United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 1999 No. 47

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As we walk the paths of life and as we attempt to view the road ahead, we pray, almighty God, that Your spirit will encourage us along that journey and support us all the day long. We know that our hearts grow weary and we need strength; we know that our minds lose the discernment needed for the future and we need vision; we know that we miss the mark and we hunger for forgiveness and a new start. Wherever we are or whatever we do, we pray for Your presence, O God, and for Your enduring peace. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 92. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 251 North Main Street in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, as the ''Hiram H. Ward Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 158. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 316 North 26th Street in Billings, Montana, as the ''James F. Battin United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 233. An act to designate the Federal building located at 700 East San Antonio Street in El Paso, Texas, as the ''Richard C. White Federal Building''.

H.R. 396. An act to designate the Federal building located at 1301 Clay Street in Oakland, California, as the ''Ronald V. Dellums Federal Building''.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 67. An act to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Washington, District of Columbia, as the ''Robert C. Weaver Federal Building''.

S. 437. An act to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 333 Las Vegas Boulevard South in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the ''Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse''.

S. 453. An act to designate the Federal building located at 709 West 9th Street in Juneau, Alaska, as the ''Hurff A. Saunders Federal Building''.

S. 460. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 401 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, as the ''Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse''.

S. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution authorizing the President of the United States to conduct military air operations and missile strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

WE NEED STRAIGHT ANSWERS FROM OUR ADMINISTRATION AND FROM OUR COMMANDER IN CHIEF

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, on a day when American men and women in uniform may go into harm's way, headlines scream of Kosovo. That is a concern, but there are also concerns this morning in North Korea.

The Washington Times reports this morning, and I quote, ''Vital parts of a 50-megawatt North Korean nuclear reactor have been missing since international inspectors first visited the site under the terms of a 1994 nuclear-freeze pact with the United States.

''The absence of the reactor parts, which could be used to construct another reactor, was known by some State Department officials but was never disclosed to Congress.''

Mr. Speaker, on a morning when people may go into harm's way, the State Department did not notify us of this Korean breach. The Energy Department did not notify us of an espionage breach.

We need straight answers from our administration and from our commander in chief.

GHB INCIDENT—THE DEATH OF KERRI BRETON

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I too, offer godspeed as we make our decisions on Kosova.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to talk again about GHB, a dangerous drug that has destroyed the lives of some of our young women and young people in this country.

I have introduced a bill, the Hillory F. Farias Date Rape Drug Prevention Act, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), who has also introduced a bill.

I would like to share the story of a young woman named Kerri Breton, who also died as a result of GHB poisoning.

Printed on recycled paper.

This young, 26-year-old single mother died last May after she ingested a GHB laced drink while on a business trip.

She was a vibrant young woman who had worked hard for most of her life to achieve, despite the setbacks she had faced. She lost her mother to cancer when she was 13 and she had a child while in high school. However, Kerri was able to get her GED and at the time of her death she worked at an insurance firm where she had just received her insurance license.

On the night of her death, Kerri was on a business trip in Syracuse, New York. She had drinks with a colleague and then went to her room. The next morning, her roommate found Kerri dead on the bathroom floor. There is still a murder investigation going on to determine how this drug got into Kerri's drink.

We must commit to passing legislation that will schedule GHB.

I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) for sharing this story with me. Kerri Breton was a resident of his district in New York, and this tragic story was sent by Ms. Breton's stepfather, Roger Voight. The gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) has recently joined us as a cosponsor of this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to immediately have hearings on scheduling GHB and for this House to pass this legislation expeditiously so that we can save the lives of young people like Kerri Breton and give tribute to the loss of their lives and avoid these tragedies in the years to come.

NO MORE SOCIAL SECURITY SLUSH FUND

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, while the White House is busy working on a plausible explanation as to how atomic espionage at Energy Department labs was ignored over the last 3 years, Republicans have been busy putting together a budget that reflects responsible common sense conservative values.

For 40 years, the Democrats failed to take Social Security off the table, turning the Social Security Administration trust fund into a Washington slush fund. Well, those days are over. The Republican budget is going to do what should have been done a long time ago. It puts the Social Security surplus into a safe deposit box.

Long-time observers of Washington know that we need a safe deposit box to keep big spending liberals from running off with it. The Social Security trust fund should not be a slush fund. The Republican budget takes 100 percent of the retirement surplus and sets it aside for Social Security and Medicare.

We are going to hang a huge sign on the safe deposit box with a message, ''no liberals allowed. Do not touch.''

DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE BUDGET

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to offer prayers and hope for our situation that we face today in Kosova.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the democratic alternative budget, a budget that extends Social Security until the year 2050 and saves Medicare, which will run out of money in 2008 unless we do save it.

I am happy that the Democrats are proposing 77 percent for Social Security and to save Medicare to the year 2020. We also fully fund the President's education request. The other budget resolution does not. We offer money for child care. The other budget resolution does not.

Mr. Speaker, we offer $1.9 billion for our veterans and their families. Let us support the democratic budget alternative that saves Social Security and Medicare, helps our veterans, helps our children as we move to the 21st Century.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET ACTUALLY EXPANDS ENTITLEMENT SPENDING

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, how soon we forget. President Clinton just 3 years ago proposed a five year budget that would have added $1.2 trillion to the national debt. That is $200 billion deficits every year for as far as the eye could see.

The Republicans said no.

They said no to big government.

They said no to using phony numbers.

They said no to a national health care system that his own party admitted would have pushed the deficit into the stratosphere.

So Congress insisted on passing a bipartisan budget that balanced and kept the lid on spending.

Well here we go again. It is back to budget-busting time.

Once again, it is going to be up to Congress to act like grownups and keep the lid on spending.

The President's budget actually expands entitlement spending, puts the Medicare program in jeopardy only one year after we acted to save it, and goes back to tax increases that hurt the economy.

Tax and spend, tax and spend. No matter how good the White House can spin it, and they are very good, this budget is a tax and spend budget that takes us in the wrong direction.

COUNTRIES ALL OVER THE WORLD ARE DUMPING IN AMERICA'S MARKETS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. trade deficit is projected to exceed $200 billion this year. Japan will once again exceed $60 billion in surplus. If that is not enough to tax your exports, China is expected to take a $70 billion chunk of money in trade surplus from Uncle Sam. Unbelievable.

Countries all over the world are dumping in our markets. Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. If our trade policy is so good, why does not Japan do it? Why does not China do it? Why does not Europe do it?

The truth is, our trade policy is about as effective as tits on a boar hog.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back our stupidity and I yield back our other cheeks.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN INDIA

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about human rights abuses in India today.

As we may know, Christians and other religious minorities have faced terrible persecution in India recently. In January, an extremist mob burned alive an Australian missionary and his two sons who were trapped in their car.

This is not the first instance of persecution. Over Christmas, churches throughout India were burned and destroyed. Christians' homes were looted and stoned, and Christian individuals were attacked and stoned.

In January, missionaries and seminary students were attacked and beaten with rods. Then just last week, an extremist Hindu group called Vishwa Hindu burned 150 Christian homes in Orissa's Gajapati District and terrorized the Christian community with homemade guns.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Indian government to take decisive action to stop this continuing violence and bring to justice those who have committed the crimes, and protect the rights of all minority religious believers in India.

STOP THE KILLING IN KOSOVA NOW

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I apologize in advance to my colleagues and to the American people who may be offended by what I am about to show but I think it is very, very important in view of the events of today that we show this.

This is a poster. It shows a dead child who was killed with ethnic cleansing in

Kosova, and it says his mother will never have to see him this way. They killed her, too.

My colleagues, this is what is going on today in Kosova, and I say Kosova because 92 percent of the population, the ethnic Albanians who live there, call it Kosova and they were being ethnically cleansed.

We need to stop it. We need to support the bombing. We need to support NATO troops on the ground. NATO is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. It is concerned about genocide in Europe as it rightly should be.

Milosevic, the Serbian leader, has broken every agreement to which he has agreed. The U.S. vital interests are there. We have a vital interest to stop genocide. We have a vital interest to stop a wider war which will surely happen in the Balkans if we sit back and do nothing. It could suck in our allies, Greece and Turkey and Hungary and other countries.

We need to support U.S. troops. We need to support the bombing. Stop the killing in Kosova now. Stop the genocide and the ethnic cleansing.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET CONTRASTED WITH THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, let us compare and contrast the Republican budget with the President's budget.

The Republican's budget saves more for Social Security and Medicare. The President's budget cuts $9 billion from Medicare.

The Republican budget enforces balanced budget discipline. The President's budget busts the budget caps by $30 billion.

The Republican budget provides middle class tax relief. The President's budget, surprise, surprise, raises taxes by $172 billion.

One budget reflects the common sense conservatism of responsible government that gives people more freedom and a higher standard of living. The other budget reflects the instinct to expand government at every turn, all the while shortchanging our seniors.

The Republican budget strengthens retirement security first. It protects seniors and sticks to the historic balanced budget agreement signed by the President only 2 short years ago.

This is a budget Americans can applaud.

HERSHEY, PENNSYLVANIA, A LOT OF TALK AND A LOT OF CHALK

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

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, like a lot of my colleagues, I went up to Hershey, Pennsylvania, had a lot of talk and a lot of chalk. We went up to talk about how we are going to restore civility in this body. We talked about unfair allocation of staff and money. We talked about unfair committee ratios, the most unfair in 50 years.

