

We must be certain that the final agreement carries a legitimate chance for an enduring peace before we commit the vast American resources routinely mentioned as part of a settlement. Any meaningful peace agreement must be attractive to both parties independent of financial incentives. Further the U.S. must not force an untenable deal that delivers today's headlines at the expense of lasting peace.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS MOORE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 4811, the FY 2001 foreign operations appropriations bill. This bill is more than \$300 million below current funding levels and almost \$2 billion less than the Administration's request.

The allocation of resources in this bill will not enable our nation to carry out an effective foreign policy to meet our vital national security needs. The low levels of funding in key areas of this bill will hinder our ability to respond to and confront ongoing development around the world. Many countries around the world are undergoing rapid change; our nation now has an unique and unprecedented opportunity—and indeed, a responsibility—to provide global stability through the spread of democracy and the promise of economic growth.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to failing our vital foreign policy and national security objectives, this bill fails in responsibly allocating resources towards other critical priorities. While the overall request has been reduced by 10 percent, the amounts requested to address the problems of infectious disease, poverty alleviation, access to family planning, and debt relief in the world's poorest countries have been cut in a disproportionate manner:

The bill underfunds, by \$390 million, our commitment to provide debt relief to the world's poorest countries. The Jubilee 2000 campaign for debt relief, which received bipartisan support throughout the United States and with a broad spectrum of religious leaders and organizations.

The bill also reduces, by \$42 million, funds to combat worldwide HIV/AIDS.

The bill hinders developing nations' ability to grow by drastically cutting funds for the International Development Association, the African Development Bank and Fund and the Asian Development Fund by 32 percent.

This bill also cuts nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, de-mining, and related programs by 32 percent.

Finally, this bill cuts, by \$385 million, international family planning programs; and imposes restrictions on foreign organizations

which are contrary to our long-held constitutional principles of free speech.

There are, however, provisions in this bill that I strongly support. This bill includes increases for the Child Survival and Disease account and the Peace Corps, for example. The most important priority that this bill funds well, however, is the maintenance of our commitment to the state of Israel and the peace process in the Middle East.

Mr. Chairman, foreign aid should not be immune from scrutiny and budget cuts; however, it should not be the victim of skewed priorities. Indeed, robust and well-directed foreign assistance programs are essential for our national security. The process of building stability around the globe my combating infectious disease and poverty, working for conflict resolution, enhancing democratization, and fostering the conditions for economic growth ultimately benefits us all.

Unfortunately, the allocation of resources in this bill fails to recognize this fundamental fact, shortchanges our foreign policy goals, and undermines our national security. I will vote against this misguided bill today and urge my colleagues to do the same.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently was not present on the floor for a vote yesterday, July 17th, 2000.

If I had been present for rollcall No. 402 I would have voted "yes," and I extend my congratulations to the Republic of Latvia on its 10th anniversary.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. CAROLYN C. KILPATRICK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill. (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4811, the FY 2001 Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. I am deeply dismayed at the lack of funding for such critical, life-saving programs as debt relief, HIV/AIDS prevention and treatment, and international family planning.

At a time when many developing countries are consuming 30 to 40% of their annual budgets on debt repayment, they are simultaneously depleting monies that would be better spent on health care, education, and economic development. The Foreign Operations Appropriations bill for FY 2000 established clear and specific criteria which developing na-

tions must meet in order to qualify for debt relief. These conditions include performing satisfactorily under an economic reform program, promoting civil society participation, implementing anti-corruption measures and transparent policy making, adopting strategies for poverty reduction, and strengthening private sector growth, trade, and investment. New governments in nations such as Bolivia and Mozambique are succeeding in their concentrated efforts to democratize and stabilize their respective countries, and have met the qualifying standards for debt relief. It is unjust to continue to punish the poorest civilians for debts incurred and for promises unfulfilled by former dictators.

