comprehensible information on the health benefits and risks of the method chosen, including those conditions that might

render the use of the method inadvisable and those adverse side effects known to be consequent to the use of the method; and (5) the project shall ensure that experimental contraceptive drugs and devices and medical procedures are provided only in the context of a scientific study in which participants are advised of potential risks and benefits; and, not less than 60 days after the date on which the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development determines that there has been a violation of the requirements contained in paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (5) of this proviso, or a pattern or practice of violations of the requirements contained in paragraph (4) of this proviso, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, a report containing a description of such violation and the corrective action taken by the Agency: *Provided further*, That in awarding grants for natural family planning under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 no applicant shall be discriminated against because of such applicant's religious or conscientious commitment to offer only natural family planning; and, additionally, all such applicants shall comply with the requirements of the previous proviso: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this or any other Act authorizing or appropriating funds for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, the term "motivate", as it relates to family planning assistance, shall not be construed to prohibit the provision, consistent with local law, of information or counseling about all pregnancy options: *Provided further*, That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to alter any existing statutory prohibitions against abortion under section 104 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 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 No. 26 offered by Ms. LEE:

In title II of the bill in the item relating to "CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$60,000,000)".

In title II of the bill in the item relating to "CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND", after the third dollar amount in the fourth proviso, insert the following: "(increased by \$60,000,000)".

In title II of the bill in the item relating to "CHILD SURVIVAL AND HEALTH PROGRAMS FUND", after the dollar amount in the sixth proviso, insert the following: "(increased by \$60,000,000)".

In title II of the bill in the item relating to "ANDEAN COUNTERDRUG INITIATIVE", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(decreased by \$33,000,000)".

In title III of the bill in the item relating to "FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(decreased by \$22,000,000)".

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for cosponsoring this amendment which would increase the United States contribution to the Global AIDS Trust

Fund from \$100 million to \$160 million in fiscal year 2002. I would also like to acknowledge and thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for their strong leadership in the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, and for increasing global HIV and AIDS with this initial \$100 million increase, and by a proposed \$100 million in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Now, the United Nations Secretary General, General Kofi Annan, has stated that a \$10 billion annual war chest is needed to fight HIV/AIDS. The Harvard AIDS Institute has stated that \$10 billion is needed annually for HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment. So while these increases are taking us in the right direction, there still is not enough money for the Global AIDS Trust Fund.

Last year, the United States spent \$490 million on global HIV/AIDS programs. This amount falls short of the billions required to fight the global AIDS crisis.

Now, we all know that the global AIDS crisis, particularly as it is affecting the African continent, is the greatest humanitarian crisis of our time. Eight thousand people died of AIDS every day last year and that means six people died every minute. Since the virus was first recognized 20 years ago, 58 million people have been infected and, at current rates of spread, the total will exceed \$100 million by 2005. AIDS has orphaned over 10 million children in Africa. By 2010, there will be more than 40 million AIDS orphans.

I participated in the United Nations General Assembly Special Session on HIV/AIDS as part of the official United States delegation. World leaders, international HIV experts, and economists in civil society called for a \$7 billion to \$10 billion Global AIDS Trust Fund in order to address HIV and AIDS prevention, education, care, and treatment in Africa.

So I want to remind my colleagues that last year, both the House and Senate passed bipartisan legislation which authorized the establishment of the World Bank AIDS Trust Fund. This bill was signed into law by President Clinton.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I will insert from the RECORD a letter I received from the Secretary which indicates the importance of this legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, DC, July 11, 2001.

Hon. BARBARA LEE,
Committee on Financial Services, House of Representatives, Washington, DC

DEAR MRS. LEE: Thank you for your letter of June 22nd on the negotiations to create a global fund for AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. I appreciate the leadership and support

that Congress has demonstrated on this issue, and agree that the international community should work to reach agreement to establish the fund as quickly as possible. There has been considerable progress toward this end, and the United States is pushing hard to reach agreement on process details and timetables that will enable the fund to be established and operational by January 2002.

The United States support a fiduciary role for the World Bank in the global fund, and we are working with other donors to achieve consensus on such a role. We have already had preliminary discussions with the Bank on the substantive elements of such a function.

It is also the United States' position that the fund should be donor-controlled and broadly representative of all stakeholders, with a major operational role for medical and public health experts. We believe that a consensus is also beginning to form around these issues.

Thank you again for your continuing interest and concern in this urgent matter.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. O'NEILL.

Mr. Chairman, in order to remain at the forefront, our leadership, the United States leadership, must include providing significant funding to the Global AIDS Trust Fund. Actually, this year our authorization, which was agreed upon by our Committee on International Relations under the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), calls for approximately a \$750 million distribution. The trust fund will provide direct funding for HIV/AIDS prevention, education, treatment, and care services. These funds are desperately needed.

I believe, and experts support, the fact that the United States must commit a minimum of \$1 billion for the Global AIDS Trust Fund in order to lead this international effort. This will help leverage the \$10 billion requirement, and it will keep the United States in a leadership position.

Now, I understand the financial constraints which are presented in this bill. However, I strongly believe that we must do everything that we can at every opportunity to bring us closer to that \$1 billion level. So our \$60 million amendment will do just that.

As discussions about a comprehensive and coordinated global response to the AIDS crisis has ensued, there have been many questions about whether or not African countries and HIV/AIDS service providers will be able to expend large amounts of funding on the pandemic. I want to remind my colleagues about the authorizing language in H.R. 3519, the Global AIDS and Tuberculosis Relief Act of 2000. The authorizing language included language that indicated that we must build the necessary health care and social infrastructure, while at the same time providing for care and treatment to ensure long-term success.

There have been reports which claim the developing countries and HIV/AIDS service providers will not effectively be

able to absorb or distribute large amounts of money for the global pandemic. But according to a USAID report, there are over 25 countries that have been identified as high impact countries, yet aid is only scaling up in four of these countries. According to the USAID missions, capacities for increases in funding in Africa alone could be doubled and spent effectively.

As for offsets, I want to state for the record that the offsets for this amendment will come from an across-the-board cut of the foreign military financing budget increases from last year. These cuts do not include funding for Israel, Egypt, or Jordan. Our amendment will also cut funding from the Andean antinarcotic initiatives specifically, military spending for Peru only, once again, only from the increase this year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentlewoman from California and the leadership that she has shown in this fight against HIV and AIDS, and I also want to say the same about the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the other member of our subcommittee. Both of them have been true leaders in this and, really, the conscience of the House in this matter.

I wish I could agree with the amendment, but I think that we have a carefully balanced bill when it comes to our priorities, so I find myself in disagreement with this amendment. I think it is worth noting that the committee has recommended a generous increase for international health, and it has reduced the President's request for both of the accounts that this amendment would reduce even further.

The amendment, while it may be well motivated, threatens the balance among competing interests, competing national interests that are found in this bill. Arriving at that balance with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member, has not been easy; and I do not expect that all of the Members necessarily are going to agree with it. But once we upset that, once we demolish that balance, I do not think it is going to be easy to restore.

Unlike last year, we cannot count on the other body to restore assistance to the Andean nations, nor can we count on the other body to restore further cuts we make in military assistance to Poland or to the Baltic States.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would also cut \$22 million from the foreign military financing program. This is an account that is very large at \$3.627 billion. But 94 percent of those funds in this year's bill are allocated for Israel, Egypt, and Jordan. Only \$177 million is

available to the rest of the world. Let me repeat those two figures. This amendment cuts \$22 million, and that is one-eighth of the military assistance to countries outside of the Middle East.

Who is going to be affected by that? Will this cut be allocated against our friends in Poland, in Hungary, or the Czech Republic, those who have just joined NATO? It is inevitable that they are going to be affected by this. Last year we had a similar amendment, together with the Waters amendment, that eliminated all military assistance except to Israel and Egypt, and even reduced funding for those countries.

□ 1330

It also eliminated our military assistance to the Baltic States. Members ignored warnings from the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) in their rush to support popular causes of the day.

I know that many Americans of Baltic and Central European origin were concerned about the action taken by this body last year, because most of us heard from them. Those Americans recognized not just the symbolic importance but the material importance of the assistance we give to the Baltic States and to Poland and to Hungary.

We should not make the same mistake again, in my view, of ignoring those concerns and the vital strategic interest we have in that region.

With regard to HIV/AIDS, my own commitment and involvement in this issue I think is a matter of public record. Just last Friday I chaired a day-long panel here in the House of Representatives, four panels of experts and leaders who updated dozens of staff members and other Members of this body on the current situation with regard to the pandemic.

That day-long seminar drove home very clearly to me the comments and remarks and the truth of what the gentlewoman from California has said. The crisis in HIV/AIDS has not abated. It is getting worse in the world. It requires more resources, a lot more resources.

Our bill does provide those resources, above and beyond what was requested by the President, at the expense of other programs. My chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Agencies reflects the priority we are giving in this global fight against the scourge of AIDS. We have \$474 million for HIV/AIDS, and we just added in a recent amendment another \$18 million to that. Another \$80 million was provided by the supplemental appropriations conference agreement that Congress sent to the President last Friday.

Taking those two bills together, this bill and the supplemental that we just sent to the President, the House would increase AIDS funding by 76 percent in this year, from \$315 million in fiscal year 2001 to \$554 million in 2002, and my

mental calculations here are not reflecting the \$18 million we just added in with the adoption of the other amendment a few minutes ago.

This increase, over 76 percent in HIV/AIDS funding, is what the committee has concluded that we can afford and effectively use within the allocation provided for this bill. I am uncertain whether another \$60 million would be obligated and effectively used during the fiscal year 2002, but it would be spent eventually.

I know the gentlewoman has put all of this money into the International Trust Fund, which I think, as the gentlewoman knows, at this point is still just on paper. We do not have it organized.

So I would oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues not to adopt this amendment but to allow the subcommittee and committee's work in this area to stand.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Leach amendment. This amendment proposes a smart shifting of funds. It moves foreign military funds to an HIV/AIDS initiative that will affect positive changes in people's lives around the world.

HIV/AIDS affects more than 10 million young people around the world, making it the largest health crisis children face. As bad or worse is that this horrific virus has made orphans of millions of uninfected children whose parents have died from HIV/AIDS. How bad does it have to get before this Congress realizes that we need to take immediate and effective action against the global AIDS epidemic?

As yet, our response as a nation to this global pandemic has not kept pace with the enormous growth in this deadly disease. The countries hit hardest remain ill-equipped and unable to respond adequately.

AIDS is no longer only a health matter. It is a matter of social stability. It is a matter of economic development. It is a matter of international security.

Increasing the World Bank's HIV/AIDS Trust Fund by \$60 million will help to reduce the rate of new infections. It will extend the lives of people living with HIV and provide care and support for children and families impacted by the disease. The availability of this funding will make the difference between death and a healthy future.

By passing this amendment, the United States will make a practical investment and a necessary investment in those across the globe who need our help, help they need now. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

First, let me congratulate and thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. LEE), for her leadership in this effort; and I would also express my deep respect for the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for his commitment in this area.

I know it is awkward for the Committee on Appropriations, after putting substantially more money into this process, to have Members come to the floor and ask for more. But let me explain why I think this is important.

If one were sitting on the moon and were to look down at this country and the world at this time, it is hard not to conclude that the greatest difficulty we have is disease control, particularly AIDS. Our Surgeon General has said that this is going to be the largest pandemic in human history, exceeding that of the bubonic plague of the 1300s and the epidemic of flu in the early part of the last century which both killed over 20 million people.

Twenty-two million have now died from AIDS, and in Africa alone 25 million have the HIV virus. Obviously, this is a disease that knows no borders. Obviously, it cannot be contained in continents. It is rapidly spreading into the subcontinent of Central Asia, into Southeast Asia, into the former Soviet Union. Over 1 million American citizens have the HIV virus.

Mr. Chairman, now with regard to where the resources for this amendment come from, this is a very modest amendment. It takes about \$60 million from a military interdiction program in Peru and from foreign military sales.

Intriguingly, from a national security perspective, one of the great questions is, is the security of the average American citizen going to be more likely protected with giving guns and bullets to others at the turn of this century or through dealing with this disease in this kind of way—especially when those guns and bullets apply to foreign military sales, not provisions for the military of the United States of America?

Finally, let me say why it is with some concern that I rise with the gentlewoman. In the last Congress, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services established a World Bank AIDS Trust Fund and authorized a substantial sum of money. Unfortunately, the appropriations process did not come forth with the matching obligation.

So what the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and I are attempting to do is to meet the beginning of that obligation in a much more serious way. This is the will of the Congress in an authorizing sense, and it is our view it ought to be matched in an appropriations way.

Finally, let me just say that it is self-evident that we have a humanitarian crisis, but it also is an economic crisis. It is a national security crisis. It is a crisis that has to be dealt with on

a worldwide basis. That is precisely what the leaders of the world met this last week to talk about. It is precisely what this Congress has to deal with today.

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

Mr. LEACH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her effective work to fight for and provide funding for HIV/AIDS. I know the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) has been an outstanding advocate of the same program.

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently tried to support that. But I reluctantly oppose this amendment, as it will cut into our important Andean antidrug initiatives and reduce some very important military assistance initiatives, as the chairman pointed out.

With regard to Peru, I just would like my colleagues, as they discuss assistance for Peru, to bear in mind the case of Lori Berenson, the case of the American citizen who has been wrongly imprisoned for far too long in Peru.

Mr. Chairman, while I commend our colleague, the gentlewoman from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE, on her effective work to fight and provide funding for HIV/AIDS, which I have continually supported, I reluctantly oppose this amendment as it will cut into our important Andean anti-drug initiatives and reduce some important military assistance initiatives.

And with regard to Peru, I urge my colleagues to bear in mind the case of Lori Berenson, the American citizen who has been wrongly imprisoned in Peru on charges of terrorism. This case needs to be closely examined before we consider granting the Peruvian government U.S. aid. Peru needs to understand that the present status of Lori Berenson is unacceptable.

While Peru has made great strides in improving its economy and fighting drugs, the Fujimori regime created a judicial system that is seriously lacking in independence. Lori Berenson was initially condemned under a flawed military court system that imprisoned hundreds of innocent Peruvians. Peru has now conceded that Lori was innocent of leading or participating in any terrorist organization. Her second trial should not have been held without a major revision and reform of Peru's anti-terrorism legislation. Her case will remain a thorny issue between the United States and Peru until Lori is released from prison.

Lori has been in prison for 5½ years, it is time for her to be able to return home.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by thanking again the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who is a stalwart and wonderful leader on this cause, and her fine staff.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lee-Leach amendment that

would increase the United States contribution to the global HIV/AIDS fund from \$1 million to \$160 million. World leaders, HIV/AIDS experts and economists have called for a \$7 billion to \$10 billion fund in order to address HIV/AIDS. This amendment is simply a down payment.

Why are such funds needed? Because we are facing a worldwide crisis. More than 36.1 million people are currently infected and living with HIV worldwide, and 1.4 million of them, Mr. Chairman, are children. In the year 2000 alone, 8,000 deaths occurred every day, or nearly six deaths every minute. Experts predict more people will die of AIDS in the next decade than have died in all of the wars of the 20th century.

Equally devastating, the disease also threatens the health and well-being of uninfected children by taking the lives of their parents. By the year 2000, over 42 million children worldwide have been orphaned due to HIV/AIDS.

In the most severely affected regions of the world, a high proportion of teachers are too sick to work or are dying of complications due to AIDS.

Condom distribution is key to a successful HIV/AIDS prevention campaign. USAID has distributed over 1 billion condoms. In addition, USAID is supporting the development of female-controlled methods of prevention, such as microbicides.

If the U.S. Government is committed to supporting efforts that reduce mother-to-child transmission, we must put our money where our mouth is. An alarming number of children have acquired HIV/AIDS through MTCT, and 3 million children under the age of 15 have died of AIDS. USAID is also funding community outreach to pregnant women to make them aware of the risk for the unborn children.

We must ensure that African governments and development agencies in Africa receive the funding needed to continue to expand their work to prevent spread of HIV/AIDS and to treat the victims.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge support of the Lee-Leach global health amendment increasing contributions to the global HIV/AIDS fund. It is a pro-life effort, Mr. Chairman. I would encourage support.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Committee on International Relations, I have had a great deal of time and effort spent on the Andean area of this hemisphere; and if there is a place in this world that deserves some kind of financial aid, this is it, both in the military and also because of the fact that we have created a drug problem in this country and have made people in much weaker areas like the Andes region develop the idea of growing drugs there.

We need to support those areas. We need to support them in every way we can. Over half of this money that is involved here is for peaceful purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I noticed on the amendment that it applies all of this money to child survival and health programs. I was reading in record of the bill that, and not everybody talks about this, there is \$434 million, and then it is \$474 million in the bill. That is \$45 million above the President's request and above \$315 million last year. There is also \$100 million in our supplement.

Mr. Chairman, the Child Survival and Health Program funds, and this is the part that I found interesting, it funds \$295 million just for child survival, maternal health; for vulnerable children, \$25 million; and for HIV-AIDS, \$434 million. For other infectious disease, I checked on that, tuberculosis and others that generally spring up following on HIV-AIDS, and reproductive health and voluntary family planning, that also fits the HIV-AIDS program. Then there is a grant to UNICEF. Again, much of this could be applied to HIV-AIDS.

When we add it all up, there is over \$1 billion 387 million that can be used in this particular area, much more than anybody has been willing to talk about so far.

I would just like to say that the Andean region deserves every consideration that we can give it because we have created the problem that exists there. The use of drugs in this country has created a monstrous drug problem in all of the Andean region; and it is, in my considered opinion, very important that we continue to support that area, especially since the people in Europe and the other parts of the world who have the same drug problem are doing nothing to assist.

□ 1345

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I thank the sponsors of this legislation, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), for the outstanding work that they have done continuously, along with many, many Members who have joined in, including the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and many others who have joined in on this particular aspect of support of the HIV problem.

Let me simply say that my theme today is that we are our brothers' keepers. In newspaper reports we find that 95 percent of all AIDS cases are in the developing world and that this strain of AIDS could cause a drastic explosion if it jumps to the Western world. More than 70 percent of all people living with the disease, or 25.3 million HIV-positive individuals, live in Africa. However, this disease is moving

to India. We find that the disease is growing the fastest in places like Russia and China; and, therefore, this is a world-wide disaster.

Over 10 percent of the population is infected in 16 African nations, but it is spreading. The U.S. Census Bureau calculates that by 2010 average life expectancy will be reduced by 40 years in Zimbabwe, Botswana, and in South Africa by 30 years. The disease destabilizes these nations by decimating their workforce, destroying any economic prosperity, depleting their military and peacekeeping forces, and leaving thousands and thousands of orphans. We expect in the years to come that we will find 40 million children orphaned in sub-Saharan Africa.

Let me emphasize the crux of this particular amendment. It is a modest amendment. And I do appreciate the needs of peacekeeping in our European nations, but I would simply say that there will be no opportunity for peacekeeping if we do not fight the devastation of AIDS. AIDS devastates the militaries of these respective countries. It provides military instability because the military personnel travel from country to country and take the infection and carry it elsewhere. It destroys economic development; and certainly because AIDS has no borders, our children are impacted.

So I simply offer my support for this amendment, and I believe it is a modest amendment in terms of the funds that it takes from the respective accounts.