We did not talk about the unfortunate thing that happened this morning, and that is the unavailability of rooms for Democratic members to meet in this body.

Now we can talk about the prerogatives of the Chair and the Republicans to run this place. I do not have any quarrel and I do not really expect to win, but I do expect to have fair treatment and a fair opportunity to talk.

The question is, are the Republicans going to mean what they said about restoring civility?

□ 1015

Yesterday we came back and voted on staff and money, an unfair allocation of both. But to just say that they cannot make rooms available for the Democrats to meet, it looks like the preponderance of the growing evidence is the Republicans do not intend to be fair, and that the spirit of Hershey has gone.

THE REPUBLICAN PLAN SETS ASIDE 100 PERCENT OF BUDGET SURPLUS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, last fall the President said we should set aside 100 percent of social security for social security. I voted to support him in that. But in January he stood here at the State of the Union and said, no, we are going to put aside 62 percent for social security. Then in February he submitted a budget that said 57 percent for social security. And then if we look at his proposal, he really sets aside zero for social security. In five months we have gone from 100 percent to 62 percent to 57 percent to zero, and that has been the history of social security.

There are a lot of different opinions about how we ought to reform social security, but every single senior that I talked to in Montana says, let us start by stopping the raid on the social security trust fund.

There are three ways to do that. One, today, let us support a supplemental that is offset, so we do not raid social security for foreign aid. Let us support the budget, that sets aside 100 percent of social security for social security. Then let us support the social security and Medicare safe deposit box, where there be no more raids, not for tax cuts or spending increases. No more shell games. We are going to save every dollar, 100 percent for social security. We can start today.

THE SPIRIT OF HERSHEY: RESPECT FOR DIFFERENCES OF OPINION

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I truly hope that the spirit of Hershey is not gone already. Last weekend we had the second congressional bipartisan civility retreat in Hershey, Pennsylvania. We tried, in short, to come together to find a way where we can still disagree on issues without being so disagreeable.

I believe we made some progress last weekend. But to be on the safe side, we were honored to have with us Sir John Hume, the Nobel Peace prize winner of last year, due to his role in negotiating the peace agreement in Northern Ireland. We were hoping to get some wise words from him. I believe he delivered.

He reminded us in attendance that, ''Differences of opinion should not be viewed as a threat. The answer to difference is not to fight about it but to respect it, for the differences are the essence of humanity, because there are no two people in the world who are the same.''

As we begin debates that seriously affect the Nation and our future, such as Kosovo, such as the budget, I would hope and pray that we remember these wise words from Sir John Hume.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET IS HONEST ABOUT OUR NATION'S RETIREMENT SECURITY

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, this week we are going to debate two clearly different visions of America. As Members know, we are going to debate the budget that will be presented for the year 2000.

The President's budget would raise taxes on the middle class of America, it busts the budget caps, and it uses the social security surplus to fund over 120 new government programs. Worst of all, after leaving the Nation's retirement in shaky financial shape, this president is proposing taxes on the middle class' number one guarantee for retirement security, life insurance.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that taxpayers that have been faithful and honest about preparing for their retirement should not see this being taxed. Conversely, this Republican Congress has a taxpayer-friendly budget that protects 100 percent of social security and Medicare surpluses. It practices budgetary constraints, and provides over $800 billion for tax relief for all middle class taxpayers.

I intend to vote for that which is for Republicans and for the taxpayers of this country.

CALLING ON MR. MILOSEVIC TO SEEK A DIPLOMATIC SOLUTION

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, few people have suffered as much during the Second World War as did the people of Serbia. I am calling on Mr. Milosevic, who has brought so much anguish and hardship and trouble to his own people, to take these last moments before NATO is unleashing horrendous power and bringing further destruction to his people.

All through the 1960s and 1970s, Yugoslavia was the freest and most prosperous country in Central and Eastern Europe and the Balkans. It is now a basket case. It is a police state.

There is still some time for Milosevic to come to his senses and call off his madness. He cannot stand up to NATO. He can still call for a diplomatic solution, and we are ready to deal if he is. But the Serbian people and the people of Yugoslavia have suffered too long under his dictatorship.

URGING MEMBERS TO COSPONSOR REAUTHORIZATION OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago Congress passed the landmark Violence Against Women Act and changed the way this Nation addresses the crimes of domestic violence and sexual assault.

Today, because of that, there are more investigations and prosecutions with stiffer penalties, including life sentences for those who cross State lines to commit domestic violence. Communities across the country are training police officers on how best to respond to family violence calls.

Today there is a National Domestic Violence Hotline, which provides a lifeline to the more than 8,000 callers each month. There are more shelters and counseling services provided for the women and children who are faced with danger in their own homes. Children who experience domestic violence have stronger advocates and support within the judicial system. These programs have made a significant difference in the health and happiness of hundreds of thousands of women and children and families.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the 5-year reauthorization of the programs under the Violence Against Women Act. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsorship. There is no excuse for domestic violence.

FAIRNESS MUST BE PRACTICED WITH RESPECT TO APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago, with strong Democratic support, the House of Representatives, in a bipartisan way, passed the education flexibility bill. This bill is about old values and new ideas: old values of local control of our schools, new ideas of added flexibility for increased student performance.

When we appointed conferees to this bill last night, our leadership did not appoint a single Democrat who supported the bill on the House Floor. We had a majority of Democrats support the bill in committee, a majority of Democrats support the bill on the House Floor, but yet no Democrats who supported the bill were appointed to conference and supported the bill on the House Floor.

We can talk about Republican and Democratic civility and fairness, we can talk about better ratios and funding, but we need to practice that fairness with our appointments to conference.

In Abraham Lincoln's words, with malice towards none, with charity toward all, these need to be reflected outside our party and within our party.

THE VETERANS' BUDGET

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, growing up, one thing I learned from my father, a veteran of the Second World War, was that when you shake hands and make a promise with someone, you stick to it. This might seem a little old-fashioned, but it is a value I will never forget.

Our servicemen and women enlist in the Armed Forces with a simple understanding. To their country they pledge their youth, their dedication, and if need be, their lives. In return, their country promises that veterans will have some basic needs provided for when they leave active service.

The Clinton-Gore administration has broken this promise to our Nation's veterans. The administration's budget neglects our veterans' health care needs. The VA faces cost increases of more than $1 billion, and a shortfall of more than $100 million in medical insurance collections. In other words, our veterans are shortchanged by $1 billion under the President's budget.

If we add those costs up with the Clinton-Gore proposal, do we know what that amounts to? Disaster. Our veterans deserve better. That is why I support the largest increase in history for VA medical care over the administration's budget request. The majority's $1 billion increase over the Clinton-Gore budget for veterans will head off predicted closures of needed VA facilities. This is our promise to veterans, and we are going to keep it.

CENSUS UNDERCOUNT

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an accurate Census, and the use of adjusted data to compensate for the chronic undercount of people that occurs in each Census.

In 1990, the Census missed almost 21,000 people in my congressional district in Orange County. This is the equivalent of over $54 million lost over a 10-year period. Only nine of California's 52 congressional districts were more undercounted than my own. We lost a lot of money, and we pay taxes.

In the city of Anaheim, my own hometown, we were undercounted by over 7,000 people, and as a result, Anaheim lost $1.5 million in Federal funding, job training, law enforcement, emergency shelters. These were all underfunded because we were not getting our Federal dollars. It would have made our streets safer, we would have had shelter for the homeless, we could have trained the unemployed.

I urge my colleagues to support the use of adjusted Census data, and challenge them to make all Americans count.

THE CRISIS IN KOSOVO

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise with a heavy heart. I would like to talk about the budget, saving social security, saving Medicare, but I think the crisis in Kosovo demands our attention.

The Constitution says, ''We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States.''

Article 1, section 8, says ''The Congress shall have the power to declare war.'' I wonder when we are going to accept responsibility for our actions and debate a declaration of war when we are about ready to bomb a sovereign state. If we want to do that, let us accept our responsibilities, and let us do it as a body.

Until that time, let us not hide behind the curtains or the skirts of the President of the United States under the War Powers declaration. Let us get some guts and let us fight for freedom.

LET US FULLY FUND THE BUDGET TO PROVIDE FOR VETERANS' NEEDS

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, as the sound of war today reverberates throughout this Chamber, let us take this opportunity to make sure that we do not forget about the veterans of past wars, the men and women who have put their lives on the line defending this country.

Frankly, the President's budget is grossly inadequate in terms of protecting veterans' needs, as is the Republican budget. In the State of Vermont, the Veterans Administration hospital at White River Junction is under significant financial pressure, and that is true at VA hospitals all over this country.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when some are proposing huge tax breaks for some of the richest people in this country, let us not forget the veterans.

Let us, in this budget process, go well beyond the President's budget for veterans, well beyond the Republicans' budget for veterans, and finally provide the true funding that the Veterans Administration needs to protect those people who put their lives on the line defending this country.

INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 30, TO KEEP EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY WITHIN THE BOUNDS OF THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, many Members of Congress are deeply concerned about the use of executive orders. The public is legitimately concerned also. The courts have improperly given executive orders the force and effect of law. We must get executive orders back into harmony with the Constitution.