Nearly four decades of economic development, particularly on the continent of Africa, are currently unraveling before our eyes. The proposed funding level in H.R. 4811 of \$202 million—\$42 million less than the President's request—is simply not sufficient to effectively combat the HIV/AIDS pandemic at its current growth rate. The global AIDS crisis is a threat of unprecedented magnitude, and it has been unsparing in its attack on the world's children. UNAID reports that more than 3.8 million children under 15 have already perished as a result of AIDS. An additional 1700 children per day are newly infected with HIV and join the 1.3 million who are currently living with the disease. The U.S. Census estimates that the life expectancy in many Sub-Saharan African countries will fall to age 30 within the next 10 years.

This indiscriminate plague gravely affects even children fortunate enough not to have contracted the disease themselves, by rendering them orphans—13.2 million to date. The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) has estimated that by the year 2010, there will be 42 million AIDS-related orphans, many of whom will be susceptible to abuse or recruitment into gangs or militia.

In addition to the horrific and exponential increase in suffering and loss of human life, HIV/AIDS inevitably will have an enormous and devastating impact on future economic development, political stability, trade and commerce, and international security. Since effective medical research and counseling intervention have been proven to drastically reduce the mother-to-child transmission rate of HIV around the globe, from the United States to Thailand, there is absolutely no excuse not to help fund these vital programs.

As world experts meet this week in Durban, South Africa for the 13th International HIV/AIDS Conference, we must do our part in this country and in this bill to alleviate the unimaginable suffering that HIV/AIDS is causing in the developing world.

A crucial element of reducing the prevalence of HIV/AIDS is adequate access to family planning resources and information. Pregnancy, childbirth, and unsafe abortions claim the lives of 600,000 women annually, primarily due to early and frequent childbearing and poor access to health care and contraception. Family planning helps prevent high-risk and unwanted pregnancies and reduces the spread of sexually transmitted diseases and life-threatening infections such as HIV/AIDS. The Administration's request for a \$169 million increase to USAID population assistance would likely result in 1.5 million fewer unintended births; 2.2 million fewer abortions;

15,000 fewer maternal deaths; and 92,000 fewer infant deaths.

I oppose this bill because it does not provide assistance to the women and families that most need our help. H.R. 4811 hinders the dissemination of accurate and complete reproductive information for women in developing countries by limiting which family planning options foreign NGOs may discuss with their clients. Under this bill, even organizations that use their own funds to engage in pro-choice lobbying efforts to provide abortions, or to even discuss this reproductive option will not be eligible for U.S. funding. I cannot morally support a measure such as this, that would not withstand constitutional scrutiny within our own country.

With the understanding that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure", I would encourage my colleagues to seriously consider the moral, social, and economic ramifications of not providing aid when we, as a nation, are clearly in a position to do so.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Foreign Operations bill. We can and must do better.

INDIA IS A VALUABLE PARTNER
FOR THE UNITED STATES

SPEECH OF

HON. ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 13, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4811) making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Burton Amendment to Restrict aid to India.

Each time that this amendment has been offered in previous years, the House has resoundingly voted it down. I expect that it will meet with a similar fate this time.

Strengthening our partnership with India needs to be a fundamental part of America's strategy in Asia. This amendment would damage U.S.-India relations at a time when our countries are cooperating on a number of issues of interest to us both.

Earlier this year, President Clinton traveled to India, in affirmation of the ties that bind our nations together. India is on the front lines of the battle against terrorism. In light of this, the Government of India committed to the President during his visit that India would work closely with the United States to combat terrorism. The joint U.S./India working group on terrorism established during the President's visit can help both our nations counter this threat. Cutting assistance to India would put this cooperation at risk just as it is getting off the ground.

Furthermore, India has acted responsibly to deal with conflict with her neighbors, showing restraint when provoked during the Kargil crisis and later when terrorists seized an Indian airlines flight and hijacked it to Afghanistan. The conduct of the Indian Government when faced with these immediate threats demonstrates that India is a reliable strategic partner.

But the U.S./India relationship goes deeper than just strategic need. India is the world's largest democracy, a natural partner for the world's oldest democracy, the United States. India provides an example for the rest of Asia of how democracy and free market economic growth can go hand in hand.

