

share our treasure, our time, and our talents with truly needy people.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from California and the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my distinguished colleague for yielding to me, and since he may not participate in the debate on the bill itself, I wished to publicly pay tribute to his leadership role on this most important issue.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). I appreciate that very much.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no speakers at the present time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has, since she has been a Member of Congress, been totally committed to trying to alleviate AIDS in the world and has been the leader in legislation with reference to this problem, and certainly working with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), has been directly involved in this particular piece of legislation.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, for yielding me this time and for his leadership and his assistance and guidance throughout this entire process.

Since I have been here in Congress and since 1998, we began to introduce and bring forward to this Congress the notion, really, of an AIDS Marshall Plan, which former Congressman Ron Dellums, my predecessor, conceived, brought to us, and indicated why the Congress should begin to go on record to take the lead in the world to fight this global pandemic.

I would like to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and our ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for their leadership and for making sure that this continues to be a bipartisan effort. This is not really a political issue. Both gentlemen have made sure that throughout this overall process that the people and their needs and the issues with regard to this pandemic stayed foremost in our mind and would not allow us to break down into our partisan squabbles that oftentimes we break down into. So I thank them both for their leadership.

I would like to now talk just a little bit about the Uganda model of success, which is, of course, the model the President has cited as the model he is looking to to address this pandemic in this bill, and also why I believe the 33

percent set-aside offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) is an amendment that goes counter to what the President's intentions and stated reasons for moving forward in the Uganda fashion.

First of all, each country, each village, each organization knows what strategies work best in terms of how they address this pandemic. This pandemic is killing so many people, there are so many orphans, there is so much disaster on the continent of Africa, that we have to marshal each and every effective way to stop it. So we should not in any way constrain this bill to a 33 percent set-aside that places for the most part abstinence as a priority.

Again, this flies in the face of what our agreement was in committee, and that is the ABC approach, which is the Uganda approach: abstinence, be faithful, use a condom. The three-pronged approach should be balanced, is balanced, and should be the approach we use in this bill. I do not know why this requirement now, after our committee debate and committee discussion, would be put into the bill when we know the President has called for all three approaches. In fact, the Washington Times today indicated its support for the three-pronged approach and not for us prioritizing one versus the others.

And let me just read what the Uganda model really is. I do not think we should be misled or misinformed about what Uganda is doing. Sophia Monico, who was the director of TASO, which is Uganda's premier HIV/AIDS group, said, and this is quoted in The New York Times article, she said: "It is so unfair to pull out one element of a bigger picture, a very small percentage of the whole picture, and say 'this is what works.'" She goes on to say that "Uganda is indeed a model for nations fighting AIDS, but it is not quite the model the religious right would like to believe. Ugandans are responding to a campaign known as ABC, which says: Abstain. If you can't abstain, be faithful. If you can't be faithful, use a condom. Contrary to the assertions," the article goes on to say, "of Mr. PITTS and others, there is really nothing unusual about this slogan."

The WHO has sanctioned this. This is the standard public health approach to prevent sexually transmitted diseases. And so, Mr. Speaker, today, as we debate this bill, I hope Members of Congress will understand that setting aside 33 percent for abstinence only flies in the face of ABC. It flies in the face of the Uganda model. It does us a disservice as we put forward this very good bill to now take a step backwards and put a requirement on our organizations that makes no sense, that will not work, and, quite frankly, that was defeated in committee.

So I want to see this move forward in a way I know the President wants to see it move forward, and that is the ABC approach, the standard multi-

faceted approach that gives all three approaches equal weight.

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

Mr. Speaker, precisely because issues like these are so important and need to be discussed is why we have made them in order in the Committee on Rules for discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to something in the committee report that I consider an error, and I would like to make a suggestion so that it might not occur again. This particular legislation, not the rule as much as the legislation, I am not in support of for various reasons.

□ 1045

One, I think the odds are very slim that it is going to do a whole lot of good. It is very well-intended. I am a physician, and I cannot think of anything better than to wipe out AIDS in Africa, or in the United States, for that matter. But \$15 billion going to Africa on a questionable program bothers me because at the same time, we are cutting benefits to our veterans and also the elderly have a hard time getting medical care here. So there is a practical argument against the legislation.

In the bill and in the amendments, there is a lot of social engineering going on. I think if we are going to do any social engineering or social suggestions, it ought to be here and we ought not be naive enough to think we can change habits that exist in Africa.

But the point I wanted to bring up is the authority for doing programs like this. We have a rule in the House that we have to cite the constitutional authority, for the legislation we're dealing with. The committee report cites the authority from a very important section of the Constitution, article I, section 8, because literally we, the Congress, get our marching orders from article I, section 8, which is the section of the Constitution relating to making all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested by the Constitution.

Well, that is where the shortcoming comes because if we read the Constitution, at the end of article I, section 8, it says, "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers." Therefore, the "necessary and proper" clause is explicitly designed to give the authority to write the laws for the foregoing powers. Believe me, we will not find any authority in article I, section 8 for dealing with medical care problems in Africa.