I would lastly say on the drug issue, as would anyone, we want to diminish or decrease the amount of drug use in this country. But I believe a key element of that is treatment. No matter how much we try to fight the supply, if we do not deal with the issue of treatment, we are fighting almost a losing battle. I believe these funds will be vitally necessary and useful to be utilized to fight the devastation of HIV-AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to extend my strong support for the Lee-Leach Global AIDS amendment to the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. This amendment would increase the United States contribution to the global HIV/AIDS fund from \$100 million to \$160 million.

The Lee-Leach amendment addresses the global HIV/AIDS crisis—the most urgent humanitarian crisis of our time. More people have died from HIV/AIDS over the last twenty years than from any other disease in history—21.8 million people. In this country we have been able to slow the rate of AIDS' death, but the disease is at crisis proportions in sub-Saharan Africa, where four-fifths of those deaths have occurred—an average of one death every eight seconds.

The Houston Chronicle reports that 95 percent of all AIDS cases are in the developing world, and that this strain of AIDS could cause a drastic explosion if it jumps to the Western world. More than 70 percent of all people liv-

ing with the disease, or 25.3 million HIV-positive individuals, live in Africa. Over 10 percent of the population is infected in sixteen African nations. The U.S. Census Bureau calculates that by 2010, average life expectancy will be reduced by 40 years in Zimbabwe and Botswana, and in South Africa by 30 years. The disease destabilizes these nations by decimating its workforce, destroying any economic prosperity, depleting its military and peacekeeping forces and leaving thousands of orphans.

The epidemic is not limited to Africa. Indeed, the fastest growing front of the epidemic is now in Russia, where the number of new infections last year exceeded the total from all previous years combined. In 2000, the number of Russians living with HIV/AIDS skyrocketed from 130,000 to 300,000.

A multilateral response to the global AIDS crisis is the quickest mechanism to engage international donors and to initiate a coordinated international response to the global AIDS pandemic. World leaders, international HIV/AIDS experts and economists and civil society have called for a \$7–\$10 billion dollar fund in order to address HIV/AIDS prevention, education, care and treatment in Africa. A significant contribution to this goal would be a wise political and national security investment.

The global AIDS trust fund is designed to leverage significant contributions from the international community to fight this global killer. The Lee-Leach amendment would send a strong message that the United States is committed to eradicating HIV/AIDS from the face of the earth. If the Lee-Leach amendment is made law, it would provide significant direct grant funding to African governments, NGO's and civil society in regions of the world that have been hard hit by HIV/AIDS top turn the tied of HIV/AIDS. The Bush administration has told us that the trust fund would be ready to disburse funds by the end December 2001.

I urge all of my colleagues to remember that AIDS knows no borders. With more than 4 million infections annually, Africa remains the epicenter of the AIDS epidemic. However, AIDS is truly a problem that threatens global stability. In India, more than 3.7 million people are living with the virus. In 1999, the highest increase in reported rates of HIV transmission were found not in Africa, but in the former states of the Soviet Union. Keep in mind that stability in those countries that possess nuclear weaponry has been a goal of our foreign policy since the early days of the Cold War.

The \$60 million we are seeking will be a down payment on a larger investment in the global AIDS trust fund. I urge my colleagues to recognize this investment and support those amendment.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. However, I do want to commend the author for her sincerity and the work that she has done on the HIV situation.

I oppose this for a number of reasons. First of all, let me reiterate what the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) just said, that we have over \$1 billion in various appropriation

efforts to combat AIDS. This bill alone, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) has said, we have a \$474 million earmark, and then another \$80 million that was in the supplemental budget, and we just increased this \$18 million with the Visclosky amendment.

Now, compare that over \$500 million, just on this bill, Mr. Chairman, to last year's \$315 and the year before about \$220 million. Clearly, this foreign operations committee is moving at a very aggressive pace to try to help this situation worldwide, but also in coordination with 12 other appropriation committees in their efforts.

This committee is also funding or encouraging the funding of such products as the Morehouse School of Medicine is doing in Atlanta, and other nonprofit organizations and research institutes. So we are clearly committed to fighting the AIDS situation.

I want to also talk about where this money is coming from, because the author of this amendment is taking money out of some very, very vital programs, the foreign military financing assistance programs. Let me just read the names of some of the recipients of this valuable money: Albania, Bosnia, Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Macedonia, Malta, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia. These are all emerging democracies in the Balkans.

How can we, at this critical point in their most recent history, turn our backs on them? Why would we cut this money to what are emerging as not just great democracies but also free people and allies for the United States of America? That is what is going on in the Balkans. That is where this money is coming from.

Now, let us look at the Western Hemisphere. This cuts money from people in Argentina, Belize, El Salvador, Haiti, Jamaica. Certainly, right now, with all the trouble Jamaica is having, it is not time to pull the rug out from under their military assistance.

So I would say, as well intended as this amendment is, it is financed through the wrong mechanisms. And, Mr. Chairman, if that is not bad enough, I want to talk about the Andean initiative and a lot of the criticism of that. And I share the criticism when we rush out on a defense contractor buyer spree, buying helicopters and creating a cottage industry for people who deal in quasi-military equipment, but there are some other programs in there that are extremely important.

Judicial training and witness monitoring that NGOs are doing for some of these countries. Now, I had a constituent several years ago who was jailed in Ecuador. And under the Ecuadoran system of government, an individual has to prove that they are innocent. The state does not have to prove that they are guilty. It is completely

different than America. People are put in jail, and they have to build their own case. The government does not even have to tell the person jailed what they are charged for.

One of the great disservices we could inadvertently do for our constituents in America is to put them at further risk when they go to some of these countries in South America. They do need judicial reform, and this money cuts that very needed judicial reform.

So for these reasons I oppose this amendment. Again, I appreciate the sincerity of the authors and the supporters of it, but I think we need to look again at where they are taking the money and the track record of this committee, what it has done, and what its commitment remains to be on HIV.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the Lee-Leach global AIDS amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for their leadership on this issue. My second term in the House of Representatives, and last year, through my work with the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), I became more and more aware of the need for this country to step up to the plate and take its leadership role in addressing the pandemic of AIDS.

In reality, as we nickel and dime our way towards paying for the AIDS pandemic in our country and across the world, we ought to be anteing up \$1 billion from the United States that would allow us to leverage another \$8 to \$9 billion across the world to support this AIDS, to get rid of this AIDS pandemic.

The prior speaker specifically said that we were cutting funds. But in fact we are looking at funds to leverage to the trust fund, and we are not cutting USAID funds. We are not talking about bilateral funds, and we are not talking about decreasing the income of the various countries that are being dealt with. We are talking about decreasing an increase for these countries, because some of the dollars have actually sat being unused. For example, in the country of Peru, military funds for the Andean initiative sat unused for a number of years. In addition, funds in Colombia would not be affected. Additionally, cuts to this initiative are budget cuts only to budget increases over the next few years.

Let me for a moment, Mr. Chairman, tell my colleagues some of the 24 organizations that are supporting this piece of legislation, and these are organizations that are religious, health, hunger and research oriented groups.

They include ACT UP out of Philadelphia, AIDS Action, AIDS Alliance for Children Youth and Families, AIDS Nutrition Services Alliance, AIDS Vaccine Advocacy Coalition, Advocates for

Youth, the American Public Health Association, Catholic Relief Services, Church World Service, Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation, Gay Men's Health Crisis, Global Campaign for Microbicides, Global Health Council, Health GAP Coalition, HIV Medicine Association, the Human Rights Campaign, Infectious Diseases Society of America, Maryknoll AIDS Task Force, the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA, the National AIDS Fund, PLAN International, the Presbyterian Church USA, Washington Office, the San Francisco AIDS Foundation, Student Global AIDS Campaign, and the Washington Office on Africa.

All of these organizations get it. All of these organizations understand the importance of our addressing the AIDS pandemic across the world.

Now, I am knowledgeable to the point that I have seen and I have read that there are grandparents across sub-Saharan Africa that are raising 35 and 40 grandchildren, and they are raising 35 and 40 grandchildren as a result of the fact that AIDS has wiped out generations across sub-Saharan Africa. We should not continue to let that happen.

It would be different if we could not make an impact. It would be different if we had to say to the world, World, we cannot help you, we can let this AIDS pandemic continue to spread. But we can make a difference, the big United States of America, the one that comes to the plate for everybody else.

Step up, America. Step up, United States, and fund this AIDS pandemic program at its maximum.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. This amendment has the right heart but the wrong idea.

We all support increased efforts to address the world's HIV-AIDS crisis and the chairman of this committee is to be commended for his efforts to fund such programs. But the solution to AIDS is not to reduce the funding to combat illegal drugs on the streets of the United States or to reduce assistance to our allies.

This amendment reduces military assistance to many of our allies. Approximately half of this budget is dedicated to Israel and another large percent to Egypt. It is earmarked. That leaves only \$177 million for the rest of the world, of which this amendment would strike \$22 million, putting pressure both on Israel and Egypt as well as the rest of the countries of the world.

I represent a large Macedonian population. The country of Macedonia allowed our troops to be based there. They were drawn into the Balkan wars. A unified government that represented all different parts of Macedonia has come under duress because of their willingness to support America. Now we would turn around with this amendment and reduce aid to them.

I particularly rise as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice,

Drug Policy and Human Resources to discuss the importance of fully funding the Andean Regional Initiative, to ensure we continue effective efforts to reduce the supply of drugs to the United States. Of our total narcotics control budget, and I believe in a balanced approach, we spend just 17 percent on interdiction and all international aid programs, including our past support of Plan Colombia at \$1.3 billion. We spend almost twice as much, 31 percent, on demand-reduction programs as well as other issues.

Although I strongly believe we must pursue a national strategy evenly balanced between supply and demand reduction, it is clear that our funding for international programs is not only extremely reasonable in proportion to overall drug control spending, but dollar for dollar has a disproportionate impact on our strategy. Moreover, it is a critical time to our allies in Central and South America.

In Colombia, opium growing in the north has continued unchecked and now provides the vast majority of the heroin that is on the streets of America and in our neighborhoods. In south Colombia, we are at the start of an aggressive program to eradicate the primary source of the world's cocaine. It is important for my colleagues to understand that we are still at the start of Plan Colombia. We are likely to falsely hear over and over today that it somehow has not worked. How can the plan have worked when the first helicopters are just arriving at the end of this month and in the next month? Last year's funding is just reaching there now.

□ 1400

Yet we already see the coca growers and the poppy growers starting to move to other countries which is why we now have an Andean initiative.

The political situation continues to be unstable and politically volatile. The consequences of a lack of resolve on the part of the United States to maintain stability and democracy in Colombia will be monumental. Many of those consequences will be felt almost as harshly on the streets in our hometowns and in our neighborhoods in America.

To ensure that our efforts are effective, it is equally critical to support a regional strategy to maintain stability and democracy throughout the Andean region. Almost half of the money requested for the Andean initiative is for countries other than Colombia. Without military aid to help restore order, terrorism and conflict funded by American and European drug habits have exported terrorism and an unbelievable mess in each of these countries.

When you look at this, we talk about rebuilding their legal systems, we talk about alternative economic development, but when the judges are being

killed, when families and children are being kidnapped, we first need to get order. As we work towards order, then we help to rebuild their countries. These countries need our help to ensure that narco-traffic does not simply spread from Colombia to destabilize and corrupt other nations, especially those who have made a concerted effort to eliminate the drug trade from their countries.

We need to battle the AIDS virus but we also need to battle the drug crisis.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a couple of points quickly in response to what has been said here today.

There is \$38 million that comes out of the economic assistance for the Andean countries. Forty-seven percent of the money that we have in that account goes to economic assistance. Half of it goes to economic assistance. So you are cutting the money from that.

You cannot just say you are cutting it from military. You are cutting it from the justice programs. You are cutting it from the poverty programs. You are cutting it from the alternative economic assistance programs.

Most of our programs have been consolidated to the Andean initiative, those in Latin America. If you take those out, there is only \$146 million total for the entire region that is left in all other programs of assistance. So you are cutting drastically into those programs.

Lastly let me say a few words with regard to the trust fund. In this bill, we have \$100 million in the trust fund. There is \$100 million that we appropriated the other day that is in the supplemental. And, there is \$100 million that will be included in the Labor HHS. In total, for the trust fund, we have \$300 million. This amendment would increase it to \$360 million. I say we are doing everything we can in the area of the international trust fund for AIDS and the other diseases.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise not only as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform that the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), who just spoke, is chairman of, so I am very familiar with our efforts to fight drugs all over the world, but at the same time I stand here as one who was just informed by my health commissioner that in the City of Baltimore, which is only 45 miles away from here, in my district and three ZIP Codes, we have a level of AIDS that is approaching very rapidly the levels found in Africa and third world countries. That is 45 miles from here, less than an hour's drive.

So when the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) spoke a little bit earlier about his concerns about making sure that we provide a proper defense for this country, that not only affects the third world but it also affects these very United States.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Lee amendment which seeks to add the \$60 million to the U.S. contribution to the Global AIDS and Health Fund, and I compliment her on her efforts and those associated with it.

I would also like to state for the record that I am disturbed by some of the comments made about this amendment. I am disturbed because I cannot believe that Members of this great House have questioned the integrity of the amendment. Last week I read in the CQ Daily Monitor a quote from a Member on the other side of the aisle when he said, "Are they really trying to add money to HIV/AIDS or trying to cut money from the other side?"

While our efforts in fighting international narcotics are a very serious issue and concern, there are many valid issues that must be addressed regarding our role in the Andean region.

Although I am a supporter of Plan Colombia, some of the concerns you have heard about today are valid and need further scrutiny. What is important at this juncture is finding a cure and stopping the spread of a deadly pandemic. AIDS is an all inclusive, nondiscriminatory disease that transcends country boundaries, age, gender, and race.

Experts predict that more people will die of AIDS in the next decade than have died in all the wars of the 20th century. It is estimated that \$7 to \$10 billion are needed to fight this global AIDS pandemic. Further, I recently read a statement that and I quote, "It is a dramatic paradox that the same continent that saw the appearance of a man 6 million years ago is starting to witness our disappearance this millennium." Yet we continue to quibble over \$60 million.

Listen to the statistics. Worldwide, more than 36 million people are living with HIV/AIDS. That is more than the entire population of the great State of California. There are more than five million new infections each year; 600,000 of those are in children under the age of 15. By 2010, AIDS will orphan 44 million children. More than a fifth of all adults in at least four African countries are infected with the HIV/AIDS virus. According to the joint United Nations program on HIV/AIDS, if the crisis is not addressed, 100 million people will be infected worldwide by 2005.

I believe that the Congress and the President's demonstrated unwillingness to increase international family planning funds and the crushing debt burden these countries face leave many developing countries, particularly

those in sub-Saharan Africa, with limited options, thereby exacerbating this devastating health crisis.

Of the 22 countries who have received debt relief under the Highly Indebted Poor Countries Initiative, two-thirds will spend more on servicing their debt than they spend on basic health care. As such, those who are suffering from HIV/AIDS and its related illnesses are left untreated and unaccounted for.

Mr. Chairman, we have the means and the moral obligation to maintain a commitment to be leaders and fighters on this issue. As such, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE). The funding is critical to sustaining the role that the Global AIDS Health Fund can play in eradicating the deadly effects of HIV/AIDS. Let us remain steadfast in our commitment.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Lee-Leach amendment which would increase the funding for the United States contribution to the Global AIDS Fund from \$100 million to \$160 million. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for all of their leadership that they have provided on this issue.

Last year I recall that they came to this floor and they asked for a bit more assistance; and the Members of Congress saw the wisdom in their words and work, and they supported them. I hope that the House will give support to this amendment that is being placed before Members today.

The global HIV/AIDS pandemic is the most severe health crisis of our time. Over 36 million people are currently living with HIV/AIDS, and 95 percent of them live in developing countries. The impact of the pandemic on sub-Saharan Africa defies description. Seventeen million Africans have already died of AIDS since the beginning of the pandemic, and 25 million Africans are living with HIV/AIDS. Over 6,000 people die from AIDS-related diseases every day in sub-Saharan Africa.

The pandemic has been especially devastating for children. Approximately 1 million children are living with HIV/AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa, and an estimated 600,000 African infants become infected with HIV each year through mother-to-child transmission either at birth or through breast feeding. The Joint United Nations Program on HIV/AIDS, U.N. AIDS, projects that at least half of all 15-year-olds will eventually die of AIDS in the worst-affected countries such as Zambia, Botswana, and South Africa.

Furthermore, over 12 million African children have lost their mother to AIDS and are considered AIDS orphans. The HIV/AIDS pandemic has

curtailed the economic development of many African countries. AIDS is believed responsible for shortages of skilled workers and teachers, high rates of absenteeism, labor turnover, and the deaths of Africans at upper levels of management in business and government in many areas of sub-Saharan Africa.

USAID has estimated that Kenya's GNP will be 14.4 percent smaller in the year 2005 than it would have been without AIDS. In the Ivory Coast, five teachers reportedly die from AIDS during each week of the school year. Teachers and other skilled workers can be very difficult to replace. In some parts of Africa, employers find it necessary to hire two workers for each job opening because they expect one out of every two workers to die from HIV/AIDS.

The HIV/AIDS pandemic has disrupted the lives of farm communities and reduced agricultural production. When adult members of farm families become ill, they become unable to continue farming. Farm tools and animals may be sold to pay for their care. Children are forced to leave school and care for their parents. Sharp reduction in crops such as maize and cotton and other crops in Zimbabwe have been attributed to widespread illness and death from AIDS among farm families and agricultural workers.

United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan has asked for the establishment of a Global AIDS Fund to address this devastating pandemic. He estimated that it will take \$7 billion to \$10 billion per year to mount a successful effort to treat HIV-infected people and stop the spread of AIDS.

The Global AIDS Alliance estimates that it will take \$15 billion per year, yet current spending on HIV/AIDS is only \$1 billion per year from all sources combined. This bill provides a paltry \$474 million in funding for international HIV/AIDS programs. The United States certainly can do better. The United States should be a leader in global AIDS funding.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Lee-Leach amendment and demonstrate the commitment of Congress to worldwide efforts to stop the spread of this deadly disease.

Mr. Chairman, I know that some of us are beginning to sound like a broken record. But we will be on this floor day in and day out at every point that we can join this issue. We will be here. We will not sit silently by and watch the devastation that we are witnessing in the world, and particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, and be quiet.

One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, What more do they expect? We are putting money in the budget. We keep putting money in the budget. Members heard what the estimates are. \$1 billion from all sources when we need \$10 billion to 15 billion. We have a long way to go.

Mr. Chairman, Members will be hearing from us often. Members will be hearing from us in the most profound way we can put forth this issue. We have got to have more money to stop the pandemic.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Lee-Leach amendment. I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for introducing this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard about the severity of the AIDS pandemic. It has at this point exceeded in damage to human life the flu pandemic of 1918; and before it is stopped, it probably will exceed the damage to human beings of the Black Death of the 14th century.

There are some countries where one out of every four people is already affected. We still do not have a cure. We have some ameliorative treatments, and those treatments are not affordable to people in most of the developing world. It is the greatest single threat that humanity faces today.