I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 30, with quite a few sponsors. The second sponsor is the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HENRY HYDE). That will accomplish this.

It states that ''Any executive order that infringes on the powers and duties of Congress is advisory only, and has no force or effect.'' We must pass House Concurrent Resolution 30, and make certain that executive authority is kept clearly within the bounds of the Constitution.

THE BUDGET, MEDICARE, AND SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am really here to talk today about the budget, Medicare, and social security. We have the opportunity to show the American people that we can work together and agree on a budget resolution. While it is important that we continue the effort to balance the budget, we need to ensure that programs that benefit the American people the most are protected and strengthened.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle keep talking about tax cuts, and all of us like to give tax cuts, but I do not want to do it at the expense of social security, Medicare, or the educational opportunities for our children.

□ 1030

We cannot risk these valuable programs simply to give tax cuts. It is critical to have a budget that ensures national projects like the expansion of the Port of Houston in my district. The Port of Houston is important, not only to our Nation, but also locally because dredging the channel ensures safety for many of our residents.

It is our responsibility to take the necessary steps to have a budget that saves and protects Medicare, Social Security, education and projects like the Port of Houston.

SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND ROBBERY

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

Mr. COOKSEY. Mr. Speaker, Lenox Lewis may have been robbed in his recent boxing match, but his experience is nothing compared to the robbery of the Social Security Trust Fund over the past 40 years. It is happening in broad daylight, and the robbers have nowhere to hide. It is time to stop the robbery.

The Republican budget puts the Social Security Trust Fund in a safe deposit box so that the plundering of the Trust Fund will stop. The President will have a hard time finding money to pay for the 85 new spending initiatives in his budget proposal. That is 85 new ways to make a mockery of the Social Security Trust Fund the way the President has proposed.

The Republican budget, on the other hand, reserves 100 percent of the retirement surplus for Social Security and Medicare. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have heard that right. The Republican budget reserves 100 percent of the retirement surplus for Social Security and Medicare. In fact, our budget puts aside more money for Social Security and Medicare than does the President's budget.

We cannot do anything about the Lenox Lewis rip-off, but we can put a stop to the robbery of the Social Security Trust Fund that has been going on for too long.

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, testimony by the Congressional Budget Office Director confirms that President Clinton's budget blows the roof off the bipartisan spending caps of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. He stated that the President's budget will exceed those caps by $30 billion in the next fiscal year alone.

The balanced budget agreement is under 2 years old, and the President simply cannot stop himself from spending more of one's money.

We already know that the Clinton budget included $108 billion in new taxes and fees and not a dime of broad-based tax relief. On the spending side, we knew that the President proposed more than $200 billion in new domestic spending over the next 5 years, including nearly 40 new mandatory programs and almost 80 new discretionary programs.

Worse yet, first he said all of the surplus should go to Social Security. Then he said 62 percent of the surplus should be saved for Social Security. Now it is clear that the President's proposal uses even the off-budget Social Security surpluses for new domestic spending programs.

Mr. Speaker, we will pass a budget that provides more freedom to American families and, more importantly, will tell the truth to the American people about what is in it.

DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN BUDGET DIFFERENCES

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget is deja vu all over again. Just like 4 years ago, the Republican leadership has concocted a budget that flies in the face of mainstream America.

Their budget fails to extend the life of Medicare by even one day. Instead of strengthening this pillar of retirement security, the Republican budget lets Medicare spend itself into oblivion and collapse in the year 2008. It does not use one penny of the surplus to strengthen Medicare. But while Medicare burns, the Republican budget uses the surplus to give nearly $1 trillion in tax breaks for the wealthy. This is irresponsible, and it is wrong.

The Democratic budget reflects the priorities of the American people. First and foremost, it takes the high road and strengthens Medicare until 2018. It provides tax relief to working middle class families that need it most. Unlike the Republican plan, which fails to give 48 million families any tax relief at all, the Democratic budget plan delivers tax relief and strengthens Medicare.

The American people deserve a budget that is responsible, that is fair. They

do not need a double dose of deja vu. Let us strengthen Medicare, and let us give middle class families a tax cut.

REPUBLICAN AND DEMOCRATIC BUDGET DIFFERENCES

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of talk today about the President's budget. I have got to say it has got more phony numbers than their census sampling scheme, more misery than the Chinese money laundering scandal.

Here is the basic difference between the Republican budget and the Democrat budget. Republican budget saves more money for Social Security. I think even a Democrat would admit that 100 percent is more than 62 percent.

We want to preserve 100 percent of Social Security. Democrats want to preserve 62 percent. On Medicare, we want to protect Medicare. The President's budget cuts $9 billion from Medicare.

Here is what I will say to any of my Democrat colleagues or anybody who is interested. I will send my colleagues the budget. I am going straight off the fact sheet here. I will send the budget to anybody who wants to debate that. It is probably not right to just accuse it without backing it up. I will back it up.

Our budget enforces the balanced budget agreement which we had signed with the President 2 years ago. The President's budget reneges on a promise, well nothing unusual about that for this administration, but $30 billion over that.

Then, finally, we have a middle class tax cut, whereas the President calls for a tax increase. Three fundamental differences; two approaches to government.

INTERNET GUN TRAFFICKING ACT

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, right now gun sales take place on the Internet with no checks and balances. An illegal gun dealer can simply have his name, address, and telephone number listed on a web site, making himself available for contact by an unlicensed gun purchaser. These transactions can be executed without being subjected to any Federal regulations. Most of these sales go on unbeknownst to Federal authorities.

We have to close this gun trafficking loophole on the Internet today; and today, that is precisely what I am doing. I am introducing the Gun Trafficking Act of 1999. This legislation will place a licensed manufacturer or dealer between the seller and buyer.

As a middle man, this licensed dealer will facilitate the gun sale and will ship the gun purchases to a licensed dealer in the buyer's State. No longer will unlicensed dealers and buyers have a free reign and easy access on the Internet.

I ask each Member of Congress to plug this deadly loophole. Vote for this important piece of legislation.

MORE GOVERNMENT SPENDING OR RESPONSIBLE APPROACH TO SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE CRISES

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, remember in 1996 when the President stood right up there and he said the era of big government is over? Remember that? Well, he proposed this year 80 new spending programs.

There are a number of folks, Democrats on this side of the aisle, who would like to take the Social Security money and use it to increase government spending, make the government bigger and more intrusive more than ever; and that is why Republicans are taking 100 percent of the retirement surplus and putting it into a safe deposit box for Social Security and Medicare.

If my colleagues look at this chart, again, the President's budget cuts $9 billion from Medicare. It busts the budget caps by $30 billion and raises taxes by $172 billion.

Republicans are trying to take 100 percent of the retirement surplus and put it into a safe deposit box for Medicare and Social Security. The choice is clear. More Washington spending or a responsible approach to the coming Social Security and Medicare crisis.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1141, 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 125 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 125

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. Points of order against consideration of the bill for failure to comply with clause 4(c) of rule XIII or section 302 or 306 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against the amendment printed in the report are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. During consideration of the bill, points of order against amendments for failure to comply with clause 2(e) of rule XXI or section 302(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes of debate to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), my friend and colleague, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 125 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 1141, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1999.

As we just heard from the Clerk, the rule description sounds technically complicated, but Members should keep in mind that this is an open rule which includes the waivers necessary to bring this matter to the attention of the House today and which allows the House to address the major issue of contention, offsets, in full and fair debate.

As to the specifics, the rule waives clause 4(c) of rule XIII, which requires the 3-day availability of printed hearings on a general appropriations bill and sections 302 and 306 of the Congressional Budget Act against consideration of the bill.

The waiver relating to section 302 of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of the committee's legislation providing new budget authority

until that committee has filed its 302(b) report and which also prohibits consideration of legislation providing new budget authority in excess of a subcommittee's 302(b) allocation of such authority, are necessary because the Committee on Appropriations has not filed its final 302(b) suballocation report for FY 1999 and, since there are no final suballocations, H.R. 1141 is technically considered to be in breach of existing suballocations.

The waiver of section 306 is necessary because the emergency designations within H.R. 1141 are within the Budget Committee's jurisdiction but were not reported by the Budget Committee.

The rule provides one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and it provides that the bill be open to amendment by paragraph.

The rule also waives clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in a general appropriations bill and prohibiting nonemergency designated amendments to an appropriations bill containing an emergency designation.

In addition, the rule provides special protection for an amendment printed in the Committee on Rules report if offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) or his designee. This allows the House to consider and vote upon the fundamental issue of offsets. That amendment shall be consider as read, shall not be subject to 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.

The rule permits the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to grant priority in recognition to members who have caused their amendments to be preprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD prior to their consideration. That is an option, not a requirement.

□ 1045

The rule also permits the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce the voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

The rule provides waivers necessary to ensure a fair debate, specifically clause 2(E) of rule 21 and section 302(C) of the Congressional Budget Act for all amendments to the bill.

Lastly, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

As I said, it sounds complicated but it is essentially an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are a compassionate people, willing to respond with a helping hand when our friends and neighbors are in trouble, at home and abroad, or when suffering grievously the consequences of disasters, as we have seen in the past year. H.R. 1141 meets a series of needs related to the devastation caused in the fall of 1998 when Hurricanes Georges and Mitch tore through the Caribbean and Central America with an intensity and viciousness rarely seen in nature.