I find it interesting here because quite often one side of the aisle when they do not like legislation will use my

argument in this case, and other times it is the other side of the aisle. So everybody makes my argument one time or the other. My suggestion is if the Constitution means anything, and if article I, section 8 means anything, it ought to be applied across the board or we ought to change the Constitution and say this is a mandate from the American people that we should pursue missionary work in Africa.

But most likely nobody is going to propose a change in the Constitution, the Constitution will not be changed, so the Congress chooses to ignore the Constitution when it feel like it; therefore, we have reduced the Constitution to something that has very little value anymore.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) who has stood out on this issue for all the time he and I have served here in Congress.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time and for his leadership on this issue.

It is very good to stand here in support of a bipartisan bill that addresses some of the real problems in the world today. Particularly in the wake of the situation in Iraq, it is important for the United States to show the world that we care about the big problems that affect other people in other countries as well as issues that affect American interests.

Let me take a moment to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her leadership. If anyone in this body has stood up on this issue, it is the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). This is truly a bipartisan bill. I would also like to applaud the President because he has pushed this issue \$15 billion to fight AIDS in Africa. I think that is a very good thing.

I hasten to note that many of these programs started under the Clinton administration, and for years, Democratic activists have been fighting for additional money to fight AIDS in Africa. I intend to support this bill; however, the rule allows amendments which I believe are problems.

Some of my conservative brethren come to this debate and argue that we ought to give more priority to abstinence. In a tone of some self-righteousness they suggest that abstinence ought to be the preferred method, and that this reflects American values. I think on the issue of fighting AIDS, the American value is saving as many lives as we possibly can. And for that reason when later today we have this amendment to prioritize and single out abstinence, I am going to oppose it.

I think our responsibility is to make resources available to be used in the best, most efficient way possible. Abstinence does have merit, I will be the first to say that. And where it can be

used effectively and advocated to young people, I would support that. But to say that abstinence should get a specific share of the money, even if it is not the most effective proposal, does not make sense. The American value is to save lives.

Now, it seems to me that we ought to use all available approaches and use our money most effectively and most efficiently. My conservative colleagues say look at the Uganda model. And as the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) just pointed out, they have somewhat distorted it. They would have us believe that Uganda, which has been very successful in reducing AIDS, primarily relies on abstinence. That is not true.

It is true that Uganda has been successful in reducing infection rates from 26 percent to 6 percent over a 20-year period. It is not true that they rely solely or even primarily on abstinence. Abstinence is only part of their Anti-aids program. In fact, Ugandans used 80 million condoms last year. 80 million condoms. Condom use by prostitutes in Kampala, the capital city of Uganda, has increased from zero to 95 percent. It has been proven that condom use is an important part of the program.

What we are saying today is that we need to include all approaches: Abstinence, faithfulness, and condom use, and not single out any particular approach. Let the affected communities in Africa decide what works best and spend the money accordingly. If we do that, this is truly a great bill and we should be proud to support it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) who also has been in the leadership on this matter and serves on the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of what transpired in the Committee on International Relations this last couple of months in moving this legislation forward. It was reported out of committee by an overwhelming bipartisan majority, and it shows what we can do when we come together in a bipartisan fashion. I commend the administration for its support of a creative solution for the HIV-AIDS epidemic that Members from both parties can support.

It has been referenced that some of our colleagues have interpreted ABC as "anything but condoms," and we are going to talk about that on the floor as various amendments come forward; but I think it is critical that we take a step back and not put a political agenda ahead of a program with proven success.

I hope that my colleagues can withhold their desire to impose their standards on hundreds of millions of people that live in different countries with different cultures, in wildly different communities. There is too much at risk for global health, which certainly includes our own in this country. Addressing the AIDS epidemic, tuber-

culosis, and malaria not only benefits the health of those individuals, it is going to stabilize communities and regions that are devastating. And, yes, it is going to help us at home as we work to alleviate global issues of health, safety and security.

The SARS epidemic provides the most recent, graphic, current example of the need to address epidemics at a global level before they affect us here in America. I hope we can reflect not just on the hard work of the administration, our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), active leaders like the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), but reflect on how when the legislative process works when we put the imperative of problem solving ahead of political concerns.

We have more at stake these days than just dealing with the AIDS epidemic. I hope that this will be a template not just moving forward in this critical area, important as it is, but this is the way that we can solve homeland security issues, economic issues, and the great issues on the international arena as well.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our friends who were there, and I urge adoption of the rule and moving forward with approval of this and then going home this weekend thinking about what we have accomplished, how we have done it and where we can take it from here.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS). I reiterate and strongly believe there are few things that we could do more important than what we are going to do today. I am very proud to have been able to bring forward this rule to provide for consideration of this extraordinarily important legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

---

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill H.R. 1298, which we are about to consider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.