The amounts of money we are spending on it, frankly, put us to shame when we consider the priorities. Any budget is a set of priorities. The Global AIDS Trust Fund in this budget will get \$100 million in this bill; another \$100 million in the Labor-HHS bill; bilateral aid from AID adds another \$247 million, for a total of \$447 million proposed in the United States budget.

Mr. Chairman, we are spending about \$6 billion a year on missile defense research. Some people think we ought to spend more, some think we ought to spend less. \$6 billion for a possible threat; \$447 million for an existing mortal threat that is in front of our eyes.

□ 1415

The U.N. has estimated that we should be spending 7 to \$10 billion a year, the world, not just the United States, seven to 10 times the \$1 billion the world is spending on this now. This modest amendment would add \$60 million. The total U.S. commitment would go from \$447 million to \$507 million in a budget of roughly \$1.8 trillion.

Again, look what we spend money on: \$6 billion on missile defense. This money, \$60 million, is minimal. It is taken from foreign military aid, mostly to Latin American countries which, frankly, is not all that necessary, I do not know about the great military threats faced by Latin American countries, and from drug initiatives abroad which have not cut down the flow of drugs into this country. The threat of AIDS is a heck of a lot more threatening to us than any drug problem could ever conceivably be.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we adopt this amendment. \$60 million is a pittance. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) should have added another zero. It should have been \$600 million. But then we would not seriously consider it. But the pittance that is added here is the very, very least we can do so that we can say to our children, we did not ignore the AIDS crisis, the worst crisis to humanity in at least 600 years.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just briefly wanted to rise to commend the makers of this motion, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), and commend them for their leadership. I also want to acknowledge the great job that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) did in the bill in increasing the funds for HIV/AIDS because the number has increased. As one who has worked on this issue over the years, I can only say that this problem of HIV/AIDS has been exacerbated by poverty in the world. AIDS and poverty are a terrible combination. They exist side by side in the developing world.

But it is the poverty of our language that I wanted to address right now. We must have some poverty because we have not been able to convince the Congress of the need for us to have more funds into the global fund for AIDS and other infectious diseases.

My colleagues have spoken eloquently to the numbers of people with HIV/AIDS, and I want to repeat one of those numbers. That is, that left at the pace that we are going now, the UNAIDS program reports that, by the year 2005, 100 million people will be infected with HIV/AIDS. How much more staggering would the numbers have to become for us to respond in a way that is commensurate with the leadership of our country, that is commensurate with the need that is out there?

The HIV/AIDS issue internationally and at home challenges the conscience of the world. The United States must lead the way in meeting that challenge.

I will submit the rest of my statement for the record, but I commend once again the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for their leadership on this.

Ms. WATSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to speak today in support of the Lee-Leach amendment to dedicate resources to the fight against the global HIV/AIDS crisis. The scope and severity of this crisis are not just a global health challenge but one of economics as well. The crisis has been felt harshly by less de-

veloped countries, the very countries whose governments are least equipped to handle this scourge.

Critics of this amendment are concerned that it would reduce foreign military spending. But the global HIV/AIDS crisis poses as direct a threat to the security of many nations and the safety of their citizens as a more conventional military challenge would. The global fight against HIV/AIDS requires at least the same commitment that this Nation has made to training foreign militaries or fighting our war on drugs. If we do not take part in funding the research and the treatment, it could wipe out our forces, not only abroad but here in this country, too.

Let us shift our priorities. Let us train an army of doctors to fight the global HIV/AIDS crisis. Let us declare war on this dreaded disease. And, most importantly, let us vote for the Lee-Leach amendment which will take a strong first step at addressing the economic challenge of the global HIV/AIDS crisis.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of the Lee amendment. It is not a matter of debate that the HIV/AIDS crisis is devastating Africa. More than 25 million people in sub-Saharan Africa are living with HIV/AIDS. Nearly 4 million were infected during 2000 alone. AIDS has deprived children of their parents, robbed schools of their best teachers, and stripped businesses of their most able employees. It is devastating the military forces of many African countries, posing a serious threat to United States national security interests in the region, and AIDS will cut life expectancy in some African countries in half in the next decade. That is just Africa. HIV infections are growing exponentially in the Russian Federation, 3.7 million are already infected in India, and there is an emerging crisis in China.

HIV/AIDS is both a national security issue and a moral one. Our response must reflect the massive humanitarian and national security implications of the crisis. I am very pleased that this bill provides a total of \$474 million to address the HIV/AIDS crisis. I am also pleased that our subcommittee has established a pattern in recent years of providing increasingly higher funding levels for this purpose. But I do believe we can do more. Our efforts to address this pandemic must be bilateral and multilateral and must encompass everything from care and treatment to prevention and education. The United States through USAID has taken a leadership role in the fight against HIV/AIDS. We should play a similar role in multilateral efforts as well.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her amendment.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I commend my friends on both sides of the aisle who have brought to the attention of the House and the American people the pandemic problem of AIDS. I salute them in their efforts. Unfortunately, I believe that their efforts here may be well-intended, but in fact this amendment is somewhat misplaced.

Anyone who has held a dying African child in their arms, or witnessed someone suffering from AIDS, shares their well-intended compassion. I think this Congress has demonstrated, both in this bill and by the action of the Congress last week to increase the AIDS contribution by some 76 percent. I have held one of those dying African AIDS children in my arms. Unfortunately, at this time, to be honest, the only thing we can do is give them some comfort. Most of them will unfortunately die, and your heart does ache when you see the rows of graves across the African landscape and now across the horizon of many other countries.

The key to success in this area is research. We should be devoting our resources to research. I am pleased under the Republican Congress we have doubled the amount of money for medical research, and I think we are well targeted to finding a cure.

What we do not want to do here today in misguided compassion is to turn the clock back, though, on our efforts to stem illegal narcotics. This is a headline from my newspaper: Drug Deaths Top Homicides. For the first time, in 1999, drug-related deaths in this country exceeded homicides.

We knew that some years ago when we took over the House of Representatives as a new majority the seriousness of the threat we were facing with illegal narcotics. They made the same decision some time ago in the Clinton administration to start cutting some of these programs. On this chart is where the cuts started in 1993, the same kind of cut that is proposed here today. Unfortunately back then they started dismantling the Andean strategy and assistance. When this occurred we saw a skyrocketing of drug abuse in this country and drug deaths in this country. Only after we restarted this effort, and the chart here clearly points it out, have we made a dent in this problem.

Now would be the worst time to turn the clock back. Where is the heroin and the cocaine and the other drugs coming from that are killing our youth and our population in unprecedented numbers? They are coming from Colombia. That is why we targeted Colombia.

Does the plan work to stop illegal narcotics? With the Speaker and others involved in the subcommittee on drug efforts which the Speaker chaired before me, and we targeted the places where our drugs are coming from,

Peru, Bolivia and Colombia. Unfortunately, the Clinton administration cut assistance to Colombia; and we were able just recently to start that with Plan Colombia. But we see in Peru almost a complete eradication of cocaine production. In Bolivia, I can announce that our task is complete and accomplished with few dollars.

The problem we have in Colombia is that terrorism, which is killing thousands and thousands of people, is financed by illegal narcotics traffic. Colombia is now the source of deadly heroin. Look at this chart. In 1993, zero amount of heroin was produced there. Now, 75 percent of the heroin killing men and women and children in our streets comes from Colombia. That is why we are targeting this country.

This is not a pretty picture. This is one of my constituents. His mother gave me this picture to show the Members of the House. This young man was one of my constituents. He died of a heroin overdose. That heroin is coming from Colombia. It came from this route that we would now eliminate and destroy a program that we have started and that we have begun anew to curtail these deadly drugs from coming into our country.

What is worse about the drug epidemic, and we will hear more testimony about this in the coming weeks, is the heroin use and hard drug use is hitting our teens. It is hitting our minorities, but it is also hitting those most vulnerable in our society, our young people, both minority and others.

To make a mistake here with misplaced compassion, I urge my colleagues not to do it. Do not make that mistake. We can address both the problems of AIDS and we can also fight the war on illegal narcotics.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Lee-Leach Global AIDS Amendment for the Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill.

The HIV/AIDS pandemic is the most devastating human disaster our world has ever known, with more people having died from AIDS-related complications than any disease, war, or natural human disaster ever recorded. Since the beginning of the fight against HIV/AIDS in the early 80's, more than 22 million people have died, with Sub-Saharan Africa bearing the brunt of the devastation.

At the present time, more than 70 percent of the 35 million people infected with HIV live in Sub-Saharan Africa, with the nation of South Africa having the world's largest number of HIV infected individuals, more than 4 million people, living with AIDS.

My area of the world, the Caribbean, though much smaller in size and population, has an HIV infection rates second only to those in Africa. AIDS is already the leading cause of death in the Caribbean for those aged 15 to 45 and as in many other areas of the world, the number of cases is growing at an exponential rate according to the Caribbean Epidemiology Center.

I am alarmed, as I am sure we all are, by the fact that left un-addressed, more than 100 million people, well more than 1/3 the population of the United States, will be infected with HIV by the year 2005. Something must be done!

Although the loss of life presents the most tragic consequences of HIV/AIDS, additional consequences include resulting military, social, and economic instability. AIDS, unlike many diseases, takes those in the most productive years of life, resulting in a significant decline in the number of individuals in affected countries that are available to serve as educators, health care providers, and other skilled laborers.

In addition, it has resulted in more than 13 million orphans, 95 percent of whom live in African nations. As a result of the significant losses of life, some developing democracies have begun to recruit these orphans, many of whom have no completed adolescence, into armies used to fight regional wars.

Although we still wish it were more, the Lee-Leach Amendment provides the opportunity for the United States to do its part in the global fight against HIV/AIDS, increasing the U.S. contribution to the global HIV/AIDS funds by \$60 million to a total of \$160 million. Our contribution will be used to leverage additional funds from our international partners in the public and private sector, with the hope of raising the 10–15 billion dollars per year requested by United Nations.

It would send a strong signal that the United States is committed to eradicating HIV/AIDS from the face of the earth and also provide significant direct grant funding to African and Caribbean governments, NGO's and civil society in regions of the world that have been hard hit by HIV/AIDS so that we can finally begin to turn the tide of the disease.

I urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile amendment, which will help save the lives of millions of people infected with HIV.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bipartisan Lee-Leach amendment to increase the United States contribution the global HIV/AIDS fund \$100 million to \$160 million.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished Chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee Mr. KOLBE and the Ranking Democrat, NITA LOWEY for their hard work on this bill. I am grateful that they were able to find additional money for the bilateral HIV/AIDS program over the Administration request.

However, this amendment seeks additional funds for the Multilateral efforts. Mr. Chairman, a multilateral response to the global AIDS crisis is clearly the quickest mechanism to engage international donors and to initiate a coordinated international response to the global AIDS pandemic. World leaders including UN Secretary General Kofi Anan and international HIV/AIDS experts and economists have called for a 7–10 billion dollar fund in order to address HIV/AIDS prevention, education, care and treatment in Africa.

The global AIDS trust fund is designed to leverage significant contributions from the international community to fight this global killer. The Lee-Leach amendment would send a strong message that the United States is committed to eradicating HIV/AIDS from the face

of the earth. If the Lee-Leach amendment is passed, it would provide significant direct grant funding to African countries, NGO's and civil society in regions of the world that have been hard hit by HIV/AIDS to turn the tide of HIV/AIDS.

Furthermore, the Bush administration has briefed us that the trust fund is making strong progress and should be ready to disburse funds by the end of this year.

A few weeks ago, my committee, under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, HENRY HYDE, passed a bipartisan, groundbreaking bill authorizing \$750 million for a multilateral fund to combat HIV/AIDS.

So far, the Bush administration has offered \$200 million—100 million from Foreign Ops and 100 million from Health and Human Services.

While this was a good start, it is by no means a good end. I urge my colleagues to support an increase to this fund by supporting the Lee-Leach amendment.

I know it is not easy to cut other programs and I wish it were not necessary. However, the Administration, in all its wisdom, has decided that a 1.6 trillion dollar tax cut is more important than funding these global priorities.

Well, that being the case, we cannot afford to wait around until the Administration gets its priorities straight. We must act now.

The Global AIDS fight must be joined now. The consequences if we wait are too terrible to contemplate.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. The Lee-Leach amendment will increase the United States contribution to the global HIV/AIDS fund from \$100 million to \$160 million. This increase—albeit not enough to curb the pandemic, will be of enormous help in the short run because HIV/AIDS continues to devastate every corner of the globe. Mr. Chairman, it is incomprehensible to think that the increase called for in this amendment possibly cannot be adopted tonight because of the cynical few in this chamber who believe that Congress has more pressing needs right now than to further increase appropriations to control this epidemic. To them I say it is our duty and responsibility to not turn away now.

This year marks the 20th year since the Centers for Disease Control published its Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report with a small segment dedicated to a rare pneumocystis pneumonia present in five gay men in Los Angeles. It was the first published account of what we would come to know as Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, commonly known as AIDS.

Now, twenty years later, thirty-six million people presently live with HIV/AIDS worldwide and 22 million have died of the disease. In Sub-Saharan Africa, 25 million people are living with HIV/AIDS and in India, Southeast Asia and the Caribbean; the numbers of infections are rising at alarming rates.

Mr. Chairman, two-thirds of the world's 36 million AIDS victims live on the African continent—and women are the largest segment of victims and continue to be at the greatest risk.

This year, over six hundred thousand children will be born HIV-positive, or become infected after their birth and during

breastfeeding. Few will survive childhood. Equally disturbing is the fact that the disease threatens the health and well being of uninfected children by taking the lives of their parents. By the year 2010, over 42 million children worldwide will become orphans due to HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support the Lee-Leach Amendment to increase our contribution to the global HIV/AIDS fund from \$100 million to \$160 million. It will be a wise humanitarian and national security investment.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lee amendment to increase United States funds to fight the global HIV/AIDS pandemic and also in support of the McGovern amendment which will improve the health of mothers and children and combat the spread of infectious diseases around the world. I commend the authors and cosponsors of these amendments for bringing them before us today.

These two necessary and complementary amendments will enhance our efforts to help stop the spread of many terrible diseases, including polio, tuberculosis, and AIDS, and help children and their mothers around the world survive. The terrifying statistics about the HIV/AIDS pandemic, which is ravaging sub-Saharan Africa and threatens to do the same in many other regions around the world, are becoming all too familiar. Twenty-two million people world wide have died from AIDS, nearly double that number are living with HIV/AIDS, and if we don't take effective action 100 million people could be infected with HIV within the next four years. And a staggering number of orphaned children have been left by parents who have died because of AIDS.

But this pandemic is taking its toll not just in these personal terms. It is wreaking havoc on the economic and social fabric of many nations. In addition, this pandemic presents us with an international security problem as it fuels military instability, as well.

But we cannot allow the enormity of the problem to numb us or convince us that this pandemic is beyond our ability to fight it. Instead, the scope of what we face must serve as a siren calling us to take even stronger action than we have to date. I remain convinced that winning this battle is the moral imperative of our time. So let us marshal the resources we need and let us make sure we are using those resources wisely. We should pass these amendments to help us mount a comprehensive fight against HIV/AIDS and other deadly diseases.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 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. 27 offered by Mr. MCGOVERN:

Page 6, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

Page 7, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 7, line 5, after the second dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 25, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, let me begin by first thanking the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) for their incredible work on this bill.

Today, I rise to urge my colleagues to support this amendment that I and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) are offering together.

Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively simple amendment. First, it will add \$50 million to the infectious diseases account specifically for international tuberculosis programs. We need to invest more in programs that combat the spread of TB. Funding for international TB control was virtually nonexistent in 1997. While funding has modestly improved in recent years, we still have a long way to go to make up for the long-running neglect.

□ 1430

Current funding levels are not sufficient to address the scope of the disease and to protect the health of Americans. TB kills 2 million people each year, and more than one-third of the world's population is infected with TB. It is the leading killer of women and creates more orphan children than any other infectious disease. As the New York Times editorialized last week, a little money now can control this neglected killer before we face a global epidemic.

The amendment will also add \$50 million for the Child Survival and Maternal Health account. Eleven million children die every year from preventable causes. Child survival programs are critical to saving the lives of children and have been one of the most effective U.S. investments for the last decade and a half. The polio eradication programs in particular have been highly successful; and since 1998, polio has been reduced worldwide by 90 percent.

According to the World Health Organization, maternal health is the largest disparity between the developed and developing countries. Maternal mor-

tality is on average 18 times higher in developing countries, and children are much more likely to die within 2 years of a maternal death.

The increase funding provided by this amendment for these global health programs will literally make the difference between life and death for billions of people. This is a modest investment that will yield critical returns.

The offset for these programs will reduce the \$676 million Andean Counter-Drug Initiative by \$100 million in military aid for the Colombian Armed Forces. Here, too, the choice is simple. This House has a chance to send a straightforward message to the Colombian military: sever all ties with the paramilitary groups and sever them now. As my colleagues know, over 70 percent of the human rights crimes committed against the civilian population in Colombia, massacres, torture and the destruction of communities and the displacements of the population, are perpetrated by the paramilitaries, and the Colombian military works in collusion with those groups. In fact, just recently Amnesty International issued a report on the persistence of ties between the Colombian military and their paramilitary cohorts.

The last Congress, the previous administration, and, to date, the current administration, have failed, in my opinion, to act seriously about human rights in Colombia. We have attached human rights conditions to our aid package that are essentially meaningless. If the Colombian military behaves badly, and it has, we have been content to waive our conditions and to keep writing checks. What kind of message did this send?

Today, we have an opportunity to send a different message, to show that we do care about human rights, that we are serious when we demand that the Colombian military stop collaborating with paramilitary forces. Congress should not be an apologist for bad behavior. We should not look the other way or rationalize what continues to be a disturbing alliance that threatens the future of civilian institutions in Colombia.

Now, let me point out to my colleagues that nearly \$300 million remains in this bill to help Colombia and the Pastrana government with development, moving the peace process forward, strengthening civil and judicial institutions and supporting the police. In the defense appropriations bill, which we will debate later this year, there will be at least \$80 million for the Colombian Armed Forces. In addition, approximately \$158 million in military aid remains in the pipeline from last year's package.

This amendment is not about walking away from Colombia; rather, it is about saying very clearly that human rights do matter and that the way to

promote stability in the region is for the Colombian military to end its collaboration with paramilitaries.

Now, even if some of my colleagues are ambivalent about the Colombian offset, I hope you will not be ambivalent about supporting increased funding for these critical women's, children and health programs. The Andean Counter-Drug Initiative is \$226 million more than the amount in this bill for our worldwide programs to combat infectious diseases and for child survival and maternal health; \$226 million more.

This amendment is truly about choices, about priorities, about saving lives. I urge my colleagues to support the McGovern-Hoekstra-Pelosi-Morella-Jackson-Lee amendment.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the McGovern amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do rise in opposition to this amendment. I am reminded just a couple of days ago when we first took up this bill, last Thursday, that several Members came to the House floor to praise the bill. The manager on the other side of the aisle and I appreciated the compliments about bipartisanship and the balance that is reflected in the committee's recommendations. But approval of this amendment would weaken that hard-to-achieve bipartisanship. It would destroy the balance that is found in our bill. Let me explain why I think this is the case.