The people of the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, and many of the Caribbean Islands are still trying to rebuild their lives and their livelihoods in the wake of these two brutal storms. Mother Nature struck again with a vengeance in January of this year when an earthquake rocked northern Colombia. These three catastrophic events together were responsible for at least 10,400 deaths, injuries to more than 17,000 people, three-and-a-quarter million people homeless or displaced, and an estimated financial cost of several billion dollars.

Here at home our farmers have been struggling with their own disastrous problems, stemming primarily from low crop commodity prices. This legislation responds to those and other needs, and to the request of the administration that we move expeditiously toward releasing necessary funding, by providing a total of $1.3 billion in fiscal year 1999 spending.

I would note that we expect the Congress to exercise its oversight in the expenditure of the funds in this bill, to ensure that the relief gets to those in need and does not get sidetracked or diverted by bureaucratic or other snafus. I am specifically thinking about the people of Haiti and the very real concerns I have about the stability of Haiti's infrastructure and the misery that exists upon the Haitian people in Haiti. I will certainly be watching closely, and I know others will as well, to see that the money gets to those who need it and where it was intended to go.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does something else that is very important. It provides the offsets for nearly all the spending it outlines. Why is this important? It signals that we are committed to changing the way business is done in Washington, to living within our means, and to making the choices necessary to ensure that we never again allow this government to spend our children into deficits and red ink.

In the bad old days of soaring deficits it used to be common practice to slap the label of ''emergency'' on a grab bag of spending items in order to circumvent the spending constraints. Well, things have changed. Even though the administration is willing to call most of the items in this bill emergency-related to avoid the offsets, our majority has ensured the bill is more than 90 percent offset, and they deserve a lot of credit, paid for with rescissions from the lower priority programs and accounts with as yet unspent funds. This is a question of prioritizing needs.

The one piece of this bill that is truly defined as emergency spending is the payment for monies already spent to cover the costs of deployment of our military resources in the immediate aftermath of these three disasters; the ready response, as it were; the life-saving missions that were undertaken by our military.

Mr. Speaker, the rules of the budgeting game are vague and imprecise. They provide cover for too much spending, in my view. Yet my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, made the extra effort in crafting this compassionate bill, which takes the extra step of responsibly paying for the bulk of its spending.

It is my hope that down the road when we discuss reforming our budget process, and we will, because we have introduced legislation, we will make some changes to the current rules to assist in these efforts in the future; changes that would better define what we mean when we say emergency, and that would establish a rainy day reserve fund to better plan ahead for true emergency situations. We know they are going to happen.

In the interim, as we proceed with H.R. 1141, I know that there will be debate about the policy of offsetting any or even all of the spending in this bill, and that is a legitimate debate for us to have, and that is why we have provided this rule before us today, which allows for that discussion and ensures that all Members will have a chance to be heard. I urge my colleagues to support this fair, open rule.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), for yielding the time to me.

This is an open rule. It will allow consideration of H.R. 1141, which as we have heard is a bill making emergency and nonemergency supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1999. As my colleague has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill contains urgently needed money to repair the damage in Central America and the Caribbean caused by Hurricanes Mitch and Georges. The money will be used to repair hospitals, schools, roads and sanitation services. The money will also provide emergency financial assistance to Jordan in support of the Wye River Peace Accords between Israel and the Palestinian Authority.

The bill also contains nonemergency funding, including $3 million for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom to fight religious persecution around the world.

Unfortunately, the bill cuts important international programs in an effort to provide offsets for most of the new funding. For example, the bill cuts $150 million from a program to safeguard weapons-grade uranium and plutonium in Russia.

The bill also makes numerous cuts in international assistance programs. As a whole, the bill would constitute a net

reduction in U.S. foreign affairs spending, a reduction which, according to the administration, would seriously undermine America's capacity to pursue its foreign policy objectives and promote our economic security.

The rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. Though this is an open rule, many potential amendments would not be in order because the House has not completed the budget process.

The Committee on Rules did make in order an amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBEY), the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations, which would eliminate some of the cuts in international programs. The amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBEY) is a needed improvement and I hope House Members will support it, and I want to thank the Republican majority for making this amendment in order.

I regret, though, that the Committee on Rules failed to make in order an amendment that I proposed to free $575 million in previously appropriated funds as a downpayment on the dues the United States owes the United Nations. I am embarrassed that the world's greatest superpower is also the world's biggest deadbeat.

The United Nations plays a critical role in diffusing international tensions and providing a forum where nations can fight with words and not with bombs. The U.N.'s peacekeeping efforts have saved uncounted lives by averting war. Its food and health programs have saved many more lives.

Paying our dues is a simple matter of keeping our word. We owe this money, and if we do not pay it, there is a very good potential, a very good chance that we will lose our vote in the U.N. General Assembly. That is an emergency, and that is why House Members should have an opportunity to vote on paying our U.N. dues, back dues, through this emergency foreign aid package.

In the last few years our U.N. dues payment has been blocked by abortion opponents who are holding up the money in order to force restrictions on U.S. international family planning assistance. The resulting stalemate has stopped both family planning assistance money and U.N. back dues payments. I am pro-life, and I count the leaders of the pro-life movement in the House among my close friends, but I do not believe the U.N. dues should be held hostage to votes on abortion and family planning.

It is time to put an end to this game and pay our debt. This amendment that I offered in the Committee on Rules was defeated on a straight party line vote of 6 to 4. I did receive assurances, though, from the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, that payment of U.N. dues was important and that he would examine other options in the future. I am encouraged by this promise. I intend to work with my Committee on Rules colleagues on both sides of the aisle until a solution can be found to break the U.N. dues logjam.

I am disappointed that we cannot deal with the question of our U.N. dues back payment now. It is an emergency and it requires our immediate attention.

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

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, last week I heard a lot of speeches in this House about the crucial need to protect American families with the National Missile Defense System. Frankly, it is a concept I support. I heard a lot of speeches about the threat of nuclear missiles launched against the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly why I am so amazed and disappointed that this bill, less than 1 week after those very speeches, eliminates crucial funds designed to stop the nonproliferation of nuclear bomb grade materials in Russia. Specifically, this measure would cut $150 million that, as we speak, is being used to develop an agreement between Russia and the United States that would take 50 tons of plutonium, 50 tons of plutonium, and make it unusable for nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, 50 tons of plutonium is enough nuclear material to build as many as 20,000 nuclear bombs. That is 20,000 nuclear bombs that could be put on missiles and aimed toward the United States, or 20,000 nuclear bombs that could be hidden in a truck and detonated in any American city, 20,000 nuclear bombs that terrorists and thugs across the world would pay any price to get their hands on.

According to the chief American negotiator in these ongoing negotiations with Russia, according to that negotiator, this bill could cause Russia to walk away from these crucial anti-proliferation negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, we all know there is serious economic instability in Russia. We all know that there is a serious presence of organized crime in Russia. We all know that there are terrorists throughout the world that would do anything to get their hands on even 1 percent of this 50 tons of plutonium and use that to build weapons that could be used against American servicemen and women abroad or against American families in their own homes, in their own hometowns.

There is no logic, absolutely no logic, to spending billions of dollars for a National Missile Defense System and then at the very same time stopping a process that could prevent the potential development of tens of thousands of nuclear weapons. This action would give new meaning to the term ''penny-wise and pound-foolish.''

Now, proponents of this proposed $150 million cut allege it will not undermine our nonproliferation negotiations with Russia. That is what they allege. Well, that is not what the American negotiator says. That is not what the Russian negotiator said, and said as late as yesterday to a number of Members of the House. That is not what the Republican author of this crucial funding says, and that is not what the Secretary of Energy said, the former U.N. Ambassador, who has ultimate responsibility for these ongoing nonproliferation debates.

Let me quote Secretary Richardson, the Secretary of Energy, when he said in a letter dated today, ''Such a reduction would have severe consequences,'' severe consequences, ''for the ongoing negotiations of pursuit of a bilateral agreement with Russia on disposing of enough plutonium to make tens of thousands of nuclear weapons. To now withdraw this earnest money would be to call into question U.S. reliability. Russia may well perceive such a withdrawal as a breach of good faith. Withdrawing this money would severely set back and might even bring a halt to our constructive discussions on this important nonproliferation and national security issue.''

He goes on to say that, ''The U.S. has also been working closely with the international community to gain commitments for additional support for the Russian plutonium dispossession effort. These potential donors would perceive a reduction in available U.S. funds as a dilution of our leadership and resolve and our leverage would be drastically undercut.''

□ 1100

Mr. Speaker, we should do the prudent thing today. We should send this bill back to committee and have it withdrawn, have the provisions withdrawn that would basically put a greater risk on American servicemen and women abroad and American families right at home.

No Member would have the intent to harm any serviceman or woman or not a single person in this country. But I would suggest that, despite the best of intentions, if we listen to the negotiators, we listen to the experts involved in these nonproliferation debates, this measure today and this unwise, difficult, terrible cut could put at risk our negotiations and, most importantly, millions of Americans all across this land of ours.