And contrary to what some may contend, India has a long tradition of harmony among people of different backgrounds and faiths. India is the original melting pot, and like our own nation, derives strength from its diversity.

We have witnessed the strength of these values through the Indian-Americans who have come to settle in this country. My hometown of Chicago is home to a vibrant Indian-American community. Indian-Americans in Chicago add to the richness of our neighborhoods, and community leaders such as Dr. Bharat Barai, Mr. Bhagu Patel, Dr. Vijay Dave and Mr. Niranjana Shah have shown their neighbors that the values of tolerance and respect they brought with them from India are the same values we cherish here in the United States.

Cutting off the meager, amount of assistance to India in this bill would not save the United States a great deal of money. It would, however, hinder our ability to reduce poverty and build lasting cultural and economic relationships with the people of India.

It would also send a dangerous message to the world about America's commitment to democracy abroad. If we, as Americans, want democracy to flourish around the globe, then we must support democracies when we have the chance. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and support our partnership with India.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, July 18, 2000, I was granted a leave of absence for official business which I was undertaking in my district in Hawaii.

Four recorded votes were taken yesterday. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: rollcall 401, H. Res. 534, Security at Los Alamos, "yes"; rollcall 402, H. Con. Res. 319, Latvia 10th Independence Anniversary, "yes"; rollcall 403, H. Res. 531, Condemn 1994 Bombing of Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, "yes"; rollcall 404, H.R. 3125, Internet Gambling Prohibition Act, "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 12, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and as a result missed Rollcall vote No. 395. If I were present, I would have voted "Aye."

MORE DOCUMENTATION OF
EXCESSIVE RX PRICES

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 18, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, prescription drug prices are too high for the uninsured and the average retail customer who has to buy prescriptions on their own.

How much too high?

For generics at least 57 percent too high. For single source brand name drugs, about 32 percent too high, and for multi-source drugs, about 39 percent too high.

Says who?

A new Medicare survey of what hospitals actually pay for drugs compared to what the so-called Average Wholesale Price is. HCFA is issuing a new regulation on how to pay hospitals under the Hospital Outpatient Department (HOPD) prospective payment system. As part of that new regulation, they had to figure out what the beneficiaries' 20 percent co-payment should be. Instead of foolishly taking the Average Wholesale Price as a gauge of what to apply the 20 percent co-pay against, HCFA wisely sampled what the actual acquisition cost of drugs are, then developed an average formula to calculate the 20 percent the seniors and disabled would owe. Following is the discussion from the Federal Register of April 7th.

This is all more proof that the uninsured and those who are buying drugs at retail need help getting the purchasing power of large groups. The Democratic Prescription drug bill, H.R. 4770, would help seniors get the kind of discounts we know that hospitals are getting. The savings to seniors will be phenomenal!

A one-time exception to the general methodology described above pertains to current drugs and biologicals that will be eligible for transitional pass-throughs when the PPS is implemented. For this final rule, we revised many APC groups by removing, to the extent possible, many of these drugs and radiopharmaceuticals. Therefore, the payment rates for the APC groups with which these drugs are associated exclude the costs of these drugs and the total amount paid to hospitals for the drugs will be 95 percent of the applicable AWP. In order to be able to determine a coinsurance amount for these drugs, we needed to estimate what portion of this payment would have been included as part of the APC payment amount associated with these drugs and what portion would be the pass-through amount. Using an external survey of hospitals' drug acquisition costs, we determined the APC payment amount for many of these drugs as their average acquisition cost adjusted to year 2000 dollars. Where valid cost data were not available for individual drugs, we applied the following average ratios of acquisition cost to AWP calculated from the survey to determine the fee schedule amount: .68 for drugs with one manufacturer, .61 for multi-source drugs, and .43 multi-source drugs with generic competitors. In either case, the coinsurance amounts were determined as 20 percent of these fee schedule amounts. It is important to note that these estimates do not affect the total payment to hospitals for these drugs (95 percent of AWP).