First, as a Member who comes from southern Arizona and represents a border State and a border district, I know the importance of Latin America to the United States. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts is also personally familiar with Latin America and parts of it. I am sure he does not intend to shortchange development in Latin America, but that is what this amendment would do.

Let me state a very simple fact: this amendment cuts development and humanitarian assistance for Latin America by \$50 million, or more than 10 percent of the amount in this bill. Let me repeat and elaborate on what I just said: the McGovern amendment cuts development assistance to Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador and Brazil. The McGovern amendment cuts human rights and humanitarian assistance to internally displaced persons in Colombia. Yes, it would also cut some military assistance for Colombia. Read the last part of the amendment; page 25, line 7: "After the dollar amount insert the following, reduce by \$100 million."

It does not read cut military assistance to Colombia by \$100 million; it does not exempt economic assistance for the Andean region, assistance for Peru or Bolivia or funding for the Colombian National Police. Now, I have seen a "Dear Colleague" letter that makes those claims. In fact, it says, "The amendment does not cut any eco-

nomics assistance for the Andean region, assistance for Peru, Bolivia or funding for the Colombian National Police." This is incorrect. This is not true. This is a misstatement. This is not a fact. It is not correct. It simply is wrong.

My conclusions reflect the text of the amendment that is before us. My assumption is that the executive branch will allocate reductions mandated by this amendment across all programs in the Andean Regional Initiative. It would be equally reasonable it assume that the executive branch would give priority to eradication and security assistance and make cuts in development and humanitarian assistance beyond what I assume.

It is not reasonable to assume, I think, that the executive branch under this, the previous President or any President, is going to take all the money out of the Colombian Army. So it is reasonable it assume this money is going to come out of economic assistance. As much as the gentleman from Massachusetts may wish that it would come all out of the military assistance, the amendment does not say that. So it is incorrect for us to assume that that would be the case. In fact, we can assume quite correctly that it would come out of all of those.

Of course, some support this amendment because they seek more funds to combat tuberculosis, and that is a noble cause. More deaths among women under 45 are caused by TB than by AIDS. It is the major immediate cause of death of those living with HIV-AIDS.

The question is how rapidly can the Agency for International Development and its cooperating organizations ramp up what had been a relatively small program for TB. Only 3 years ago, AID was spending less than \$15 million for TB. This year, we recommend \$70 million. That is an almost five-fold increase. It is difficult to implement that in the short-term.

This amendment would add another \$50 million to that, bringing it to \$120 million, or an eight-fold increase, 800 percent increase, over 4 years. Yes, the needs are there, but how quickly can we absorb that? How quickly can the infrastructure around the world absorb that?

I am reminded of the efforts of Queen Elizabeth I to cure her subjects of tuberculosis, of those people who were within the Queen's touch. In the 17th century, a form of glandular TB known as the King's Evil caused horrific swelling from infected glands in the neck. Eventually it led to death. So wherever Queen Elizabeth went around her kingdom, persons infected with this form of TB would crowd around her, hoping the royal touch would cure them. Some days she touched hundreds of people, and was exhausted by the effort.

I wish, I wish that the \$50 million here for tuberculosis could make the

difference hoped for by the sponsors of this amendment. However, like the royal touch of Queen Elizabeth, another \$50 million for tuberculosis may raise indeed our spirits and make us feel good, but it is not going to affect tuberculosis for the current year.

Unlike Queen Elizabeth's touch, however, this amendment will have adverse effects. It will cut development assistance in Latin America. It will signal to our neighbors that this country is disinterested in their security and in their development.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one point. The reason why our amendment does not specify military aid is because the amendment would have been ruled out of order. I am sure somebody on that side would have called a point of order against it. We would have been legislating on an appropriations bill.

Under the gentleman's argument, the entire \$676 million Andean counter-drug package could be utilized for military aid in Colombia. Our legislative intent is being made clear by this debate. We do not want \$100 million to go to the military of Colombia, because we are sick and tired of their continued collaborations with paramilitary groups.

The reason why we are moving this amendment forward, quite frankly, is because this Congress has not been clear, this administration, and, to be fair, the previous administration, has not been clear, about standing up for human rights. If we do not make it clear now by sending a strong signal to the military of Colombia that we want them to sever all ties with the paramilitaries now, then I do not know what we can do to make that case.

So that is what the intent of this amendment is, and that is why we did not specify the word "military" in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following in the RECORD:

[From Amnesty International, July 2001]
 COLOMBIA: MILITARY LINKS TO PARAMILITARY GROUPS PERSIST

In early 2001, Colombia's human rights crisis has continued to deepen against a background of a spiraling armed conflict. The parties to the conflict are intensifying their military actions throughout the country in campaigns characterized by gross and systematic violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. The principal victims of political violence continue to be civilians, in particular peasant farmers living in disputed areas, human rights defenders, journalists, judicial officials, teachers, trade unionists and leaders of Afro-Colombian and Indigenous communities. Violations of international humanitarian law by

armed opposition groups increased significantly in 2000. These groups deliberately and arbitrarily killed several hundred people, including judicial officials, local politicians and journalists. In 2000, more than 4,000 individuals were victims of political killings, over 300 "disappeared", and an estimated 300,000 civilians were internally displaced. Armed opposition groups and paramilitary organizations kidnapped at least 1,500 people.

Illegal paramilitary groups—operating with the tacit or active support of the Colombian armed forces—carry out the majority of Colombia's political killings, many through massacres of four or more people. In contrast to their declared aim to combat guerrilla forces, paramilitary groups continued to target the civilian population through massacres, torture, the destruction of communities and the displacement of the population. The government has taken little effective action to curtail, much less to end, widespread and systematic paramilitary atrocities, despite repeated promises to dismantle paramilitary forces. The armed forces have failed to attack or dismantle paramilitary bases, the majority of which are located in close proximity to army and police bases. Collusion between the Colombian security forces—particularly the army—and paramilitary groups continues and, indeed, strengthened in 2000. Instances of collaboration include the sharing of intelligence information, the transfer of prisoners, the provision of ammunition by the armed forces to the paramilitary, and joint patrols and military operations in which serious human rights violations are committed.

Given the Colombian security forces' poor human rights record and their on-going collaboration with illegal paramilitary groups, Amnesty International opposes military aid to Colombia. Our opposition will continue until concrete steps are taken to systematically address these issues. Until then, military aid will only contribute to a deteriorating human rights situation and could strengthen specific units which collaborate with paramilitary groups.

Amnesty International USA recommends that the House of Representatives pass an amendment to cut military aid to Colombia from the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill;

Congress include strong human rights conditions excluding a national security waiver on any aid approved for Colombia;

Congress and the Administration urge the Government of Colombia to sever ties between the Colombian military and illegal paramilitary groups, capture and prosecute paramilitary leaders, and dismantle paramilitary bases; and

Congress and the Administration urge the Colombian State to carry out all human rights investigations and trials under civilian jurisdiction, with the full cooperation of the security forces.

[From the New York Times, July 19, 2001]

THE TUBERCULOSIS THREAT

The London neighborhood of Newham is a good illustration of the perils of complacency about tuberculosis. That East End borough now has 108 cases of tuberculosis per 100,000 inhabitants—double that of India and on a par with Russia. Many of those sick are immigrants from Asia and Africa, a reminder that tuberculosis anywhere can mean tuberculosis everywhere. But Newham is also suffering because London needs to spend more on public health. There are not enough nurses and specialists in the worst-hit areas to control the disease.

The House of Representatives will consider funding for international tuberculosis programs as part of the foreign operations appropriations bill this week. The bill currently provides only \$70 million for global tuberculosis programs, just \$10 million more than last year. Far more is needed to stop the global resurgence of the disease, which kills two to three million people a year.

The task is urgent in part because of the rise of tuberculosis resistant to the usual antibiotics. Dr. Lee Reichman, director of the New Jersey Medical School's National Tuberculosis Center in Newark, gives a chilling account of the threat in his new book, "Timebomb," written with Janice Hopkins Tanne. The epicenter is Russia, where the prison system is churning out resistant tuberculosis, Dr. Reichman says. But resistant forms of the disease have been found in virtually every part of the United States. Unlike standard tuberculosis, which can cost as little as \$10 to cure, the resistant version costs upwards of \$20,000 to treat over several years, and some patients cannot be cured.

The other reason more people are dying of tuberculosis today than ever in history is AIDS. One-third of the people in the world are infected with bacillus that causes TB. Ninety percent, however, will never get the disease—unless their immune systems are compromised by AIDS. Forty percent of Africans with AIDS have tuberculosis, which is the leading killer of people with AIDS.

That suggests a simple and cheap way of prolonging the lives of millions of AIDS sufferers—cure their TB. Once their tuberculosis is gone, many AIDS patients will enjoy years more of relatively good health before they get another opportunistic infection.

Tuberculosis kills more people around the world each year than any other infectious disease and is more easily transmitted than AIDS. But unlike AIDS, most forms are easily curable. The World Health Organization has just created a global drug fund that will supply countries with an uninterrupted flow of medicine if they can use it properly. A little money now can control this neglected killer before we face a global epidemic of a version that has outrun our ability to treat it.

EXCERPTS FROM THE COLOMBIA SECTION, "2000 COUNTRY REPORTS ON HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES"—U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FEBRUARY 2001

Members of the security forces collaborated with paramilitary groups that committed abuses, in some instances allowing such groups to pass through roadblocks, sharing information, or providing them with supplies or ammunition. Despite increased government efforts to combat and capture members of paramilitary groups, often security forces failed to take action to prevent paramilitary attacks. Paramilitary forces find a ready support base within the military and police, as well as among local civilian elites in many areas.

Throughout the country, paramilitary groups killed, tortured, and threatened civilians suspected of sympathizing with guerrillas in an orchestrated campaign to terrorize them into fleeing their homes. . . . Paramilitary forces were responsible for an increasing number of massacres and other politically motivated killings. They also fought guerrillas for control of some lucrative coca-growing regions and engaged directly in narcotics production and trafficking. The AUC paramilitary umbrella organization, whose membership to-

taled approximately 8,150 armed combatants, exercised increasing influence during the year and fought to extend its presence through violence and intimidation into areas previously under guerrilla control while conducting selective killings of civilians it alleged collaborated with guerrillas. The AUC increasingly tried to depict itself as an autonomous organization with a political agenda, although in practice it remained a mercenary vigilante force, financed by criminal activities and sectors of society that are targeted by guerrillas.

Credible reports persisted of paramilitary installations and roadblocks near military bases; of contacts between paramilitary and military members; of paramilitary roadblocks unchallenged by military forces; and of military failure to respond to warnings of impending paramilitary massacres or selective killings. Military entities often cited lack of information or resources to explain this situation. Impunity for military personnel who collaborated with members of paramilitary groups remained common.

(Prepared by the Washington Office on Latin America, 202-797-2171. Emphases added)

UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS REPORT ON THE HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN COLOMBIA, MARCH 20, 2001

The paramilitary phenomenon continues to expand and consolidate. The government's commitment to confronting these groups has been weak and inconsistent. Evidence of this can be seen in the responses to the [UN High Commissioner for Human Rights] Office's communications with the authorities about imminent attacks or about the existence of bases, roadblocks and paramilitary movements. The instruments adopted by the Government to combat paramilitary groups have proven ineffective in containing their expansion and dismantling them. In other cases those instruments have not been applied. There is still great concern about the persistent links between public servants and members of paramilitary organizations, as well as the lack of punishment. (Paragraph 254)

The paramilitary groups continue to be the principal perpetrators of collective killings. The Ministry of Defense reports that paramilitary groups are responsible for 75 massacres, which is 76% of all massacres committed between January and October. The practice of collective killings of defenseless civilians is their principal method of operation and war strategy. (Paragraph 88)

The fact that some of the military personnel dismissed this year have joined the paramilitary groups a few days after their removal from active service is an additional cause for deep concern and serious reflection. . . . There is a well-known paramilitary roadblock at the entrance of the village of El Placer, just fifteen minutes from a battalion of the Army's 24th Brigade. The roadblock continued to operate eight months after the Office reported directly observing it. The military authorities denied in writing the existence of this paramilitary post. The Office also observed ongoing paramilitary operations at the "Villa Sandra" ranch, between Puerto Asis and Santa Ana. Putumayo, a few minutes away from the Army's 24th Brigade. Later there was a report of two raids by the public forces, though they apparently did not produce any results. The existence and operation of the paramilitary base is public knowledge. In fact, international journalists repeatedly visited the base and published interviews with the paramilitary commander. (Paragraph 134)

The Ministry of Defense has not made public the total number of internally displaced people registered during the year, but according to numbers published by the Ministry, between January and June 2000, 71% of displacement was presumably caused by paramilitary groups. 14% by guerrilla groups, 15% by combined guerrilla and paramilitary actions, and 0.04% by armed agents of the State. (Paragraph 141)

(Unofficial translation prepared by the Washington Office on Latin America, 202-797-2171. Emphases added.)

Mr. TIERNEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), as well as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for their leadership and hard work on this issue. Would that we could legislate on this, because certainly we would move in the direction that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) has set forth.

I am pleased to support this important amendment. It is important to the millions of people who die from tuberculosis each year; it is important to the mothers in developing countries who have maternal mortality rates 18 times that of people in developed countries; and, Mr. Chairman, it is important to the people of Colombia who live in fear because our past efforts have failed them.

Last year, the Congress agreed to a \$1.3 billion supplemental appropriation for a 2-year package for Colombia and surrounding countries. Now, between this appropriation and the defense appropriation, we are being asked for another \$1 billion.

Last year we were told that our taxpayer dollars would be used to increase protection for human rights, expand the rule of law, and promote the peace process in Colombia. We were told it would be used to eradicate coca crops across Colombia. We were told it would be used to promote alternative crops and jobs in Colombia. That is what we were told.

After close examination of the evidence, we simply have to ask, where did the money go? The human rights situation in Colombia has gotten worse, the peace process is no closer than it was, and many of the crops eradicated were actually food crops. And now we are being asked to buy the same set of broken promises as last year, and this is not progress.

We all know that the Colombian military has close ties with the paramilitary organizations responsible for large scale massacres of civilians. Our own State Department has documented that the Colombian Armed Forces aid paramilitaries by providing them with intelligence, supplies, ammunition, and that they often fail to protect civilians from attacks.

The military funding we give in the hopes of helping the Colombian people

is, to some degree, having the opposite effect. In the first 18 days of this year, 170 people were killed in 26 massacres. Data shows that as of April, deaths due to political violence roughly doubled those from previous years. These are innocent people trying to make Colombia a safer and more prosperous place, like Cristobol Uribe Beltran of the Association of Workers and Employees in Hospitals, Clinics and Organizations, who was kidnapped on June 27th and assassinated the very next day, innocent lives brought to an end for no legitimate reason. This is not progress.

We have seen the human rights abuses in Colombia continue to escalate since last year's aid package. More than 300,000 people were forcibly displaced from their home by political violence. There continues to be hostage-taking, torture, killing of civilians. Our aid is being used against people who have been mislabeled as guerrillas and are often students, professors and priests. They are taken captive by the paramilitaries and oftentimes never heard from or seen again. Our aid has been used to destroy food crops and put harmful herbicides in the rivers and ponds in Colombian villages. It has displaced people from their land and homes and forced them to relocate, and this is not progress.

We need to take a hard look at the situation we are dealing with in Colombia and make the sound judgment that our military aid efforts are simply not working. The aid we are providing is being misplaced, and I believe there is a role for the United States to play in this situation that is entirely different.

We can provide resources to build infrastructure, so crops can get to markets profitably; we can provide assistance to help build a court system to the point where it is effective, fair and respected; or we can build schools and roads and community support; or we can build a competent, efficient, respected police force and a military force that does not favor the paramilitaries or ignore paramilitary atrocities.

□ 1445

With all of these options at our disposal, we are being asked to choose the one we know will not work because it has not worked in the past.

This amendment recognizes that act and, instead, diverts some of this money from this wasteful program to one that saves lives. That is the intent of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, we ask that this money be used for tuberculosis aid and not for military purposes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, Congress's record in handling this issue is a sorry one indeed, and I think it institutionally ought to be ashamed of itself for its

total lack of guts in defending our obligations under the Constitution and our prerogatives under the Constitution. Basically, we are engaged in a war a long ways away in Colombia, rather than engaging in that war on our own streets here at home. We cannot do much about that today under the rules under which we are being forced to debate this bill.

But I want to be very blunt about what I think is happening. We are right now engaged in this war, even though this Congress never had an intelligent, thoughtful debate through the normal processes of this House. We are not operating under an authorization produced by the authorizing committee. We are operating under a political compromise fashioned by the former President of the United States, Bill Clinton, and the present Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), and rammed through this House on both sides of the aisle with no real ability of the authorizing committee to effect in any way the outcome.

With all due respect to the Committee on Appropriations on which I have served for over 30 years, that is not the job of the Committee on Appropriations. The job of the Committee on Appropriations is to fund programs previously authorized, and certainly it is not the job of the Committee on Appropriations to get this country in a position where we could inadvertently be sucked into a conflict that could keep us there for years.

The question is not whether we like the rebels in Colombia and the question is not whether we like the President of Colombia; the question is whether or not we believe that that society, as presently constituted and constructed and organized, has the ability to make what we are doing in this program work and, in my view, based on long observations of that society, I do not believe that that is the case.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote something said by Jim Hoagland, who I think can accurately be described as a moderate conservative columnist in The Washington Post. This is what he wrote a year ago. "In Colombia, the United States pursues unattainable goals, largely for domestic political reasons with inappropriate tools." Then he says, "Now in the rush to the quagmire, we see the following:" and then he goes on to talk about what happens when it becomes clear that in the considered judgment of the U.S., air force officers in the Colombian military will not be able to maintain the Blackhawks under the conditions in which they will be flying has shown to be correct. He asked what will happen then. Then he simply goes on to make the point that the Congress is slipping us into this war little by little the way that Kennedy and Johnson did in Vietnam, and we all know what the

disastrous results were of that operation.

I am also frankly mystified by the views of our new Drug Czar, John Walters. Walters was quoted a year ago as attacking the idea that we ought to focus on drug treatment. When he was discussing the value of that idea he said this: "This is an ineffectual policy, the latest manifestation of the liberals' commitment to a 'therapeutic state' in which government serves as the agent of personal rehabilitation."

I find that comment to be condescending and arrogant and, most of all, misguided. The fact is that if we take a look at the research done by SAMHSA, the agency charged with knowing what we are doing on drug treatment and rehabilitation, if we take a look at studies done by RAND, financed, in part, by the U.S. Army, they estimate that a dollar spent on treatment here at home is 23 times as effective as fighting a war or trying to interdict drugs internationally.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am for doing both, but I am not for spending over \$1 billion last year and almost that amount this year over 1,000 miles away from home when we still have drug addict after drug addict roaming the streets of our cities untreated and unable to get into the drug treatment programs that we have provided in this country, simply because this Congress is too misguided and does not provide the money.

It seems to me that this amendment is a token effort at what we ought to do on this program, and I, for one, intend to support it. I have no illusion that it is going to pass, but it is what we ought to do and, most of all, this Congress ought to have a full-blown, detailed debate on this issue after we have had briefings from the administration and others so that we know what the facts are on the ground and we are operating on the basis of facts, not ideology, or operating on the basis of substance, not politics. I think the leadership of both parties has been disgracefully negligent in getting us to drift into this war without any real thought about what the outcome is going to be.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. The Andean regional initiative in the bill is already \$55 million below the President's request. At the same time, this bill has already provided \$1.39 billion for child survival and disease programs, which has significantly increased.