Let us do the right thing. Let us send this bill back to committee. And if that fails, let us vote for the Obey amendment that takes out this unwise and dangerous and I hope and pray not catastrophic proposal.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the majority on the Committee on Rules chose not to make in order an amendment that I intend to offer today which would prohibit the commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service from releasing any criminal aliens who are currently detained by the INS and are subject to deportation per the 1996 Immigration Reform Act.

The reason that this amendment is necessary is, in January of this year the INS, in an internal communication with its regional directors, put out a memorandum which stated that because of lack of detention space they were going to start releasing criminal aliens who would otherwise be subject to deportation. Now, among these individuals are people who were convicted in U.S. courts of felonies such as assault, drug violations and the like.

This is also a situation where previous Congresses have provided funding increases for the INS, $3.5 billion, including $750 million for detention. The INS has subsequently reversed this policy. But the fact remains that has been the policy of the INS, and this Congress should take steps to try and address it.

Now, it is disappointing that the Committee on Rules chose not to make this in order. We all know that the supplemental appropriations bill ultimately, once it is negotiated out with the administration, will pass. And I think it is important that Congress send a message to the INS that they are not to conduct this activity.

I think many of us are familiar in our own districts, when the States have gone into releasing otherwise violent criminals for space needs, the public outcry that has occurred. I think the same would occur if the Federal Government, of which we are the stewards, is allowed to release criminal aliens who are subject to deportation.

So I have an amendment that was filed that would prohibit the INS from doing this. I realize it is subject to a point of order. I do intend to offer the amendment this afternoon. I would hope that Members will take a look at it, because I do not think Members want to be on record in endorsing this misguided INS policy.

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

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this rule and of the underlying supplemental appropriations bill.

It is an open rule. And while I am sorry that we were unable to provide waivers to all the Members who wanted them for their individual amendments, I do believe that we will have a chance for a free and open debate here, which is exactly what this calls for.

The major thrust of this supplemental appropriations bill is to deal with a very serious crisis, and it is a crisis. I just upstairs met with one of the top executives with Dole Food who was telling me about the situation in Honduras, how they as a company stepped in and tried to provide much-needed relief.

We know that literally thousands of people lost their lives and over 30,000 people have been left homeless, and the numbers go on and on and on, from Hurricane Mitch. And we have been waiting to try and put together this package of assistance. I am very proud, as an American citizen, that we can step up and help our very good friends at this important time of need.

We, as a Nation, have had a constant interest in Central America. My friend from Sanibel, Florida (Mr. GOSS) and I have on several occasions visited Central America and we know that the tremendous strides that they have made toward political pluralism are important to recognize. Unfortunately, they faced this horrible catastrophe. And while this is a great deal of money, it is I believe very, very important for us as a society to step up to the plate and provide this much-needed assistance to our neighbors.

As we know, these dollars are offset within the guidelines that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has put forward, and I commend him for that, and I think that it is in fact the responsible and right thing for us to do. And so I hope my colleagues will join in strong support of not only this rule but this very important legislation.

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

Mr. GOSS. 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. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material on the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

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

There was no objection.

1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 125 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1141.

□ 1107

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with Mr. PEASE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the supplemental appropriations bill that we present today was requested by the President of the United States several weeks ago to respond to the disaster in Central America, Honduras and Nicaragua specifically, as well as the earthquake damage in Colombia.

Actually, the bill has been fairly well discussed during consideration of the rule, but I think it is appropriate that we point out that this bill reflects a humanitarian reaction to a terrible disaster in our own part of the world.

During the late 1970s and early 1980s, this Congress and the administration spent billions of dollars in attempting to keep Fidel Castro and his friends in the Kremlin from exporting communism all over that area. We were very successful, and we helped our friends develop democratic forms of government. With the exception of Cuba, we currently have democratic governments throughout these regions. They are our friends, and they are our neighbors, and it is appropriate that we respond to them in their time of need.

As soon as the disaster occurred, American troops were sent to the region. They pulled children out of flood waters. They pulled people out of mud-swept homes. They did many, many things to save lives and to bring sanitary conditions to the region.

So what we are trying to do with this bill, as requested by the President, and he did not request all of it, I will have to admit, and we will talk about that later; he did not request the offsets that we use to pay for this bill, but the President did request that we provide $152 million for our own agricultural programs here at home, which we have done. The President requested that we provide funding for Central America, which we have done.

The President also requested that we provide a payment to Jordan, one of our greatest allies in the Middle East and an ally that is very important to peace in the region. We did provide the $100 million for Jordan, but again we offset this $100 million.

We also replaced $195 million for the Defense Department to pay them for

the expenses involved in actually responding initially as a 911 force to this terrible disaster. Now, we took considerable time to determine the appropriate offsets to pay for these bills.

As I said, we did not offset the $195 million for the Department of Defense. That was a true emergency. They were truly responding to that emergency. They saved lives. They helped people bring their lives back together. They brought sanitary conditions. They brought water that could be consumed. They repaired hospital facilities. They made medical care available. And we are not suggesting that we think we should offset these funds, but we do offset everything else.

The $100 million for Jordan I wanted to mention specifically because I said the bill was what the President asked for. Actually, the President asked for the entire Wye River commitment that he made when the Wye River agreements were reached. He asked for all of that to be done in this bill, and we did not do that. The reason is that we think that the part of the Wye River agreement that relates to Israel and the Palestinian Organization should be handled in the regular order as we go through the FY 2000 appropriations bills. But because of the death of King Hussein and the important role that he played and the establishment of the new kingdom and the new king, his son, King Abdullah, we thought it would be appropriate to move expeditiously to show a sign of support for Jordan.

The President requested $300 million in that account, $100 million in FY 1999 funds and $200 million in advanced funding. We provide in this bill the $100 million for Jordan. We do not provide the advanced funding. Again, we believe that should be taken up and considered as we go through the regular order in the FY 2000 appropriation bills.

Mr. Chairman, we need to expedite this bill. The monies that we will appropriate today will not go from our Government to another government. Because of the oversight responsibilities that the Congress has, and the Committee on Appropriations specifically, we do have an obligation to our taxpayers to make sure that any money that we appropriate is spent the way that we intend it to be spent.

And so these funds will be appropriated into a special fund that will be administered by our own Government for the contracts awarded to replace the bridges or to help rebuild schools or to reconstruct roads or to do the many things that we will help our friends and neighbors. The contracts will be awarded on a competitive basis or negotiated basis and then the contracts will be paid for from the fund that we create, from the fund that we maintain control over and the fund that we have complete oversight over.

And so, Mr. Chairman, this is a summary of the bill. I know we will have some discussions on some of the other aspects of this bill and especially the offsets, but that is basically what the bill does.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to insert a table showing the details of the bill.

(The table follows.)

FY 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1141)
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
	FY 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL			
	TITLE I - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS			
	CHAPTER 1			
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	Farm Service Agency			
106-32	Salaries and expenses (emergency appropriations)	42,753	42,753	.....
	Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:			
	Loan authorizations:			
	Farm ownership loans:			
106-32	Direct	(200,000)	(200,000)	.....
106-32	Guaranteed	(350,000)	(350,000)	.....
	Subtotal	(550,000)	(550,000)	.....
	Farm operating loans:			
106-32	Direct	(185,000)	(185,000)	.....
106-32	Guaranteed subsidized	(185,000)	(185,000)	.....
	Subtotal	(370,000)	(370,000)	.....
106-32	Emergency farm loans	(175,000)	(175,000)	.....
	Total, Loan authorizations	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	.....
	Loan subsidies:			
	Farm ownership loans:			
106-32	Direct (emergency appropriations)	29,940	29,940	.....
106-32	Guaranteed (emergency appropriations)	5,565	5,565	.....
	Subtotal	35,505	35,505	.....
	Farm operating loans:			
106-32	Direct (emergency appropriations)	12,635	12,635	.....
106-32	Guaranteed subsidized (emergency appropriations)	16,169	16,169	.....
	Subtotal	28,804	28,804	.....
106-32	Emergency farm loans (emergency appropriations)	41,300	41,300	.....
	Total, Loan subsidies	105,609	105,609	.....
106-32	ACIF expenses: Administrative expenses (emergency appropriations)	4,000	4,000	.....
	Total, Chapter 1:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	152,362	152,362	.....
	(Loan authorization)	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	.....
	CHAPTER 2			
	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE			
	Immigration and Naturalization Service			
106-27	Salaries and expenses: Enforcement and border affairs (emergency appropriations)	80,000	80,000	.....
	CHAPTER 3			
	DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE - MILITARY			
	Military Personnel			
.....	Reserve personnel, Army (emergency appropriations)	.....	2,900	+2,900
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	5,100	+5,100
.....	National guard personnel, Army (emergency appropriations)	.....	6,000	+6,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	1,300	+1,300
.....	National guard personnel, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	.....	1,000	+1,000
	Total, Military personnel	.....	16,300	+16,300
	Operation and Maintenance			
.....	Operation and maintenance, Army (emergency appropriations)	.....	69,500	+69,500
.....	Operation and maintenance, Navy (emergency appropriations)	.....	16,000	+16,000
.....	Operation and maintenance, Marine Corps (emergency appropriations)	.....	300	+300
.....	Operation and maintenance, Air Force (emergency appropriations)	.....	8,800	+8,800
.....	Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (emergency appropriations)	.....	46,500	+46,500
.....	Overseas humanitarian, disaster, and civic aid (emergency appropriations)	.....	37,500	+37,500
106-27	Disaster relief transfer fund (emergency appropriations)	188,500	.....	-188,500
	Total, Operation and maintenance	188,500	178,600	-9,900
	Total, Chapter 3:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	188,500	194,900	+6,400
	Emergency appropriations	(188,500)	(188,500)	.....
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	(6,400)	(+6,400)