Let us talk about health programs in particular. I want to talk about the

public health effects of illegal drugs in the United States. The cocaine and heroin which comes to the United States from the Andean region, and almost all of our cocaine and heroin comes from the Andean region, seriously impact our hospital emergency departments. Heroin visits are rising and cocaine visits are holding steady. In 1999, more than half a million drug-related emergency room visits were reported, over 196,000 related to Andean cocaine and over 84,000 in American hospitals related to Andean heroin. Every year, our Nation spends \$12.9 billion to cover the health costs of illegal drugs, which have predominantly come in from the Andean region.

I support the bill's generous funding level for international health programs. I believe it is extremely ill-advised to further increase this spending at the expense of a significant portion of our international narcotics control program, which is fundamentally designed to protect the health of American citizens by keeping illegal drugs out of the United States. These programs account for just 5 percent of our overall drug budget. In fact, the \$100 million at stake in this amendment is 11 percent of the entire U.S. budget for international narcotics control. We cannot and should not trade the health of American citizens simply to make a political statement.

Now, I would like to respond to a number of false allegations that have occurred regarding what is going on in Colombia. Colombia is not Vietnam. It is a longtime democracy. It is one of the oldest democracies in this hemisphere. Vietnam was not.

The Colombians themselves are fighting and dying. They are not fighting and dying because of their political problems, they are fighting and dying because of our narcotics addictions in the United States. This is not a civil war, this is a war funded, whether they be the ultra-rightist groups or whether they be the FARC, whether they be the ELN, through narco-protection and narco-dollars. We have caused their conflict. We have moral obligations to help them address their conflicts. They have had the equivalent of 30,000 American police officers killed in the line of combat trying to eradicate drugs that are being grown for our neighborhoods and our streets. It is not like Vietnam. It is a country that was a democracy where now, people have fled because they are kidnapped, because they are terrorized, because of our addictions. We are not engaged in a war in Colombia. We are trying to assist them fight a war that was driven by us.

Furthermore, we heard about the peace process in Colombia. President Pastrana, whether we agreed with it or not, and I had some reservations, he gave a demilitarized zone. He bent over backwards to work with the FARC. What he got was slapped in the face. He

turned his other cheek. They continued to grow drugs and they expanded their operations, and what he got when he turned his cheek was they slapped him in the face. The failure of the peace process is not with the Colombian government. They have turned their cheek and turned their cheek and turned their cheek.

We have also heard that many crops were eradicated that were food crops. That is simply a false allegation on fumigation, and I am sure we are going to debate that further today.

Furthermore, there have been smears on the Colombian military. We have worked to improve the human rights division. A number of us on the Republican side have been criticized in the past for being too oriented towards the Colombian National Police which had a great human rights record. With the last administration and with the support of the House, we expanded our aid to the military in return for commitments on human rights. It is not an easy process, as we have tried to educate other countries where we provide military aid around the world in addition to our military when they are overseas and our police forces, so occasionally there are human rights violations.

It has not been proven that they have gotten worse, nor is it proven that they have ties to the ultra-rightists in that country and where there are, we ought to rout them out. That is why some of us have been more oriented towards giving the money to the Colombian national police rather than the military. Their elected government in Colombia asked us for help for their military, rather than just the Colombian national police. We responded to an elected government unlike Vietnam, and then we get criticized because some of the funds went to the military.

Furthermore, some of the blame in Colombia being placed on the government or on our anti-narcotics efforts is like blaming police officers for the fact that crime has increased. It is like blaming judges and the citizens for the fact that terrorism has increased. What they have is a rampant problem in their country that is indeed threatening democracy, and what we seem to want to do at times is stick our head in the sand and say, well, this does not have anything to do with us. In 1992 to 1994 this House, along with the newly elected President, cut the interdiction budget. What we saw was a supply coming into America soar. We saw the prices on the street drop. We saw the purities come up. To get back to where we were in 1992, we would have to have a 50 percent reduction in drug abuse in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SOUDER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, it is critical, not because of what is happening in Colombia, but because 67 to 80 percent of all the crime in every Member's district is drug-related. We should not cut back our efforts when we know where the coca is being grown; we know where the heroin poppy is being grown. When it spreads into the oceans and then crosses our borders, from the Canadian border, the Mexican border, the East and West Coast and starts to moving into our streets, it becomes more expensive to find it, it becomes more expensive to treat it, it becomes more expensive to lock people up, than if we can help the Colombians and the Peruvians and the Equadorians and the Bolivians fight the battle in their homelands.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the McGovern amendment; and I commend the gentleman for his leadership in bringing it to the floor. I want to follow up on some of the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member, on the need for us to have this debate.

We are talking about, between last year and this year, a \$2 billion expenditure on this initiative that has seen very little light of day in terms of what it contains and what its effectiveness is. What the McGovern amendment would do is to take \$100 million from that funding for the Andean initiative and spend it on child survival and maternal health and to fight infectious diseases, polio tuberculosis and malaria.

□ 1500

Where that money would come from is a line in the bill that simply says, "for necessary expenses to carry out section 480 of the Foreign Assistance Act solely to support counterdrug activities in the Andean region of South America, \$676 million, to remain available until expended." It does not say anything about economic assistance, human rights, humanitarian assistance, or anything like that. It says, "\$676 million."

We would have liked for this amendment to be a match for the one I offered in committee, where we could say that the \$100 million came from the military assistance, but the Committee on Rules would not have put that in order.

So in responding to the comment of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) that it takes from these other areas, no, it does not. The goal is to take it from the military assistance. If the administration chooses to take it from humanitarian and economic assistance, that is the choice of the administration. It is not the wish of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr.

McGOVERN) or the cosponsors of his amendment.

Why is this important? The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said earlier that the Rand organization presented a report that said that treatment on demand in the United States is 23 times more effective than eradication of the coca leaf in the country of origin. Think of it. It is estimated to cost about \$32 million to reduce demand in the United States 1 percent by treatment on demand.

If instead we try to reduce demand 1 percent in the United States by eradication of the coca leaf in Latin America, it will cost over \$700 million. Do the math. That is 1 percent for a 1 percent reduction.

In our country, there are about 5½ million substance abusers. About 2 million of them receive treatment, and 3½ million do not. Why are we not spending the money, which is 23 times more effective, on treatment on demand to reduce demand in our country, rather than sending all of this money, to the tune of \$2 billion, and it will grow next year, for a policy that has been ineffective?

I am very respectful of President Pastrana and his good intentions and hard work and, again, in recognition of the fine work that my colleagues, the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member, have done on this bill, but this part of the bill must be debated more fully and the Andean Initiative must be reduced.

What does the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) spend the money on? He spends it on tuberculosis. Few diseases are as devastating and widespread as TB. TB kills 2 million people each year and is only second to AIDS as the biggest infectious killer of adults in the world.

Although there is a very cost-effective cure for this disease, only one in five who are sick receive adequate treatment. The good news is that effective treatment does exist. It is called DOTS, the Directly-Observed Treatment Short course, and it is effective. It costs between \$20 to \$100 to save a life.

According to the international TB experts, a worldwide investment of \$1 billion is needed to make DOTS available to all of those ill with TB, and an appropriate U.S. share would be \$200 million. The money would go to the foreign operations bill, to increase its funding for polio eradication.

While the bill has \$25 million in it, Rotary International, which has been a leader in the eradication of polio, says we need a minimum of \$30 million for that eradication. We are in a race to reach every last child with polio. We can do it.

We need the resources to do so. It seems to me that is money much better

spent than in the unknown, slow-to-come, trickling-through-the-pipeline humanitarian or economic assistance that was promised to Colombia but where they have seen more on the military side and hardly anything on the humanitarian and economic side.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to follow the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN) and all the other makers in this amendment. I have failed in the subcommittee and in the full committee, but I am more hopeful on the floor of the House that if we want to reduce demand of drugs in the United States, we will do it in a cost-effective way.

If the burden of proof of this is, have we helped the Colombian people and reduced drugs in the U.S., we have failed on both counts. Support the McGovern amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, lest our friends on the other side of the aisle forget that the Plan Colombia concept was a Clinton administration proposal to help save Colombia from becoming a failed narco-state on the Clinton watch, we need to stay the course. We have not even delivered most of the equipment we promised to Plan Colombia, the helicopters that were provided for. In fact, they just started arriving this month. So how can we attest to the fact that this is a failure? It has not even started in full. Let us be fair and accurate in this debate.

With what we in the Congress previously gave to the Colombian National Police ahead of Plan Colombia, their antidrug units are already about to totally eliminate opium this year, the source of more than 70 percent of the heroin coming to the United States. We also eradicated 30,000 hectares of coca in southern Colombia with Plan Colombia, all since mid-December of 2000, far ahead of schedule.

All the above was accomplished in the year 2000 by the anti-narcotics police without one credible allegation of human rights abuse against its anti-drug units. In April, 2000, the Institute for Defense Analysis, the IDA, reports that our efforts with the anti-narcotics police in Colombia, both in eradication as well as hitting labs and breaking up major trafficking organizations, have produced the lowest purity and the highest prices here for cocaine since early 1985, the lowest purity and the highest prices since 1985.

This low purity and high prices for cocaine in 15 years here at home means less and less young people are going to become addicted to cocaine, and they will not require the expensive treatment and incarceration in our Nation.

So I repeat, Mr. Chairman, less and less American kids are going to be addicted to cocaine because of what we

are doing under Plan Colombia today, despite the uninformed critics, who offer no real workable alternatives.

So let us stay the course. Fighting drugs at their source is still the best and most cost-effective way, before they arrive on our shorelines, destroying our young people, increasing crime in our communities, and producing even more costs in treatment and incarceration.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to defeat the McGovern amendment and make certain that we are not going to surrender in this war on drugs.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the McGovern, Hoekstra, Pelosi, Morella, Jackson-Lee amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if I might have the attention of the House, this is an important debate because I think the American people are trying to understand just where the tension is between those of us who are interested in maternal-child health and immunization and the opponents of the bill.

First of all, let me say, Mr. Chairman, that just a couple of days ago the White House had Youth Day on Saturday, opening up the White House to thousands of youth who came to the United States Capitol, including Boy Scouts, who many of us see walking throughout the Capitol, who are here for the Jamboree to be held in Virginia.

I mention that because we in America are interested in promoting healthy children. Therefore, we have emphasized in preventative health millions of dollars to immunize our children. With that in mind, this is what this legislation is about. It is the capability worldwide to ensure that there are healthy children and healthy mothers, to ensure that there is prenatal care as it relates to nutrition, and to ensure that there is immunization.

Let me juxtapose those needs of saving lives of children, of providing the nutritional needs through the foreign operations bill, to what this amendment does. This amendment takes only \$100 million out of a \$2 billion pot.

This does not label those of us who support this amendment as antidrug enforcement or not understanding the drug issue. What we do understand is that America has been fighting drugs in Mexico and in Colombia and places throughout the world without a lot of success. We realize that we have not placed as much emphasis on treatment and bringing down the desire.

This is all about supply. I heard a good friend and colleague mention that we are trying to take money out of police operations and other operations as it relates to drug enforcement. That is absolutely a misinterpretation of our amendment. All we are doing is taking \$100 million, which may be taken out of

the foreign military aspect of this drug effort, out of a \$2 billion line item.

So, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize what we have been able to accomplish with assistance on the idea of child nutrition.

If a child is not killed by measles, it may cause blindness, malnutrition, deafness or pneumonia. It is possible to save millions of children per year just by increasing immunization rates from 75 percent to 90 percent and by assuring access to essential nutrients, such as vitamin A, which increase resistance to disease and infection.

In developing nations we are finding that children are dying of the normal childhood diseases which here in America children do get but they survive because of immunization. Annually, immunizations avert 2 million childhood deaths from measles, neonatal tetanus, and whooping coughs, which if we travel to the developing nations we will find those diseases devastating to children.

The success of these programs in the world's poorest regions is even more striking when one considers that the vaccination rate in the United States only reached 78 percent, 78 percent in 1998. Unfortunately, immunization rates are not improving everywhere. Coverage in sub-Saharan Africa has decreased. Thirty percent of children still do not receive their routine vaccinations, and 30 million infants; and measles infection rates have improved in the last 10 years, but there are still 30 million cases of measles.

We must reduce hunger and malnutrition, which contributes to over one-half of the childhood deaths throughout the world. We can do so through these child and maternal health programs. Almost 150 million children are malnourished. We have watched the stories in Sudan, in Ethiopia, in other war-torn countries.

I believe the most important aspect of this debate is for us not to be considering that we are killing the drug enforcement program in parts around the world, including Colombia. That is not the case. We are asking for a small, minute number of dollars to be able to save millions and millions of children.

I believe this is a fight worthy of its name. I am delighted to be on this amendment. I have an amendment that I had intended to offer, but I believe this debate is so important that we need to focus on the juxtaposing of what we are standing for here today, saving lives, as opposed to the depleting of a \$2 billion pot.

Mr. Chairman, I am a cosponsor of this amendment. I ask support for this amendment. I will consider whether or not I will withdraw my amendment that will come subsequently. This is an important issue.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the McGovern-Hoekstra-Pelosi-Morella-Jackson-Lee global health amendment to H.R. 2506, the fiscal year 2002 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill.

I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), for taking the lead in bringing this important amendment to the House floor.

What the amendment does is it shifts \$100 million from military aid, and this is the intent, to Colombia to the Child Survival and Health Programs Fund. It would add \$50 million for child survival and maternal health programs that improve maternal and child health and nutrition, reduce infant and child mortality, and support polio eradication programs.

Additionally, this amendment would add \$50 million for infectious disease, and that is specifically for international tuberculosis programs. While TB overall is on the decline in this country, it continues unabated globally. An estimated 8 million people worldwide develop active TB each year. There are 2 million TB-related deaths worldwide each year, and TB causes more deaths among women worldwide than all cases of maternal mortality combined.

TB is the leading cause of death among people who are HIV-infected, accounting for one-third of AIDS deaths worldwide. The global TB epidemic could impact declines that have been made in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible to control TB in the United States until we control it internationally. According to experts, an additional \$1 billion is needed to adequately address this killer. The United States must take a leadership role in supporting and substantially increasing spending programs to eliminate the spread of TB worldwide. Passage of this amendment would translate into \$120 million for international TB eradication efforts for fiscal year 2002.

Equally as important is increased funding for the child survival and maternal health programs. Each year, more than 10 million children die before reaching their fifth birthday due to preventable infectious diseases such as pneumonia, measles, and diarrhea.

□ 1515

Nearly 500,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes each year; and every minute around the world 380 women become pregnant, 110 women experience pregnancy-related complications, and one woman dies.

Mr. Chairman, the \$100 million this amendment seeks to shift is offset strictly by military aid to the Colombian Armed Forces. I want to emphasize the fact that it does not, despite what we have heard, it does not touch any police aid, which would be \$152 million, and it certainly does not touch

any of the \$146 million for social and economic investment in Colombia. Neither does it affect the remaining \$277 million of the military economic or development aid for Peru, Bolivia, Ecuador, or Venezuela that is contained within the \$676 million Andean Counterdrug Initiative.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should pass by voice vote on its merits alone. However, if there is a recorded vote, I urge passage of the McGovern-Hoekstra - Pelosi - Morella - Jackson-Lee global health amendment.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, much is in dispute about this whole issue of what to do in Colombia, but I do not think anyone can dispute that there is no visible evidence that the human rights situation in Colombia has improved since Congress approved last year's mostly military aid package, and I think that should indicate to us that we ought to think about what we are doing.

With the indulgence of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), I had an opportunity to visit Colombia about 4 months ago with a number of Members of this body, and we had an opportunity to talk with a number of different people in the government in Bogota, but then also visited as much as we could in the short period of time on the front lines of the areas in the Colombian civil war, particularly in Putumayo Province, and a couple of other provinces in the south of the country.

Now, I believe that President Pastrana and the defense minister are genuinely looking for an acceptable way to end this long conflict. Some elements of the military certainly are in collaboration with the right-wing paramilitaries, and I suspect doing so in defiance of President Pastrana. I really do not believe that he is in any way encouraging them. In fact, the tensions are clearly obvious within the military in Colombia, from what I could see of the visit. The Department of Defense has discharged whole units where there is evidence of collaboration; and that, of course, is part of the tension.

But I think that our heavy use of military aid to the suspect Colombian military drives the United States' policy into the pattern of the El Salvador example from a decade and more ago, a period of time when year after year we were spending on an average of \$400 million or more year to the Salvadoran military, which was directly involved in the worst civil and human rights abuses in El Salvador, including the infamous killing of Catholic nuns, who, of course, were in sympathy with the plight of the Salvadoran people.

Now, in my view, the Salvadoran example provides some example for the sides in Colombia to use. Ten years

ago, the two sides in the civil war in El Salvador realized that they were simply killing the very best young people from both sides and that it was disastrous for everyone there, and so they sat down together to create a new future for El Salvador. And a version of that, it seems to me, is the way that this craziness in Colombia has got to end.

I think the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) provides a message. It would send a message that the purely military solution, in this case in Colombia, is a dead-end solution for Colombia and that it is really time to try something else.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the subcommittee, suggested, or pointed out, that this message is a blunt message; and it is, because it cuts \$100 from the \$676 million assigned for the Andean Counterdrug Initiative. But the administration can take that money from the military side, from the military side in Colombia, not from the civil police, not from economic aid there or in the other nations of Ecuador and Peru and Brazil, if that is where it is otherwise intended to go.

There must be a better way to do this. It is time to try something else than the failing effort to impose a purely military solution on the long-standing, nearly 30-year civil war that is going on in Colombia. Therefore, with a slight bit of ambivalence, I started here ambivalently, therefore I am supporting and commending the gentlemen from Massachusetts and Michigan for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant opposition to this amendment, but I do want to salute the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for his work on behalf of Mr. Moakley's long work in support of human rights in El Salvador and in support of human rights in Colombia; but I reluctantly oppose this amendment.

Recently, I accompanied the Waukegan Police Department on a raid of a crack house. There we found the crack addicts in the basement, but then I found that this was actually a home with three little bitty babies in it and a 12-year-old smoking crack cocaine. We cannot surrender the drug war. We need to make sure that we protect those who cannot protect themselves.

But there are two purposes of the drug war. The first purpose of a U.S. drug war is to reduce the narcotics flow into the United States, and on that we have not done well. But there is a second purpose; and that second purpose, Mr. Chairman, is to prevent narcogovernments from taking power.

We saw it once already in our history when the government of Panama fell and a narcogovernment took control there.

Manuel Noriega turned the Immigration Ministry in Panama into an enormous drug lab. And two things happen once a narcogovernment takes control: first, economies of scale; and, secondly, research and development. The research and development in the narcotics industry created crack cocaine, a \$5 single hit, that was an enormous boost to the illegal drug industry. And we cannot let that happen in Colombia.

The United States has an important and positive role to play in supporting civil society in Colombia. Colombia, our neighbor, is in the middle of a nationwide crisis which threatens the entire region, and they have asked for our help. So the question is not should we become engaged, but how we should become engaged and to what end. Had this amendment redirected funds to support civil society in Colombia, especially judicial reform, I would have strongly supported it. However, simply pulling support from Colombia and its fight against drugs and its fight against narcoterrorism is not the solution.

I believe it is vitally important to support Colombian institutions that are working in an effective fashion to bring criminals to justice, whether these criminals wear the uniform of rebels who profit from drug trafficking or are right-wing paramilitaries who fill their war chests with cash culled from the same dirty source. I would even mention that some of these lawbreakers wear the Colombian uniform of the armed services and support illegal activities of paramilitary groups that are responsible for most human rights violations in Colombia.

But I would note that all aid under this bill passes through the Leahy amendment, vetting people to ensure respect for human rights. There are institutions in Colombia that do a truly exceptional job fighting injustices engulfing the country; and among them is the attorney general, known as the Fiscalia, and the Colombian National Police. Most of the recent high-level captures of paramilitary leaders and rebel chieftains are the result of the dedicated work of the attorney general's office, where hundreds of prosecutors are working against tremendous odds to transform the written word of Colombia's laws into real-life consequences for criminals.

For instance, it is the attorney general's office that has done the painstaking investigations that have resulted in arrest warrants for top paramilitary leaders recently. They hit at the heart of the paramilitary structure, their drug profits; and they need our help. For their part, the leadership of the Colombian National Police has literally turned an institution around

over the past decade, from one stained by human rights violations into a professional force. They have done what so far the Colombian military has not, sending a clear and pointed message that rank-and-file human rights violators will not be tolerated.

Since 1994, when General Jose Serrano took over, over 11,000 officers have been dismissed for crimes that vary from corruption to extrajudicial execution. In their place are officers who know their first duty is to obey the laws themselves before they bring criminals to justice. General Gilibert continues to uphold this tradition and needs our support to continue to enforce the law, particularly in regards to human rights.

Mr. Chairman, we should not surrender Colombia to drug lords of the right or the left. Defeat in this instance of civil society would mean at least 10 percent of Colombia would attempt to move to the United States. I would hope in the future we could work together in a bipartisan fashion to craft an aid package that supports the Democrat center, civil society, prosecutors, police officers, judges to create a Democrat forum in Colombia where we could win the war against the tyranny of the right or left.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out one thing. First of all, this bill contains \$152 million of police aid. There is \$72 million in police aid from last year that is still in the pipeline. Nobody here is advocating that we surrender. What we are saying is send a signal to the military that we want them to sever ties with the paramilitary. That is what this is about.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make clear a couple of points here. First of all, we are not abandoning Colombia. This foreign aid package still includes \$299 million in aid for Colombia for alternative development, the police, and judicial reform. It includes another \$276 million in economic and security assistance for the other countries in the Andean region. It does not affect any of the military aid that will be coming before us in the defense appropriations bill.

We are emphasizing the funding in our amendment that supports peace, development and an end to poverty that leads to drug cultivation. We are eliminating funding that further militarizes the conflict. That is the purpose of our amendment. We are eliminating the aid for a strategy in southern Co-

lombia that has failed in every country where it has been tried and which is opposed by all 13 mayors of Putumayo and all six governors of southern states of Colombia.

What we are trying to do is send a strong, clear signal at last that the Colombian military must cut its ties to the paramilitaries. My concern, and the concern of a lot of us who are supporting this amendment, has been that we talk the talk when it comes to human rights but we do not walk the walk. We put in language in our Colombia aid package, conditionality language on human rights; and yet when the Colombian military does not abide by those guidelines, we simply waive those guidelines. That is the wrong signal to send.

I do not know how continuing to support a military, continuing to send a signal that we are going to turn a blind eye to human rights violations does anything to deal effectively with the drug problem in our country or deal with illegal growth of coca plants in Colombia, or deal with strengthening civilian institutions. The fact of the matter is, continuing to support the Colombian military without insisting they abide by human rights criteria, I think sends the wrong signal and it adds instability, not stability, to the region.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern amendment to shift the \$100 million from aid to Colombia's military to global health programs.

Since Plan Colombia began last year, the human rights situation has worsened. There are reports of atrocities both by right-wing paramilitary groups and left-wing guerrillas.

□ 1530

The AUC paramilitary group has gone on a bloody rampage across Colombia, massacring hundreds of civilians.

In the Naya River Valley and other places throughout Colombia, the military has failed to take sufficient steps to prevent paramilitary massacres, despite ample public warnings about the attacks.

Our own State Department has documented the ongoing links between the Colombia military and the paramilitaries. According to the State Department, impunity for military personnel who collaborate with members of paramilitary groups is all too common.

Mr. Chairman, we have a great opportunity on the floor of the House. We have an opportunity to cut \$100 million out of \$2 billion, but \$100 million which will, on the one hand, curb human rights abuses and, on the other hand, take that \$100 million and spend it on maternal health and on polio and on tuberculosis control.

When we look at what the world has done in the last 20 years when we have

the resources, it is clear that \$100 million can be spent very, very well. In one state in India a couple years ago because of government and public health authorities involvement in a tuberculosis pilot project, they reduced the death rate by 94 percent from tuberculosis in that one state in India.

Polio was eradicated in the Western Hemisphere in 1991. The last case was in Peru because of government health authorities and NGOs and others making that commitment. Since then we have almost eradicated polio around the world and should have eradicated it by 2005.

In one day in 1999, in the country of India, where NGOs from around the world and public health authorities from around the world and the government of India concentrated on vaccinations that day and immunized, in one day in India in December, 1999, 134 million children.

The point, Mr. Chairman, is when we use these public health resources well, we can make a big difference. The McGovern amendment does that. It is a small but important step in our efforts to eradicate infectious disease, to curb human rights abuses and to make this world a more healthy place.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite numbers of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for allowing me to work with him on this amendment.

Regrettably, I come to the floor to talk about this issue on an appropriations bill. This discussion would be much better if we were going through an authorization process, but this is the only place we can talk about a very critical issue.

I think there is a great degree of uncertainty of how this program is working. We know that on this appropriations bill there is significant legislation that will further militarize this situation. I think we need to be nervous about that. That is why I looked favorably on this amendment when it was proposed to me and why I chose to co-sponsor it.

In the last few months, I have had the opportunity to travel to Africa. Investing in health care around the world is an important investment. We were in Lagos, Nigeria. We had the opportunity to witness the effects of polio and recognize that polio is still a disease that faces way too many children around the world. Investing in child survival and health programs is a good investment.

In contrast to that, I think there is a sincere concern about our efforts in the drug war. As I listen to the debate today, I hear terms such as we have to reduce the drug flow, narco-governments, surrender to drug lords. I sometimes wonder if we are willing to sacrifice all U.S. values in this fight on drugs.

We know that in certain cases, and we will be talking about one of those later on today in another amendment that I will be proposing, when we tried to work out some protections that would embody basic human values and basic U.S. values and rights that we cherish in this country, we are not willing to extend those basic rights to the people in South America. We are willing to do other legislation in this appropriations bill but carrying basic rights that we treasure in this country and that we afford to our own citizens, we are not willing to extend to our colleagues south of the border.

Are we willing to sacrifice all decency and basic human rights so that we can benefit here in the U.S. while others suffer in other parts of the world? I am not sure that is the direction that we want to go.

The U.S. values that we cherish here are the same values that we should share and export to other parts of the world. We need in this bill, since it is the only vehicle that we will have an opportunity to express our values on and our feelings and opinions, we need to use this bill to say we are going to defend U.S. values and U.S. rights in this country and we are going to ensure that those values and those rights are extended into other countries where we are engaged and where we are invested.

The greatest export that we have around the world is not dollars, but it is a vision of freedom and it is a vision that says freedom and human rights are a basic right that people around the planet should share. We are the model. That model should not change when we leave our borders.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) will be recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make some observations on the amendment and the speakers that we have had.

I want to remind my colleagues what the issue really is here. We are not talking about whether or not we should be putting more money into HIV/AIDS and child survival fund. We recognize the importance of doing that. We have money that is going into those funds. We are increasing the amount for tuberculosis rapidly. We believe, in fact, that we are increasing it as rapidly as we can be. Some might argue that it is faster than the absorption. We are not even sure exactly how those program dollars are going to get spent, but the need is tremendous.

We are facing a pandemic in this world in HIV/AIDS unlike anything that any of us in our lifetimes have experienced, unlike any kind of plague that has beset this world in the last several hundred years. We need to be

focused on that. We need to understand that it is a global issue. It is not just one here in the United States. It is not just one in Africa. We are now seeing it in Haiti and the Caribbean. We are seeing it in South Asia. We are seeing it in the Central Asian republics. We are seeing it in the Caucasuses and we are beginning to see it in Southern China.

This epidemic is spreading around the world, and we need to apply the proper resources to it. Mr. Chairman, our bill does do that. We make every attempt to get money into the international trust fund as well as money into our bilateral programs.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat again where we are with this trust fund, a trust fund which, I might add, has not yet been established, a trust fund that under the umbrella of the United Nations would provide funding for programs around the world, but we still do not know how the governance of that trust fund will be done.

Nonetheless, we have \$100 million in our bill for that. Last Friday, this House approved a supplemental appropriation which is now on the desk of the President for \$100 million; the Labor-HHS bill will have another \$100 million. That is \$300 million in 1 year from this country alone towards the trust fund.

I realize that one can always argue that more is needed, but we have to balance our bill with the requirements of our other national security requirements, including those in South America, the need to make sure that the needs of the battle against drugs in Latin America continues, as well as the economic assistance in those countries.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues when they consider this amendment that they realize that we have a balance in this bill, and I would hope that my colleagues would consider it carefully and that they would reject this amendment.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the Committee will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Will all present in the Chamber please rise for a moment of silence.

Ms. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the Chair for appreciating the work of the officers here and around the world.

I speak on behalf of the McGovern-Hoekstra-Pelosi-Morella amendment that adds \$50 million to infectious disease programs to combat tuberculosis and \$50 million to the Child Survival and Maternal Health Program.

This money will be taken from the Andean Counterdrug Initiative that

would provide \$100 million in additional U.S. funding for Plan Colombia. The current administration asked for a 1-year \$1 billion military aid package to continue funding Plan Colombia and other antidrug initiatives in surrounding countries.

While I respect that initiative, I prefer to support this global health amendment because I believe that additional funding for the Colombian military will only draw the United States further into Colombia's brutal 4-decade old civil war.

Furthermore, I cannot in good conscience support funding for a military in Colombia that has close connections to paramilitaries responsible for some 70 percent of the most severe human rights violations in the world. Seventy-one percent of the 319,000 people internally displaced last year were driven from their homes by paramilitaries, according to the Colombian President's office. The \$1.3 billion aid package that we sent Colombia last year has not improved the Colombian military human rights record. Hardly any high ranking military officials implicated in connection to paramilitaries have been dismissed since the United States aid began to be implemented last August.

Mr. Chairman, as reported in last Thursday's issue of *The New York Times*, 40 percent of Africans with AIDS have tuberculosis, which is the leading killer of people with AIDS. Tuberculosis kills 2 million people each year, and is on the rise globally. Tuberculosis is the greatest killer of people with HIV-AIDS and young women worldwide. Tuberculosis treatment in the form of directly observed treatment, DOTS, is one of the most cost-effective treatments available today.

And to combat high infant mortality rates, a small investment in programs such as measles, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and polio will greatly impact many children's lives.

We can save billions of dollars in the future if polio and other preventable diseases are no longer a threat to children, and countries no longer need to vaccinate their children. The change in children's health worldwide is priceless. The funding needed to achieve this goal is invaluable by comparison.

Mr. Chairman, I urge strong support of this amendment.

□ 1545

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise today in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) to reduce funding for the Andean Initiative by \$100 million. During the consideration of Plan Colombia, I had some serious concerns regarding the manner in which the \$1.3 billion would be distributed. I believed that the concentration of those funds on military rather than

on economic and social assistance was a grave miscalculation. The assistance provided to the Colombian military has been used to support and intensify the long tradition of human rights abuses in Colombia in my opinion. Plan Colombia has bloodied the hands of this Congress.

I believe that this reduction of \$100 million should be taken from the account directed to the Colombian military to send a message that these abuses of basic human rights will not be tolerated any longer. I cannot stand idly by while this body attempts to make the same mistake once again. Though I believe that the Andean Initiative takes steps toward a broader regional strategy and addresses the shortcomings of Plan Colombia, the President's request for the distribution of this account is incredibly deficient.

The most glaring deficiency is the lack of support for the country of Ecuador. We are talking about a country that has struggled for years with high inflation, a high rate of unemployment and a low per capita income. We are talking about a country that provides the United States a forward operating location at the Manta Air base to conduct drug surveillance missions free of charge.

Under the administration of President Noboa, Ecuador has done nothing but demonstrate acts of loyalty and friendship toward the United States. How do we repay them? By providing only \$39 million, \$39 million when Peru and Bolivia are receiving well over \$100 million each. This is not providing support for a friend in need. This is a slap in a friend's face.

Ecuador is dealing with the daunting task of keeping the coca production beyond its borders. With the increasing activity by Colombian paramilitaries in the Putumayo region, this is becoming more and more difficult every day.

If the Colombian military and paramilitaries are successful in driving the guerillas out of southern Colombia, the problem will not be solved. The guerillas will simply move elsewhere to resume their business. This funding will not allow Ecuador to secure its borders or resist the movement of the guerillas into the Sucumbios region of Ecuador.

Just last month, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia crossed the Rio Putumayo into Ecuador and set up roadblocks on a main highway. This is the beginning of the terror for Ecuador. We can take steps in this Chamber to nip this in the bud.

Ecuador once shared a 367-mile border with Colombia. It now today shares a 367-mile border with rebel forces. Something must be done before this situation gets out of hand. No Member wants to be down on this floor next year voting for an aid package called Plan Ecuador.

I sincerely believe that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and

the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) are committed to improving the situation in Ecuador. As this bill goes to conference, I would like to offer my assistance to ensure that the underfunding of Ecuador be addressed and rectified.

I also note that this money that will be redirected to child survival and maternal health as well as combating the spread of infectious disease. With so much suffering in this world today, why must we contribute to more of it? Let us take this opportunity to promote the welfare of both Colombia, the Andean region and global health entirely.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the McGovern-Hoekstra-Pelosi-Morella-Jackson-Lee amendment which adds \$50 million to the infectious diseases account to combat tuberculosis and \$50 million to the child survival and maternal health account. The offset comes from a \$100 million cut in funding for the Colombian military.

As a relatively new Member of this august body, the most important parliamentary body in the entire world, what has struck me is the capacity of the United States for relatively small amounts of money, relative to the amount of money that we have and the amount of money that we spend, to do good in the world and to end the suffering of millions of people. That is what this amendment allows us to do.

I had the experience of going to Colombia with one of the sponsors of this amendment, the gentleman from Massachusetts. One of the things that we did was go to Barrios Kennedy, a place for displaced people, people who have been displaced by the multi-decade war that we are helping to fuel in Colombia. When we went to this crowded community and we met with families there, it was so sad because many of the families would put forward their children who were so sick and who were getting no help from the government, who were not getting the kind of help they needed or wanted from the United States. When they saw Members of the United States House of Representatives, they thought, can you help us? They showed us their health care bills that they could not pay. They held up their sick children. They were pleading for help.

This amendment gives us the opportunity to do two things for those people: one, to help their children with their health care needs; and, two, to end the continued problem of displacement.

How do we do that? Cutting funds from the Colombian military makes sense. This is a military that has repeatedly been implicated in the brutalization and murder of the very people

that it is supposed to protect. Last year, there was an average of at least one massacre a day in Colombia, leaving thousands murdered and millions displaced. They flock to cities like Bogota where we met with some of them.

While many of the attacks were carried out by guerillas and paramilitary, these illegal armed groups operate with impunity from the military. In fact, they are often aided in their efforts by the Colombian armed forces personnel.

This amendment sends two clear messages: one, that we care about the children and the poor and the sick in this world, that we want to eradicate polio, that we want to get rid of tuberculosis; and, two, we send an important message to the Colombian military that we will not tolerate nor support the kinds of human rights violations that continue to devastate the people of Colombia that we say we are there to help.

I urge all my colleagues to join in strong support of this well-thought-out amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGovern amendment, reducing the amount of military assistance for Colombia and increasing funding for child survival maternal health, tuberculosis and malaria. Regardless of whether you support the huge U.S. investment in arming and training the Colombian military and police, the facts are clear. The acceleration of military activity in southern Colombia as a result of Plan Colombia funding has led to less government control, more violence, and no reduction in drug cultivation processing or transshipment. As a result of these and other developments, President Pastrana is now considering signing a law which would provide the Colombian military with extraordinary power and exemptions from judicial review.

During debate on Plan Colombia last year, Members were assured that alternative economic development was as much a priority as military and police aid. We were also told that our European allies would compensate on the economic assistance side for the imbalance in our own program.

What actually happened? A massive fumigation campaign commenced last December in southern Colombia before any alternative economic development programs were in place. By last March, no alternative crop assistance had been delivered to communities which had agreed to voluntary eradication. Today, as we speak, assistance is being delivered in only two of the 29 communities that have signed pacts. In fact, only 1,800 of the 29,000 people in the affected area are actually receiving assistance today. Military assistance programs have proceeded rapidly, while economic assistance from Europe never

materialized, and United States assistance has been slow in arriving. We are adept at wielding the stick of Plan Colombia, but the carrot is nowhere to be found.

The McGovern amendment would reduce military assistance to give alternative development programs more time to be implemented. We owe the poorest of Colombia's poor who have been terrorized by the ongoing conflict the opportunity to eradicate their illegal crops voluntarily. And when they agree, we must have the capacity to deliver on our promises immediately. That is not the case today.

Congress provided over \$1 billion for Plan Colombia, of which only about half has been spent. The majority of the military equipment funded in that package has not even been delivered to Colombia. Spending this \$100 million on infectious diseases is good policy and will not slow our progress in the war on drugs in Colombia. In fact, it will actually help, by demonstrating that our policy is balanced. It will also increase the likelihood that the alternative development pacts will be sustainable over time.

The examples of successful voluntary eradication programs in Bolivia and Peru show that manual/voluntary eradication is the most effective and sustainable method of achieving long-term change. In order to bring that about, poor farmers must receive some actual benefits and gain confidence in their government. This has not yet happened in southern Colombia. The McGovern amendment will help solidify these alternative programs by slowing the pace of military assistance. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment really is not about allocation of child survival and health programs funding. Because if you just take a moment to look at the history here, we have \$1.4 billion, nearly \$1.5 billion allocated this year. Some 4 years ago, it was half the amount. It took a Republican Congress to increase this program, and it is an important program, and it is a targeted program which will aid in child survival worldwide.

But that is not the debate here. The debate is to really declare war on Plan Colombia. Some of the same opponents, Mr. Chairman, that we had toward giving any assistance to the Colombian military are the same opponents that we have here today.

We have heard that this is a purely military solution. Mr. Chairman, we have not had the military involved in Colombia really until this Plan Colombia came about. The Clinton administration blocked all of the military assistance to Colombia. Time and time again the Congress appropriated funds for helicopters. What do we need helicopters and transport vehicles to get to

the Colombian military for? To get to the violence and get to the drugs. It does not take rocket science to figure this out. The drugs, the heroin, the cocaine are in the hills and distant lands in Colombia; and you need a way to get there.