FY 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1141)— continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
	CHAPTER 4			
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
	Agency for International Development			
106-27	International disaster assistance (emergency appropriations)	25,000	25,000	.....
106-27	Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development (by transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(5,000)	.....	(-5,000)
.....	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	(5,000)	(+5,000)
	Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General			
106-27	(by transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(1,000)	.....	(-1,000)
.....	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	(2,000)	(+2,000)
	Other Bilateral Economic Assistance			
106-3				
106-24	Economic support fund (emergency appropriations)	50,000	50,000	.....
106-3				
106-24	Advance appropriations	50,000	.....	-50,000
106-27	Central America and the Caribbean Emergency Disaster Recovery Fund (emergency appropriations)	621,000	.....	-621,000
.....	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	621,000	+621,000
	Department of the Treasury			
106-27	Debt restructuring (emergency appropriations)	41,000	41,000	.....
	Total, Bilateral economic assistance	787,000	737,000	-50,000
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE			
	Foreign Military Financing Program:			
	Grants:			
106-3				
106-24	Other (emergency appropriations)	50,000	50,000	.....
106-3				
106-24	Advance appropriations	150,000	.....	-150,000
	Total, Foreign military assistance	200,000	50,000	-150,000
	Total, Chapter 4:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	987,000	787,000	-200,000
	Emergency appropriations	(787,000)	(166,000)	(-621,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	.....	(621,000)	(+621,000)
	Advance appropriations	(200,000)	.....	(-200,000)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(6,000)	.....	(-6,000)
	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	(7,000)	(+7,000)
	CHAPTER 5			
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
	Forest Service			
.....	Reconstruction and construction (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	5,611	+5,611
	CHAPTER 6			
	OFFSETS			
	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE			
.....	Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts: Loan subsidies (Title I) (rescission)	.....	-30,000	-30,000
	DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY			
	Atomic Energy Defense Activities			
.....	Other defense activities (rescission of emergency appropriations)	.....	-150,000	-150,000
	EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE			
.....	Trade and development agency (rescission)	.....	-5,000	-5,000
	BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
	Agency for International Development			
.....	Development assistance (rescission)	.....	-40,000	-40,000
	Other Bilateral Economic Assistance			
.....	Economic Support Fund (rescission)	.....	-17,000	-17,000
.....	Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States (rescission)	.....	-20,000	-20,000
.....	Assistance for the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union (rescission)	.....	-25,000	-25,000
	MILITARY ASSISTANCE			
106-3	Foreign Military Financing Program (rescission)	-18,000	.....	+18,000
.....	Peacekeeping operations (rescission)	.....	-10,000	-10,000
	MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE			
	International Financial Institutions			
	Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:			
.....	Global environment facility (rescission)	.....	-25,000	-25,000
.....	Reduction in callable capital appropriations (rescission)	.....	-648,000	-648,000
.....	International organizations and programs (rescission)	.....	-10,000	-10,000

FY 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1141)— continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
	DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
	Office of the Secretary			
.....	Payments to air carriers (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	.....	-815	-815
	Federal Highway Administration			
.....	State infrastructure banks (rescission)	.....	-6,500	-6,500
	Federal Transit Administration			
.....	Trust fund share of transit programs (Highway Trust Fund) (rescission of contract authorization)	.....	-665	-665
.....	Interstate transfer grants - transit (rescission)	.....	-600	-600
	GENERAL PROVISIONS			
106-3	Operation and maintenance, Defense-wide (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 1001) 1/	-82,000	-40,000	+42,000
	Total, Chapter 6:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	-100,000	-1,028,580	-928,580
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(-82,000)	(-40,000)	(+42,000)
	Rescissions	(-18,000)	(-836,500)	(-818,500)
	Rescission of contract authorization	.....	(-2,080)	(-2,080)
	Rescission of emergency appropriations	.....	(-150,000)	(-150,000)
	Total, title I:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	1,307,862	191,293	-1,116,569
	Rescissions	(-18,000)	(-836,500)	(-818,500)
	Rescission of contract authorization	.....	(-2,080)	(-2,080)
	Rescission of emergency appropriations	.....	(-150,000)	(-150,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(1,207,862)	(586,862)	(-621,000)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(-82,000)	(593,011)	(+675,011)
	Advance appropriations	(200,000)	.....	(-200,000)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(6,000)	.....	(-6,000)
	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	(7,000)	(+7,000)
	(Loan authorization)	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	.....
	TITLE II - SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS			
	CHAPTER 1			
	THE JUDICIARY			
	Supreme Court of the United States			
.....	Salaries and expenses	.....	921	+921
106-3	Emergency appropriations	921	.....	-921
	DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE			
	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration			
106-3	Operations, research, and facilities	1,880	.....	-1,880
106-3	Fisheries finance program account	3,120	.....	-3,120
	DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES			
	RELATED AGENCY			
	United States Information Agency			
.....	Buying power maintenance (rescission)	.....	-20,000	-20,000
	Total, Chapter 1:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	5,921	-19,079	-25,000
	Appropriations	(5,000)	(921)	(-4,079)
	Rescissions	.....	(-20,000)	(-20,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(921)	.....	(-921)
	CHAPTER 2			
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY			
.....	United States Commission on International Religious Freedom	.....	3,000	+3,000
	EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE			
.....	Export-Import Bank of the United States (rescission)	.....	-25,000	-25,000
	Total, Chapter 2:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	-22,000	-22,000

FY 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1141)— continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
	CHAPTER 3			
	DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR			
	Bureau of Land Management			
106-3	Management of lands and resources (rescission)	-6,800	-6,800	.....
	Departmental Offices			
106-3	Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians	6,800	21,800	+15,000
106-39	(By transfer)	(15,000)	.....	(-15,000)
	Total, Chapter 3:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	.....	15,000	+15,000
	(By transfer)	(15,000)	.....	(-15,000)
	CHAPTER 4			
	DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
	Employment and Training Administration			
106-3	State unemployment insurance and employment service operations (trust fund)	-5,700	-21,000	-15,300
	DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES			
	Health Resources and Services Administration			
.....	Federal capital loan program for nursing (rescission)	.....	-2,800	-2,800
	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION			
.....	Education research, statistics, and improvement (rescission)	.....	-6,800	-6,800
	RELATED AGENCY			
106-3	Corporation for Public Broadcasting	11,000	30,600	+19,600
106-3	Advance appropriations	37,000	17,400	-19,600
	Total, Chapter 4:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	42,300	17,400	-24,900
	Appropriations	(11,000)	(30,600)	(+19,600)
	Rescissions	(-5,700)	(-30,600)	(-24,900)
	Advance appropriations	(37,000)	(17,400)	(-19,600)
	CHAPTER 5			
	ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL			
	Capitol Buildings and Grounds			
.....	House office buildings	.....	5,560	+5,560
	CHAPTER 6			
	POSTAL SERVICE			
	Payments to the Postal Service			
106-3	Payments to the Postal Service Fund	29,000	29,000	.....
	EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
106-3	Unanticipated needs (rescission)	-10,000	-10,000	.....
	Total, Chapter 6:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	19,000	19,000	.....
	CHAPTER 7			
	INDEPENDENT AGENCY			
	Court of Veterans Appeals			
106-3	Salaries and expenses	372	.....	-372
	Total, title II:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	67,593	15,881	-51,712
	Appropriations	(52,172)	(90,881)	(+38,709)
	Emergency appropriations	(921)	.....	(-921)
	Rescissions	(-22,500)	(-92,400)	(-69,900)
	Advance appropriations	(37,000)	(17,400)	(-19,600)
	(By transfer)	(15,000)	.....	(-15,000)

FY 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1141)— continued
(Amounts in thousands)

Doc No.		Budget Request	Recommended in the bill	Bill compared with request
	Grand total, all titles:			
	New budget (obligational) authority	1,375,455	207,174	-1,168,281
	Appropriations	(52,172)	(90,881)	(+38,709)
	Rescissions	(-40,500)	(-928,900)	(-888,400)
	Rescission of contract authorization	.....	(-2,080)	(-2,080)
	Rescission of emergency appropriations	.....	(-150,000)	(-150,000)
	Emergency appropriations	(1,208,783)	(586,862)	(-621,921)
	Contingent emergency appropriations	(-82,000)	(593,011)	(+675,011)
	Advance appropriations	(237,000)	(17,400)	(-219,600)
	(By transfer)	(15,000)	.....	(-15,000)
	(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)	(6,000)	.....	(-6,000)
	(By transfer) (contingent emergency appropriations)	.....	(7,000)	(+7,000)
	(Loan authorization)	(1,095,000)	(1,095,000)	.....

1/ The President's Budget proposed defense spending reductions of $882 million, which offset proposed supplemental spending. Since only a portion of the proposed spending is considered in this bill, the defense reductions are adjusted to be comparable to the spending.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 9½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to be able to rise in support of this bill but I cannot, and I owe the House an explanation why.

At the beginning of this year we were told by the new House leadership that there would be a change in the way that leadership operated from last year, in that there would be less political interference from party leadership in committee decisions on substantive matters. But on the first major substantive bill before us in this session affecting the budget, we see a reversion to what happened last year.

The budget rules allow for the Congress to pass emergency legislation when emergencies occur. Under that right, the administration sent down a supplemental request which tried to respond to the largest natural disaster in this century in Central America, and the administration also asked for some additional help to deal with the fact that farm prices have slid into oblivion for many commodities.

□ 1115

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee, originally was going to bring to the committee a proposal which would have had bipartisan support. I would certainly have supported it, and I think the administration would have, too. That approach recognized that the administration was responding to legitimate emergencies. But shortly before our committee put together the bill which it brought to the House floor, the committee leadership was ordered by the Republican leadership in the House to delete the emergency designation for domestic programs and to require offsets in order to finance those programs on a nonemergency basis.

Members will be told that those offsets provide no harm and that most of that money was not going to be spent, anyway. That is simply not the case. I will therefore be offering an amendment that eliminates what I consider to be the four most reckless elements that the majority party has used to pay for this emergency supplemental. Let me walk through what they are.

First, the committee rescinded $648 million in callable capital to the international financial institutions. Now, callable capital is not spent. It simply serves to assure that the full faith and credit of participating countries stand behind the international financial institutions in the loans that they make to stabilize the economies of countries upon whom we rely as export markets. The Congress has never before in the history of these financial institutions rescinded previously obligated callable capital. I think their doing so at this time could cause great harm.

Secretary of the Treasury Rubin, in a letter to us on this issue, described this action as an ill-advised step which carries major risks and should be reversed. His letter goes on to say that the higher borrowing costs and reduced capital flows to the developing countries that could result from this proposal would only hinder growth and recovery in the developing world which in turn would hurt U.S. farmers, workers and businesses. He then goes on to say that the President's senior advisers would recommend a veto if this provision stays in the bill. I am confident the President would veto this proposition as it stands.

The text of the letter from Secretary Rubin is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,
WASHINGTON, DC,
March 23, 1999.

Hon. DAVID R. OBEY,
Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR DAVE: I am very concerned that the House is considering rescinding previously appropriated and subscribed funds for callable capital of three multilateral development banks (MDBs) in order to provide budget authority offsets for the FY 1999 emergency supplemental budget request. I strongly believe that such a step is ill-advised, carries with it major risks, and should be reversed as this legislation moves forward.

Fundamentally, what is at risk is the standing of these institutions in the international capital markets. That standing, and the Triple A credit rating these MDBs have earned, are directly a function of the support provided to the institutions by their major shareholders. Indeed, we understand that in their annual assessments of the financial condition of the MDBs, the rating agencies consider the presence of appropriated or immediately available callable capital subscriptions as a key factor.

The rescission of funds appropriated to pay for U.S. callable capital could be perceived as a significant reduction in U.S. political support for the institutions and their borrowers and could lead to a serious market reassessment of the likely U.S. response to a call on MDB capital should one ever occur. In these circumstances, the borrowing costs of the MDBs could increase as a result of this proposal. In addition, a ratings downgrade is a possibility. A downgrade would lead to even greater borrowing costs for the institutions, which costs would then need to be passed on to the developing countries the MDBs are mandated to help.

An increase in the borrowing costs of the Banks could also reduce their net income. Net income is a key source of funding for concessional programs such as the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative and the International Development Association, and any loss of such funding from net income undoubtedly would increase the demand to fund these programs from scarce bilateral resources or, in the absence of such action, would reduce concessional loans to developing countries. Ultimately, the higher borrowing costs and reduced capital flows to the developing countries that could result from this proposal would only hinder growth and recovery in the developing world, which in turn would hurt U.S. farmers, workers and businesses. This is evidenced by the fact that before the recent crisis, the developing world absorbed over 40 percent of U.S. exports.

Some have cited a 1994 rescission as a precedent for this proposal. The 1994 action and the current proposal are not analogous. In 1994, the U.S. had not subscribed the paid-in and callable capital which were rescinded. The current proposal, however, would reach back to capital to which we have formally subscribed and on the basis of which we have exercised voting rights for many years. This proposal has rightly become a concern of the markets.

I hope you will agree with me, Mr. Chairman, that the proposal is to rescind appropriated and subscribed U.S. callable capital of the MDBs would raise questions in the markets about U.S. commitment to the MDBs and could have negative consequences beyond the current budgetary horizon for the developing world and our economy. As OMB Director Jack Lew has already informed the Committee, if the supplemental bill is presented to the President with this and the other objectionable offsets included, the President's senior advisers would recommend a veto. I would be happy to discuss this matter with you further.

Sincerely,

ROBERT E. RUBIN,
Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will also do a number of other things. First of all, this bill also makes some reductions in PL–480, agriculture funds, and it eliminates $25 million in funding for the Export-Import Bank war chest. Again, Members will be told by the committee that this money was largely not going to be spent and, therefore, will create no harm. I would point out that the war chest money in the Export-Import Bank is never supposed to be spent. It is there as a visible warning to our trading partners that if they artificially subsidize their corporations in order to steal markets from us overseas, that we will retaliate by doing the same things in support of our American businesses. We should not be reducing the number of arrows in that quiver. I would also point out that the tiny amount of money which is saved by cutting PL–480 funds will be blown away by the added money that we will be asked to appropriate in direct assistance to our farmers because of what has happened with farm prices. And the PL–480 actions will reduce our ability to help our farmers through exports. We should not do that, either.

The last item which I will try to correct in my amendment goes to what I view as the most egregious and reckless of the recommendations in this supplemental. We have presently available $525 million to be used for the United States to take plutonium and uranium from Russia and to convert it from weapons grade material into material which is not weapons grade. Mr. Primakov is about to sign a $325 million uranium agreement with the United States Government. That is intensely in the interest of the United States. We need to take from the Russians every ounce of weapons grade uranium and plutonium that we can possibly get our hands on so that that does not continue to be at risk of falling into the hands of the wrong people around the world.

In addition to the uranium agreement which Mr. Primakov is supposed to sign, last fall Senators DOMENICI, STEVENS and BYRD and I and Mr. LIVINGSTON agreed to insert $200 million

into the budget last fall in order to help restart negotiations with the Russians on a parallel agreement to also purchase plutonium from the Russians so that they do not continue to have that plutonium in their country available for use in nuclear weapons. That is enough plutonium to create anywhere from 15 to 25,000 nuclear warheads. I do not think we have any business putting at risk the start-up of those negotiations by taking that money off the table.

Now, Members again will be told by the majority that this money is not supposed to be spent this year, anyway. I know that. We all know that. But the money was put on the table so that the Russians would understand it would be immediately available once we reach agreement with them on that plutonium agreement. It seems to me that, well, all I can tell Members is that our negotiators again as well as the Secretary of Energy tells us, quote, that withdrawing this money would severely set back and might even bring to a halt our constructive discussions on this important nonproliferation and national security issue.

The text of the letter from Secretary Richardson is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
WASHINGTON, DC,
March 24, 1999.

Hon. CHET EDWARDS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EDWARDS: I am writing to express my concern about the proposed rescission of $150 million from the $525 million provided by the Fiscal Year 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriation to implement fissile material reduction agreements with Russia. Since the Department of Energy has already negotiated an agreement with Russia to purchase uranium for $325 million, the entire cut would have to come from the $200 million appropriated to dispose of Russian plutonium. Such a reduction would have severe consequences for the ongoing negotiations in pursuit of a bilateral agreement with Russia on disposing of enough plutonium to make tens of thousands of nuclear weapons. It could also severely impact the wide range of cooperative nonproliferation engagement underway and planned in Russia, including efforts to protect, control, and account for weapons-usable nuclear material and to prevent the flight of weapons scientists to countries of proliferation concern.

Department of Energy officials on the plutonium disposition negotiating team have witnessed first-hand the beneficial impact these funds have made; my own interactions with my counterparts reinforce how crucial the availability of these funds is to the Russian approach to plutonium disposition. Thanks to this dramatic gesture, the Russians have become significantly more cooperative in working on the specifics of a bilateral agreement. Our recent discussions have resulted in a commonality of vision on the content, structure, and timing of this agreement.

The availability of these funds has demonstrated that the U.S. is serious about helping Russia implement the agreement once it is completed, by helping design and construct key infrastructure in Russia to safely and securely dispose of weapons plutonium. To now withdraw this ''earnest money'' would be to call into question U.S. reliability. Russia may well perceive such a withdrawal as a breach of good faith. Withdrawing this money would severely set back—and might even bring a halt to—our constructive discussions on this important nonproliferation and national security issue.

The U.S. has also been working closely with the international community to gain commitments for additional support to the Russian plutonium disposition effort. These potential donors would perceive a reduction in available U.S. funds as a dilution of our leadership and resolve, and our leverage would be drastically undercut.

In the absence of a bilateral agreement with Russia committing them to near-term action to dispose of weapons plutonium, and without international support for Russian disposition activities, Russia could be expected to place this material in storage for several decades and ultimately use it in breeder reactors to fabricate yet more plutonium. This outcome leaves this weapons material at continued risk of theft or diversion for years to come.