Just a few minutes ago we dedicated a moment of silence to two Capitol police officers to whom as Members we will always be indebted because they sacrificed their lives to protect us. Do you know how many Colombian police have died to date? Over 5,000. There will be no moment of silence for those 5,000 Colombian police.

We have been to Colombia, many times. The Speaker helped develop this program. The administration for years blocked military assistance, and we got a huge increase in the production of heroin. From zero in 1993 to 70 percent of all the heroin coming into the United States is now coming in from Colombia because they blocked the military from stopping it.

Yes, there is violence out on the right side. You hear them talk about the military and how they are committing crimes. They did not tell you about the left wing, the FARC. They did not tell you about the ELN who cut people's throats, who use people in the most abusive ways you can ever imagine in human rights violations; and the terror is equally divided on both sides.

□ 1600

But they do not tell you that in order to stop the violence, to even get the police there without being slaughtered in Colombia, that you need some way to get them there. The key to that is our military assistance, the military, which we are training three battalions, providing helicopters and assistance to get them there. They encircle an area, and the police come in, arrest the terrorists and drug dealers, all of whom are financing the terrorism that has killed 35,000 people.

Do you want to care about human rights? Then allow Plan Colombia to at least go forward for 1 year. The aid is not even there. The helicopters that we begged and pleaded with the Congress and this administration to send there 3 and 4 years ago, are still not there. The last time I was there, they had four helicopters that were operating part of the time, and one was being cannibalized for parts. Now, how do you run an effective anti-illegal narcotics campaign like that?

Over one-half of the package is for assistance. If the assistance is not there, then get after the Department of State to get the assistance for alternative crop development and other programs to help people. But you will not build roads, you will not build schools, you will not save people's lives in Colombia until you have a comprehensive plan to make it all work.

So do not pull the guts out of the plan. Do not destroy a well-balanced

plan that has protections against human rights abuses, that has a targeted approach and balance between a small amount of military delivering troops who are trained to an area to protect police.

You have heard about sacrifice of U.S. values. Well, the U.S. values our freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MICA was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, sacrifice of U.S. values, I heard that. Freedom and human rights. Well, there will not be freedom in Colombia while they are killing each other.

It is in the United States' interests, it is in our interests as a neighbor not to let our friends continue killing our friends, just as it was in any other country in South America or around the world where we sent our assistance. But, in this case, there are no troops involved, only training and assistance and close supervision.

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to respond to the points the gentleman made that we are trying to take the guts out of this package. Let me remind the gentleman that \$152 million in police aid is in this package; \$72 million in police aid is in the pipeline, and an estimated \$80 million in military aid.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, you can take that police aid and dump it in the Potomac River, because the police will never be effective unless they are protected to go in there. You will have another 5,000 police lose their lives in Colombia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if I am the last speaker, let me just say: this amendment is the equivalent of burning down a house because one of the rooms is messy and it needs cleaning. In our Child Survival Account in this bill, we are spending \$1.387 billion on child survival, maternal health, vulnerable children, HIV-AIDS, other infectious diseases, reproductive health and voluntary family planning and a grant to UNICEF.

Included in this very, very important expenditure of \$1.3 billion is five primary childhood killers: a focus on diarrhea, acute respiratory infections, malnutrition, malaria, directed primarily at children, and vaccine-preventable diseases. We are also looking at contaminated water. We are working to improve maternal health to protect the outcome of pregnancy, neonatal and young infants, to save the lives of the mothers by improving maternal nutrition, promoting birth preparedness, improving safe delivery and postpartum

care, and managing and treating life-threatening complications of pregnancy and childhood.

I keep hearing about values. This committee is already weighing in at \$1.3 billion, and we believe that we can work to continue to support the war on childhood diseases.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why do I say they are just burning down the whole house? The author of this amendment a few minutes or hours ago said that this amendment does not direct a cut towards military. Now, I understand that they are angry at the military, but this amendment does not stop there. It is not earmarked. Therefore, it does go after human rights; it does go after judicial reform. It goes after all the good parts of Plan Colombia, which I think they would support.

But I want to address why is their military involved. Maybe it would be better to send down the Boy Scouts. Maybe we could send AmeriCorps in there. Maybe we could send the Peace Corps. Maybe we could send my church Sunday school group down there, and they could interface with these drug dealers and say, you really do not want to kill people, do you? Maybe that would work better. But I think not.

Let me read to you a part of the Andean counter-drug initiative report. It talks about Bolivia's 5-year plan to eliminate illegal coca cultivation. Why do we have seven countries involved in this? Just keep in mind that the drug dealers and drug problems are kind of like fire ants in neighborhoods. You treat fire ants in your yard, they go to your neighbor's yard. And drugs work the same way.

This talks about the eradication operation in the Yungas Mountains. It says coca is located in remote areas that are well guarded by resistance and militant coca growers, making it difficult, dangerous and costly to remove. The international narcotics elimination plans to go in there with aircraft, C-130Bs, and supply personnel.

It talks about one road where there are violent ambushes and attacks from coca growers and traffickers. It talks about this one road in the Yungas being the world's most dangerous road, that aside from tricky hairpin turns, the rocky and gutted road is seldom wider than 11 feet, necessitating its closure by soldiers to allow one-way traffic during various times of the day.

Eradicating coca is very, very dangerous business, and that is why you have paramilitary in there. I wish there was another way to fight drugs, but the money is too great.

Think about what we are faced with here in the United States of America. This is a product that if you work for the drug dealer, you do not have business cards, you do not advertise, you do not have brochures; and yet this insidious product is so bad that it can be obtained nearly on every school yard in

the United States of America. I would challenge my 434 colleagues, if you do not believe me, go ask schools, particularly high schools in your districts, to the kids, can you get illegal drugs by the end of the day? And at most high school seniors' classes, about half the hands go up and say yes, they can.

This is a threat to society, not just in America, but all over the world. That is why you have to get tough with it. That is why you have to use the military.

But, again, Mr. Chairman, very, very importantly, this amendment does not stop at military. This cuts into judicial training; it cuts into efforts to assist displaced people and other human rights violations. This is a reckless and sloppy amendment, and it should be voted down. I would hope that the author of it would just withdraw it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of maintaining our commitment to the Republic of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. While I support the language on the Nagorno-Karabakh peace process and direct aid allocation, I am disappointed that aid to Armenia is somewhat less than the fiscal year 2001 level of \$90 million. Nonetheless, I am hopeful that the Senate and the conferees will correct this oversight in the coming weeks.

The United States has a long history of extending a helping hand to those people overseas struggling to make a better life, recover from a disaster or striving to live in a free and democratic country. It is this caring that stands as a hallmark of the United States around the world and shows the world our true character as a Nation.

Armenia alone among the New Independent States faces the unique challenge of developing its economy in the face of devastating blockades. The dual Turkish and Azerbaijani blockades have cut off Armenia's traditional trade routes and severely limited Armenia's access to the outside world.

As long as Armenia suffers from blockades on its east and west borders, continued and robust U.S. assistance to Armenia is necessary.

It is alarming that aid to Armenia has been decreased by 8 percent, while the administration has increased aid to Azerbaijan by 46 percent. Why are we rewarding a government that blockades its neighbor and was recently cited among the most corrupt nations in the world? Reducing aid to Armenia, while increasing aid to Azerbaijan, would send the wrong message about American priorities in the region.

Mr. Chairman, Azerbaijan continues to violate section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, a U.S. law enacted with bipartisan support in Congress and with the support of the Bush administration in 1992 in response to Azer-

baijan's blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh.

It is vital that the fiscal year 2002 foreign operations appropriations bill maintains section 907 of the Freedom Support Act without any weakening amendments or additional exemption being carved out. The reasonable and clear condition for lifting section 907 has not been met; and given the sensitive, ongoing Nagorno-Karabakh peace negotiations, section 907 must remain in place.

Mr. Chairman, let us not reward the Azerbaijani government, which is in violation of U.S. law. That same government, Mr. Chairman, has consistently been cited by our own State Department for its grim human rights efforts, as well as its flagrant violation of the most basic principles of democracy, free and fair elections.

We must apply a consistent set of conditions on foreign assistance recipients regarding their commitment to democratic principles, standards of international conduct, economic reform, and respect for human rights.

According to the State Department's 2000 Country Report on Human Rights Practices in Azerbaijan, Heydar Aliyev, who assumed presidential powers after the overthrow of his democratically elected predecessor in 1993, was reelected in October of 1998 in an election marred by serious irregularities, violations of election law and lack of transparency in vote counting at the district and national levels.

President Aliyev and his supporters continue to dominate the government and multiparty 125-member parliament. There were numerous serious flaws in the elections held in 2000. Serious irregularities included disqualifications of candidates, a flawed appeals process, ballot box stuffing, manipulated turnout results, premarked ballots, severe restrictions on domestic nonpartisan observers, and a completely flawed vote-counting process.

The constitution, which laudably establishes a system based on a division of powers among the presidency, legislature and the judiciary, unfortunately has been undermined by a judiciary which does not function independently of the executive branch and has proven itself corrupt and inefficient.

Severe disparities of income have emerged that contribute to patronage and corruption. In contrast, Mr. Chairman, the report by the State Department on Armenia says the following: "The Armenian government demonstrated the strength of its constitutional system following the tragic events of October of 1999. In the wake of the assassination of the Prime Minister and other top leaders, Armenia followed constitutional procedures and continued the normal business of government. Exchanges and training and partnership programs provide opportunities for current leaders and the next

generation of Armenians to learn about the U.S. society and institutions firsthand and to forge personal ties with individual Americans and U.S. institutions. Armenia continues efforts to improve its business climate, increase investment and create jobs. The government is implementing final measures necessary for entry into the World Trade Organization.”

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the government has demonstrated a willingness to cooperate with the U.S. in preventing weapons of mass destruction, proliferation, and in fighting international terrorism. We must continue the pressure on both Turkey and Azerbaijan and increase our support to Armenia.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to use this time, if I may, or some of it at least, to talk about the amendment that has been offered to us by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

This amendment would shift \$100 million dollars of U.S. aid from the Colombian military to maternal health and child survival programs, as well as a fund to fight tuberculosis. Over the past year, we must be aware that the situation in Colombia has deteriorated. Since August of 2000, when our government began delivering the new aid package, up to this moment, there has been a severe escalation of human rights violations in Colombia.

□ 1615

The number of massacres by paramilitary and guerilla forces in the first 4 months of this year is nearly double the number in the first 4 months of the year 2000. Despite an increase in U.S. aid, the military rarely acted to protect innocent civilians, and there are numerous instances of collaboration between the Colombia military and right-wing paramilitary groups.

A disturbing example of this took place in the City of Barrancabermeja. On July 6 of this year, a group of heavily armed paramilitary reportedly tried to assassinate trade union leader Hernando Hernandez. Mr. Hernandez, however, narrowly escaped after being warned by friends. The case in this particular city, the case of Mr. Hernandez, is one of the lucky ones. In the first 45 days of this year, 145 people have been killed in this small city, Barrancabermeja.

These killings take place in spite of the fact that this is one of the most militarized cities in all of Colombia. The Colombian Army's Fifth Brigade maintains a military presence, and that includes the U.S.-funded 61st Advanced Riverine Battalion. These units have made absolutely no serious efforts to restrain the paramilitaries from committing these atrocities.

Mr. Chairman, U.S. funding of the Colombian military has led to more human rights abuses, an increased number of political killings while, at the same time, not at all reducing drug use or violence in our own country. This amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) takes money away from a failing program and shifts it to important and grossly underfunded global health initiatives.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise, along with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), my Republican friend and colleague, to express at this point in the debate on this bill our bipartisan appreciation for the leadership of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member, for the substantial increase they commit in this budget to basic education.

Basic education in particular is about girls' education, because they are the ones most likely to be held out of school. The data shows tremendous return for the investment made in this area for each year past fourth grade: a 10 percent reduction in family size, a 10 percent reduction in infant and maternal mortality, and 15 to 20 percent increases in wages. This increase is precisely in line with the leadership of President Bush who has said recently, "Literacy and learning are the foundation of democracy and development. I am directing the Secretary of State and Administrator of the Agency of International Development to develop an initiative to improve basic education and teacher training in Africa."

Under the leadership of the President, the G-8 communique issued just this past weekend said, "Education, in particular, universal primary education and equal access to education at all levels for girls, must be given high priority in our development programs."

Former Secretary Treasury Larry Summers has said, "Educating girls quite possibly yields a higher rate of return than any other investment available in the developing world." Present Secretary of the Treasury Paul O'Neil said in a recent op-ed in *The New York Times*, "Education is inextricably linked to improving living standards."

Perhaps the most eloquent quote I have heard regarding the imperative of girls' education was issued by the chairman of the board of a community school in Bamako, Mali. This gentleman said, "Bringing girls education is like bringing light into a dark room."

That is why I am so proud of the work of the gentleman from Arizona

(Mr. KOLBE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY). I had a chance to see with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) the effects of this funding and work on expanding girls' education in Africa.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), a true leader in advancing the cause of basic education around the world.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I know the hour is late, I know the day is long, but I think it is important for us to show appreciation, so I commend both the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member for their tremendous commitment here.

What we are doing is not just about education and education reform; it goes much beyond that. As the gentleman from North Dakota has alluded to, we know that an educated child who becomes an educated parent is truly the key to solving many of the health care challenges in the developing world. We know that an educated community breeds democracy. We know that as expectations rise, as people learn about what is taking place beyond the border, those forms of tyranny and government control that are in many places of the world cannot survive. They will fall to democracy. Of course, education, as we all know, fosters economic development.

So what we have done and what we are doing today is truly a wonderful thing. I do want to show my personal appreciation and on behalf of many of the villages that the gentleman and I visited together, we thank our colleagues.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond very briefly to my good colleagues with appreciation for their important work in this area. It has been a privilege for me and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), for us to feel we have had some part in making sure that young girls around the world will get educated so they can play an important role in their community and raise their families and raise their communities and hopefully lead to a more peaceful world. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota and the gentleman from Wisconsin for their important work.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join my colleagues in offering an amendment to this bill that will permit the United States Agency for International Development to provide valuable support for global child and maternal health programs and to combat global infectious diseases.

This amendment will provide \$50 million additional funding for Child and maternal health programs and \$50 million additional funding for the USAID's valuable infectious disease program. We are not asking for new funding, but merely funds from the State Department's Andean Counterdrug initiative.

We know firsthand that the health and survival of a child is directly linked to the health of his or her mother. Infectious diseases continue to take a toll on the developing world. Ten million children will die before their fifth birthday this year due to preventable diseases, such as diarrhea, pneumonia and measles. In addition, infectious diseases, such as tuberculosis and malaria, take the lives of millions of people living with HIV/AIDS. All of these deaths are preventable and by strengthening the basic health and nutrition services in developing countries, we can make a difference.

We must recognize that the U.S. federal budget allocation to foreign aid has hit a record low, and is now less as a proportion of our national income than in any other industrialized nation. Foreign aid is not only one percent of our federal budget.

In September, we will mark the ten-year anniversary of the 1990 World Summit for Children. At that summit, the U.S. joined with over 70 other nations in committing to the reduction of child and maternal deaths. Substantial progress has been made since 1990, but many goals have not yet been met. We need to redouble our efforts to expand programs that can sharply reduce the millions of preventable deaths.

Despite the good work of many organizations and individuals worldwide, each year more than ten million children die before reaching their fifth birthday due to preventable infectious diseases, such as pneumonia, measles, and diarrhea. This is equivalent to every child living in the eastern half of the United States. While diarrhea remains one of the leading causes of death in the developing world, at present one million childhood deaths are averted every year due to diarrheal prevention and appropriate treatment programs.

Clean water and sanitation prevent infections, and oral rehydration therapy (a simple salt sugar mixture taken by mouth, which costs only pennies and was developed through U.S. research efforts overseas) has been proven to be among the most effective public health interventions ever developed.

Global immunization coverage has soared from less than 10 percent of the world's children in the 1970s to almost 75 percent today. Annually, immunizations avert two million childhood deaths from measles, neonatal tetanus, and whooping cough. The success of these programs in the world's poorest regions is even more striking when one considers that the vaccination rate in the United States only reached 78 percent in 1998.

Unfortunately, immunization rates are not improving everywhere. Coverage in sub-Saharan Africa has decreased. 30 percent of children still do not receive their routine vaccinations—30 million infants. Measles immunization rates have improved in the past ten years but there are still 30 million cases of measles every year.

If a child is not killed by measles, it may cause blindness, malnutrition, deafness or pneumonia. It is possible to save millions of children per year just by increasing immunization rates from 75 percent to 90 percent, and by assuring access to essential nutrients such as Vitamin A, which increases resistance to disease and infection. Vitamin A supplementation is protective and will protect a child from

the most serious consequences of measles, such as blindness and death, and costs only four cents per year per child. Deficiencies of both iron and iodine are among the most harmful types of malnutrition with regard to cognition. Iodine deficiency disorder is the leading preventable cause of mental retardation in children and it renders children listless, inattentive and uninterested in learning.

We must reduce hunger and malnutrition, which contribute to over one-half of childhood deaths around the world. We can do so through these Child and Maternal Health programs. As estimated 150 million children are malnourished, which puts them at even greater risk for infections. Protecting children from disease and malnutrition increases their ability to learn and thrive. The issue of hunger and nutrition was so important to my predecessor, Mickey Leland, that along with Congressman TONY HALL and BEN GILMAN, he founded the House Select Committee on Hunger in 1983. The bi-partisan non-profit Congressional Hunger Center grew out of this effort in 1993 and fights national and global hunger. It is important that we in Congress continue these efforts.

According to the United Nations, approximately 828 million people are chronically undernourished in the world today. Approximately 300 million are children. UNICEF reports that 32 percent of the world's children under five years of age, about 193 million, have stunted growth, which is the key indicator for undernutrition.

Weak health and poor nutrition among school age children diminish their cognitive development either through physiological changes or by reducing their ability to participate in the learning experience, or both. The extra demand on school age children to perform chores, for example, or walk long distances to school, creates a need for energy that is much greater than that of younger children. Available data indicate high levels of protein energy malnutrition and short-term hunger among school age children, and deficiencies of critical nutrients are pervasive.

Poor nutrition and health among school children contribute to the inefficiency of the educational system. Children with diminished cognitive abilities and sensory impairments perform less well and are more likely to repeat grades or drop out of school. The irregular school attendance of malnourished and unhealthy children is one of the key factors in poor performance. Even temporary hunger, common in children who are not being fed before going to school, can have an adverse effect on learning.

For those of you who worry that their home districts will not support such additional aid, I offer that polls consistently show that Americans support putting a high priority on addressing world hunger and poverty. In a recent survey by the Program on International Policy Attitudes at the University of Maryland, 87 percent polled support foreign food and medical assistance. Only 20 percent surveyed supports cuts in efforts to reduce hunger. 62 percent said that combating world hunger should be a very important goal for the United States. 76 percent positively rated giving child survival programs more money. Only about one fourth positively viewed giving military aid to countries friendly to the United States.

U.S. food aid alleviates poverty and promotes economic growth in recipient countries. As incomes in developing countries rise, consumption patterns change, and food and other imports of US goods and services can increase. Hence, supporting child nutrition programs is an effort that we can and must all support.

This amendment will benefit families in many other important ways. Nearly 500,000 women die of pregnancy-related causes each year. Every minute, around the world, 380 women become pregnant, 110 women experience pregnancy-related complications, 1 woman dies. Each year, an additional 15 million women suffer pregnancy-related health problems that can be permanently debilitating, and over 4 million newborns die from poorly managed pregnancies and deliveries.

Ninety five percent of maternal deaths occur in the developing world. In some sub-Saharan African countries, the risk jumps still further: one in every 14 girls entering adolescence will die from maternal causes before completing her child-bearing years—compared to 1 in 1,800 girls in developing countries.

According to the World Health Organization, maternal health is the largest disparity between the developed and developing countries. While infant mortality (death to infants less than one year), for example, is almost 7 times higher in the developing world than in the developed, maternal mortality is on average 18 times higher. Beyond the consequences for women, the health of their children is also put at risk. Children are much more likely to die within two years of a maternal death. The chances of death are 10 times greater for the newborn and 3 times greater for children 1 to 5 years.

Reducing maternal deaths is to be an effective investment in healthy families—and therefore in sustainable development—around the world. These deaths can be averted through services that include skilled attendants at birth with necessary equipment and supplies, community education on safe motherhood, improvement of rural and urban health care facilities. Most of these interventions are low-tech and low cost.

Maternal deaths affect women in their most productive years, and as a result the impact reverberates through their families, their communities, and the societies in which they live. The diminished potential productivity of the women who die is \$7.5 billion annually and \$8 billion for the newborns who do not survive.

Ninety-nine percent of maternal deaths can be prevented with improved pregnancy care, nutrition, immediate postnatal care as well as appropriate treatment for the complications of incomplete abortions. The WHO Mother-Baby program has identified a package of health interventions that, for a cost of \$1–3 per mother, can save the lives of countless women and will begin to do so immediately upon implementation.

U.S. funding for maternal health programs has remained level at \$50 million for the past 3 years. While other global health and development programs have received increased attention, women continue to die needlessly of preventable causes.

Through this amendment, we also seek additional funding to prevent infectious diseases.

Almost 2 million people die each year from tuberculosis (TB). It is estimated that one-third of the world's population is infected with tuberculosis, although it lies dormant in most people. Deadlier and more resistant forms of TB have emerged and have spread to Europe and the U.S., re-introducing the possibility of TB becoming a global killer. Moreover, since HIV/AIDS reduces one's resistance to infectious diseases, TB is easily transmitted to an infected individual. It is regarded as the most common HIV-related opportunistic infection in developing countries.

Many advances have been made to reduce the prevalence of these diseases by the USAID, in collaboration with other international agencies. For example, the World Health Organization's Roll Back Malaria campaign had decreased the death rate from malaria by 97 percent in some countries. WHO has also started a "directly observed treatment strategy," or DOTS, to fight tuberculosis. Under this strategy, patients are given second-line drugs when they become resistant to first-line drugs.

Similarly, tuberculosis (TB) has re-emerged on the world stage in deadlier and more resistant forms. With the appearance of multi-drug resistant TB, and its spread to Europe and the U.S., we face the possibility that this could again become a leading killer of the rich as well as the poor.

Infectious diseases account for 8 percent of all deaths in the richest 20 percent of the world and 56 percent in the poorest 20 percent. This poorest fifth of the world's population is seven times more likely to die as a result of infectious diseases, accounting for 56 percent of deaths within this population segment. Children are particularly susceptible to infectious diseases, which tend to be exacerbated by malnutrition, and all-too common condition in developing countries.

Finally, this amendment does not seek to cut any economic assistance for the Andean region, assistance for Peru or Bolivia, or funding for the Colombian National Police. It only seeks to cut some military aid to Colombia, aid that does not help the Colombian people, as will these valuable health programs.

The human rights situation in Colombia has deteriorated since Congress approved last year's aid package. The Colombian military continues to collaborate with right-wing paramilitaries that commit over 70 percent of human rights abuses, such as the paramilitary massacres of civilians that have nearly doubled in 2001 compared to last year.

The U.S. is engaged in a costly military endeavor with no clear exit strategy. The high level of military aid threatens to draw the U.S. further into Colombia's civil war. The amendment leaves intact \$152 million in police aid, and estimated \$80 million in the Defense Appropriations bill, \$30 million in expected drawdowns and IMET, and \$158 million in military aid in the pipeline from FY 2001. Security assistance accounts for 71 percent of expected U.S. aid to Colombia this year.

Military aid escalates the conflict and weakens the fragile peace process by emboldening those who hope to solve the conflict on the battlefield and undermining government and civilian leaders seeking a peaceful resolution to the conflict.

President Bush himself said this Tuesday that "A world where some live in comfort and plenty, while half of the human race lives on less than \$2 a day, is neither just, nor stable."

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). 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 pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) will be postponed.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise, Mr. Chairman, to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Committee on Appropriations.

Specifically, I would like to discuss with him the excellent effort Bolivia has made on the war on drugs. We have heard a lot of talk about the non-successes with some of our drug programs in South America and Central America, but the success story in Bolivia is unparalleled.

As the distinguished chairman knows, as a part of a cooperative effort with the United States and other nations of the Andean region, in 1997, Bolivia instituted its 5-year antidrug plan, the so-called "Dignity Plan." When the plan was initiated, Bolivia was the second major producer of coca in the world. There were 45,800 hectares of coca plants in Bolivia. But in the 3 years the plan has been in existence, the Bolivian government has conducted more than 16,900 drug interdiction operations. It has destroyed more than 4,000 cocaine labs; it has arrested some 14,400 individuals implicated in narco-trafficking; it has seized more than 50,000 kilos of cocaine. From 1997 to August 2000, 43 tons of drugs have been seized in Bolivia, including 1.4 million tons of liquid substances and 1 ton of solid chemical substances.

In short, Bolivia has been a full partner to the United States in its war on drugs. It has focused both on eradication and interdiction, even though the effort has caused severe problems for the Bolivian economy and for the Bolivian people. Therefore, I hope the chairman will do all he can to see that Bolivia is fully funded in fiscal year 2002. It is critical that Bolivia be provided the necessary resources to sustain its progress and not to become a victim of its success. It must have the ability to make the necessary investments to enable its economy to handle the effects of illegal drug traffic.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the former chairman of this subcommittee, for bringing this matter to our attention. No one has been more involved in helping to bring this problem in Bolivia to a conclusion, or to the successful plan that we have today. I want to thank him for bringing this to our attention.

I agree completely with what he has said here today. Bolivia does deserve our support and I intend to do all I can to be helpful with this country and I know that I can count on the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his full support in this effort.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman certainly can.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. 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. 26 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and amendment No. 27 offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

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

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 26 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 188, noes 240, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 262]

AYES—188

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	Doggett
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	Dooley
Allen	Capps	Doyle
Andrews	Capuano	Ehlers
Baca	Carson (IN)	Engel
Baird	Clay	Eshoo
Baldacci	Clayton	Etheridge
Baldwin	Clement	Evans
Barcia	Clyburn	Farr
Barrett	Condit	Fattah
Becerra	Conyers	Filner
Bentsen	Coyne	Flake
Berkley	Crowley	Ford
Berman	Cummings	Frank
Bishop	Davis (CA)	Ganske
Blagojevich	Davis (IL)	Gephardt
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Gordon
Bonior	DeGette	Green (TX)
Borski	DeLauro	Green (WI)
Boucher	Deutsch	Gutierrez
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Hall (OH)

Harman Matheson
 Hastings (FL) Matsui
 Hill McCarthy (MO)
 Hilliard McCarthy (NY)
 Hinchey McCollum
 Hoeffel McDermott
 Holt McGovern
 Honda McKinney
 Hooley McNulty
 Horn Meehan
 Hoyer Meek (FL)
 Hulshof Meeks (NY)
 Inslee Menendez
 Israel Millender-
 Jackson (IL) McDonald
 Jackson-Lee Miller, George
 (TX) Mink
 Jefferson Mollohan
 Johnson, E. B. Moore
 Jones (OH) Morella
 Kanjorski Murtha
 Kaptur Nadler
 Kennedy (RI) Napolitano
 Kildee Neal
 Kind (WI) Nussle
 Kleczka Oberstar
 Kucinich Obey
 LaFalce Oliver
 Lampson Owens
 Langevin Pallone
 Lantos Pascrell
 Larsen (WA) Pastor
 Larson (CT) Paul
 Leach Payne
 Lee Pelosi
 Levin Price (NC)
 Lewis (GA) Rahall
 Lofgren Ramstad
 Lowey Rangel
 Lucas (KY) Rivers
 Luther Rodriguez
 Maloney (NY) Roemer
 Markey Rohrabacher

NOES—240

Aderholt Davis (FL)
 Akin Davis, Jo Ann
 Armev Davis, Tom
 Bachus Deal
 Baker DeLay
 Ballenger DeMint
 Barr Diaz-Balart
 Bartlett Dingell
 Barton Doolittle
 Bass Dreier
 Bereuter Duncan
 Berry Dunn
 Biggert Edwards
 Bilirakis Ehrlich
 Blunt Emerson
 Boehlert English
 Boehner Everett
 Bonilla Ferguson
 Bono Fletcher
 Boswell Foley
 Boyd Forbes
 Brady (TX) Fossella
 Brown (SC) Frelinghuysen
 Bryant Frost
 Burr Gallegly
 Burton Gekas
 Buyer Gibbons
 Callahan Gilchrest
 Calvert Gillmor
 Camp Gilman
 Cannon Gonzalez
 Cantor Goode
 Capito Goodlatte
 Cardin Goss
 Carson (OK) Graham
 Castle Granger
 Chabot Graves
 Chambliss Greenwood
 Coble Grucci
 Collins Gutknecht
 Combest Hall (TX)
 Cooksey Hansen
 Costello Hart
 Cox Hastert
 Cramer Hayes
 Crane Hayworth
 Crenshaw Hefley
 Cubin Herger
 Culberson Hilleary
 Cunningham Hinojosa

Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Ortiz
 Osborne
 Ose
 Otter
 Oxley
 Pence
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Portman
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Quinn
 Radanovich
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Roukema
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryan (KS)
 Saxton
 Schaffer
 Schrock
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Sherwood
 Shimkus
 Shows
 Shuster
 Simmons
 Simpson
 Skeen
 Smith (MI)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Snyder
 Souder
 Stearns
 Stenholm
 Stump
 Sununu
 Sweeney
 Tancredo

NOT VOTING—6
 Delahunt Kilpatrick
 Hastings (WA) Lipinski
 Scarborough
 Spence

□ 1650

Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ROSS and Mr. BERRY changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the remaining amendment on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. MCGOVERN
 The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 27 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 CHAIRMAN. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 249, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 263]

AYES—179

Abercrombie Barrett
 Ackerman Becerra
 Allen Berkley
 Andrews Berman
 Baca Blagojevich
 Baird Blumenauber
 Baldacci Boehlert
 Baldwin Bonior
 Barcia Borski

Boucher
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brown (OH)
 Capps
 Capuano
 Carson (IN)
 Clay
 Clayton
 Clyburn
 Condit
 Conyers
 Coyne
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (IL)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 DeLauro
 Deutsch
 Dicks
 Doggett
 Doyle
 Duncan
 Emerson
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Evans
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Flake
 Ford
 Frank
 Ganske
 Gephardt
 Gordon
 Green (WI)
 Gutierrez
 Gutknecht
 Hall (OH)
 Harman
 Hastings (FL)
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hoeffel
 Hoekstra
 Holt
 Honda
 Hooley
 Hulshof
 Inslee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (OH)
 Kaptur
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kennedy (RI)
 Kildee
 Kind (WI)
 Kleczka
 Kucinich
 LaFalce
 Lampson
 Lantos
 Largent
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Leach
 Lee
 Lewis (GA)
 Lofgren
 Lowey
 Lucas (KY)
 Luther
 Maloney (NY)
 Markey
 Paul
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Pomeroy
 Price (NC)
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Rivers
 Rodriguez
 Roemer
 Rohrabacher
 Roybal-Allard
 Rush
 Sabo
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Sawyer
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Scott
 Serrano
 Sherman
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Solis
 Spratt
 Stark
 Strickland
 Stupak
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Toomey
 Towns
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Velazquez
 Visclosky
 Waters
 Watson (CA)
 Watt (NC)
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Wexler
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn

NOES—249

Aderholt
 Akin
 Armev
 Bachus
 Baker
 Ballenger
 Barr
 Bartlett
 Barton
 Bass
 Bentsen
 Bereuter
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilirakis
 Bishop
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bono
 Boswell
 Boyd
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (SC)
 Bryant
 Burr
 Burton
 Buyer
 Callahan
 Calvert
 Camp
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Cardin
 Carson (OK)
 Castle
 Chabot
 Chambliss
 Clement
 Coble
 Collins
 Combest
 Cooksey
 Costello
 Cox
 Cramer
 Crane
 Crenshaw
 Cubin
 Culberson
 Cunningham
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (FL)
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Davis, Tom
 Deal
 DeLay
 DeMint
 Diaz-Balart
 Dingell
 Dooley
 Doolittle
 Dreier
 Dunn
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Ehrlich
 English
 Everett
 Ferguson
 Fletcher
 Foley
 Forbes
 Fossella
 Frelinghuysen
 Frost
 Gallegly
 Gekas
 Gibbons
 Gilchrest
 Gillmor
 Gilman
 Gonzalez
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Goss
 Graham
 Granger
 Graves
 Green (TX)
 Greenwood
 Grucci
 Hall (TX)
 Hansen
 Hart
 Hastert
 Hayes
 Hayworth
 Hefley
 Herger
 Hilleary
 Hilliard
 Hinojosa
 Hobson
 Holden
 Horn
 Hostettler
 Houghton
 Hoyer
 Hunter
 Hutchinson
 Hyde
 Isakson
 Issa
 Istook
 Jenkins
 John
 Johnson (CT)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Keller
 Kelly
 Kennedy (MN)
 Kerns
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Knollenberg
 Kolbe
 LaHood
 Largent
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 LoBiondo
 Lucas (OK)
 Maloney (CT)
 Manzullo
 Mascara
 McCreery
 McHugh
 McInnis
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Myrick
 Nethercutt

Keller	Pence	Skeen
Kerns	Peterson (MN)	Skelton
King (NY)	Peterson (PA)	Smith (MI)
Kingston	Petri	Smith (NJ)
Kirk	Phelps	Smith (TX)
Knollenberg	Pickering	Snyder
Kolbe	Pitts	Souder
LaHood	Platts	Spratt
Latham	Pombo	Stearns
LaTourette	Portman	Stenholm
Levin	Pryce (OH)	Stump
Lewis (CA)	Putnam	Sununu
Lewis (KY)	Quinn	Sweeney
Linder	Radanovich	Tanner
LoBiondo	Regula	Tauscher
Lucas (OK)	Rehberg	Tauzin
Maloney (CT)	Reyes	Taylor (MS)
Mascara	Reynolds	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Riley	Terry
McHugh	Rogers (KY)	Thomas
McInnis	Rogers (MI)	Thornberry
McIntyre	Ros-Lehtinen	Thune
McKeon	Ross	Thurman
Menendez	Rothman	Tiahrt
Mica	Roukema	Tiberi
Miller (FL)	Royce	Trafficant
Miller, Gary	Ryan (WI)	Turner
Mollohan	Ryun (KS)	Vitter
Moran (KS)	Sanchez	Walden
Moran (VA)	Saxton	Walsh
Murtha	Schaffer	Wamp
Myrick	Schrock	Watkins (OK)
Nethercutt	Sensenbrenner	Watts (OK)
Ney	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Northup	Shadegg	Weldon (PA)
Norwood	Shaw	Weller
Nussle	Sherwood	Whitfield
Ortiz	Shimkus	Wicker
Osborne	Shows	Wilson
Ose	Shuster	Wolf
Otter	Simmons	Young (AK)
Oxley	Simpson	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Delahunt	Kilpatrick	Scarborough
Hastings (WA)	Lipinski	Spence

□ 1659

Mr. DICKS and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, due to official business in my District, I respectfully request a leave of absence for part of the day today, Tuesday, July 24, 2001. As a result of my absence, I missed recorded votes earlier today. Had I been present to vote I would have voted as follows on the following amendments to H.R. 2506, the fiscal year 2002 Foreign Operations Appropriations Bill: "Aye" on rollcall No. 260, the Visclosky amendment; "no" on rollcall No. 261, the Paul amendment; "aye" on rollcall No. 262, the Lee amendment; and "aye" on rollcall No. 263, the McGovern amendment.

□ 1700

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise for the purposes of entering into a colloquy with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), and for that purpose I would yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) for yielding to me, and I thank him for his leadership on this bill along with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mr. Chairman, after the tragic war in Bosnia, there are many children who

have lost their parents, been deserted, and have been left to fend for themselves. These are children who need and deserve a stable, safe environment where they can grow up and enjoy the support of a loving family. I strongly believe that we should support and work to help these children.

We must direct USAID to work with the Bosnian government to address the special needs of children at risk, especially orphans. These funds would be designed to support the Bosnian government to set up systems, mechanisms and/or institutions to, first, identify urgently homeless children and provide for their immediate care and protection; two, pursue reunification with other family members if possible; three, establish foster care and/or adoption arrangements; and, four, where appropriate, establish procedures that permit legitimate international adoption.

Like the Pearl S. Buck Initiative after the Korean War, we must work to establish an institutional structure to help our governments work in a cooperative manner for the good and well-being of the children.

Between now and conference, I hope that we will work together with the administrator at USAID in order to assess the scope of the problem of orphaned children of Bosnia. I strongly urge that this matter be considered in conference in order to ensure that USAID addresses the problem and work towards finding a solution. I urge USAID and other appropriate organizations such as UNICEF to address this really horrible stressful condition of many, many orphaned children in Bosnia. I also would like to compliment the work of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and his wife, Beverly, in working to help these children.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York for her comments and for bringing this matter to our attention and to say that I am in complete agreement with what she has said. I believe that Congress has to work with USAID to help assess the problem in Bosnia and Herzegovina and work to develop a solution.

I also just want to say that our full committee chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and his wife, Beverly, as was noted, have been working on this issue for many years. They have met with heads of state. They have met with other high officials in Bosnia and elsewhere in the region in attempts to get infants eligible for adoption, and I think they have had some very notable success. I will continue to work very closely with Chairman YOUNG and his wife on this matter as well and work with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and other Members who have this interest.

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. 2506) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2506, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during consideration of H.R. 2506 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 199 no further amendment to the bill may be offered except: (1), Pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate. (2), The amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 4, 7, 30, 33, 38, 44, and 59, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes each. (3), The amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 8, 11, 47, 50, 55, and 61, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes each. (4), The amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 5, 23, and 34, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes each. (5), The following amendments, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes each. The amendment printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 32. The amendment by Representative CONYERS of Michigan, that I have placed at the desk.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member designated in this request, the Member who caused it to be printed, or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment (except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, or a designee, each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of further debate on any pending amendment), and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. Points of order against the amendment numbered 44 and the amendment by Representative CONYERS for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the proposed Conyers amendment.