In such a circumstance, continuation of the U.S. plutonium disposition program would be unwise. The U.S. plutonium represents our best lever to urge Russia towards near-term disposition. Disposing of our material unilaterally would place us at a strategic disadvantage with Russia, and the Department has stated that we will not proceed with construction of U.S. facilities in the absence of a U.S.-Russian agreement.

We urge that the House maintain the commitment to U.S. nonproliferation goals by striking this rescission.

Yours sincerely,

BILL RICHARDSON.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances, I do not believe that we should be taking these actions. If we reach agreement, the cost will be far more than the amount of money now available. We will have to appropriate more money, not less. I do not know of any responsible person who would not think that that is the right thing to do, because we make the world safer from the standpoint of nuclear weapons.

So I will be offering an amendment to delete those four items from the bill, and if it is not adopted, I would urge Members to oppose this bill on final passage.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for the very thoughtful remarks that he has made. I understand his problem. We worked together to try to develop a bill that would be bipartisan in nature, and we hope before it is over that that is the way it will be. But we have the problem of dealing with all of those who lead our government saying that we must live within the budget caps as established in 1997. That is not going to be easy. If anyone has heartburn over this small number of offsets, just wait till we start bringing the fiscal year 2000 appropriation bills on the floor, because there is going to be major heartburn then if we are going to live within the 1997 budget caps.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. When I was in the State Senate, George Wallace was the Governor of the State of Alabama. He was a populist but he had a way and a manner in which to deliver a message. George Wallace called it ''getting the hay down where the goats could get to it.''

Let me give my colleagues a simple explanation of where we are today. First of all, there was a horrible disaster that occurred in Central America, our neighbors to the south. There was a hue and cry from the American people to assist those people who were begging for assistance. We sent our Defense Department down there. We sent private volunteer organizations. We sent USAID down there. They did a remarkable job and they did an assessment of the needs for these people who have been so devastated by this Hurricane Mitch.

So the President, after an assessment of this, sent Congress a message, and he said, Mr. Congressman and Mrs. Congressman, would you please consider giving us $950 million in order that we could help these people.

During this 3 or 4 weeks that we have been pondering over this, not one Member of Congress has come to me and said, ''Do not help the people of Latin America.'' Not one American has called me on the phone or one Alabamian has said, ''Sonny, don't help those poor people in Nicaragua and Honduras.'' Instead, they said help the people.

So then the Congress started mulling over this, and they decided: Wait a minute. Are we just going to give the administration nearly $1 billion and let them run and spend it anywhere they want? Are we going to permit them to give this to any government and let a government possibly squander it?

And we imposed checks and balances by taking the money out of the hands of the administrators and putting it in a separate fund. The separate fund is there to only be used, not for government-government transfers but to assist the people that have been so devastated. There is a check and balance there. We offset any concern that any Member of Congress had about the possibility of some foreign government wasting this money. It is the responsible thing to do.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. The budget resolution says we do not need to offset this money. But there are some very responsible Members of this Congress who feel differently, and they, too, came to us, far in advance, and they said: Mr. Chairman YOUNG, Mr. CALLAHAN, we are not going to vote for this bill unless there are offsets. They said: We want to save Social Security. We want to save Medicare. We want to pay down the national debt. And if you indeed take this

money without offsetting it, we are going to be dipping into those funds. The leadership told us, ''Find a way to do this.''

We found a way to do it. We used a callable capital account, a callable capital account that has billions of dollars sitting in it. And we took a portion of that appropriated callable capital account and we used it to offset these expenditures that are going to take place in helping the people of Central and South America.

What is wrong with that? Secretary Rubin, who probably is one of the most knowledgeable people of international finance that I have ever met, and I have great respect for him. He knows more about international finance than probably anybody in this House or probably anybody in the entire Congress, House and Senate. But, nevertheless, I think Secretary Rubin would agree with me privately, if no other way, that this is not going to injure the callable capital account one iota. We are reducing the callable capital account 5 percent. We are not telling these multilateral development banks that we are not going to still be obligated in the event that they may get into some financial dilemma.

The United States is not the only country that contributes to these accounts. We only account for 16 percent. That means if a multilateral development bank comes and says to the participants in that bank that we need to call up appropriated capital, we need to call up capital that is callable under the agreement, they have to go to other countries and get $84 of every $100. We only put up $16. So theoretically, even with the removal of this callable capital as we are suggesting today, the callable capital account still would have $150 billion available to it if they needed to call on it.

I urge Members to support the bill as written.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

□ 1130

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member of the full committee for yielding this time to me and for his leadership in bringing another proposal to the floor today which would eliminate the offsets that the Republican majority insists upon. I want to commend the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG); This is, I believe, the first bill he is bringing to the floor, and of course I acknowledge my distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

From the start, Mr. Chairman, I thought that this would be an easy vote, that we would recognize the emergency nature of what happened in Central America and that we would proceed without an offset. That was the understanding I had from our distinguished chairman, and then other voices weighed in, and here we are in conflict today.

Mr. Chairman, I would contend that if a natural disaster, the likes of which we have never seen in this hemisphere, taking thousands of lives, hundreds of thousands of homes, maybe millions, and hundreds of thousands and millions of people out of work, wiping out the economies of these countries is not an emergency, I do not know what is. The distinguished chairman of the committee cited the 1997 budget agreement and said that there are caps within that agreement that we must live under. However, that same budget agreement does call for emergencies not to be scored; no need for offsets in case of an emergency. If the worst natural disaster in the history of the western hemisphere does not warrant emergency funding, we might as well scrap the whole concept of emergency funding.

My distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), references our Secretary of the Treasury and says that the Secretary knows more about international finance than anyone in this body, and I hope that that is so. But nonetheless, the distinguished gentleman from Alabama does not respect the advice of the Secretary of the Treasury, when the Secretary says that it is reckless for us to use the callable capital at the Asian Development Bank as an offset what Mr. CALLAHAN thinks the Secretary would tell him personally is not what the Secretary said on the record in our committee and in a letter to the President where he recommended a veto of this legislation if the callable capital offset was included in the final package. That is why, and there are many other reasons why, it is so important for the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to prevail today.

I certainly rise to support the recommendations in the bill for emergency disasters and reconstruction assistance in Central America, the Caribbean and Colombia. Hurricane Mitch, as we have said, was a terrible devastation causing an estimated $10 billion in damage, and, as I said, thousands of deaths. The event, along with the earlier Hurricane Georges in the Caribbean and the more recent earthquake in Colombia have brought this request for emergency assistance before us, and I am pleased that the committee has recommended funding the full request. I am dismayed, however, by the insistence on the offset.

I fully support the $100 million in the bill for the Jordan. This is a down payment on additional military and economic assistance to help Jordan stabilize itself in the wake of King Hussein's death. As I have said, I oppose, I must unfortunately oppose the bill because of the offsets used in this package. The bill insists offsets for the disaster mitigation programs and the emergency fund farm assistance but does not insist on offsets for the $195 million to restore the Department of Defense hurricane cost. Why the inconsistencies? Our young people, part of the American military, bravely, courageously, unselfishly and tirelessly assisted the people in Central America at the time of this hurricane, in the immediate wake of the hurricane. Certainly we want to pay back the Department of Defense for services rendered; that does not need to be offset, it should not be, I agree with that. But why treat other assistance differently than the military assistance, the assistance of the military in this bill?

Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will strike the most objectionable offsets in the bill, and I enthusiastically support that. The 1 billion in offsets in the bill, $825 million comes from international programs, all of the proposed rescissions from foreign ops bill will have a detrimental program impact, and I intend to work hard to remove them from the bill before it is sent to the President. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill, so we increase the leverage of the President, sustain a presidential veto, and have a change in this bill so that we are not helping the people of Central America at the risk of exacerbating the financial crisis in Asia by taking a large chunk of the callable capital for the Asian Development Bank as an offset. The rescissions in the bill will hurt development programs such as health, education and even child survival.

Mr. Chairman, I do not have any more time. I will place the rest of my statement in the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment and to oppose the passage of this bill unless the Obey amendment prevails.

I rise to support the recommendations in the bill for emergency disaster and reconstruction assistance for Central America, the Caribbean, and Colombia. Hurricane Mitch was the worst natural disaster to hit the Western Hemisphere in recorded history causing an estimated $10 billion in damage, and thousands of deaths. This event, along with the earlier Hurricane Georges in the Caribbean, and the more recent earthquake in Colombia have brought this request for emergency assistance before us, and I am pleased that the Committee has recommended funding the full request.

I also fully support the $100 million in the bill for Jordan. This is a down payment on additional military and economic assistance to help Jordan stabilize itself in the wake of King Hussein's death.

Unfortunately I will have to oppose this bill because of the offsets used to fund this package. The bill presented offsets the Disaster Mitigation programs and the Emergency Farm assistance, but does not offset the $195 million appropriated to restore the Department of Defense hurricane costs. This bill started out in Committee as a bipartisan product with no offsets. If the worst natural disaster in the history of the Western Hemisphere does not warrant emergency funding, we might as well

scrap the whole concept of emergency funding.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Mr. OBEY intends to offer an amendment which will strike the most objectionable offsets in the bill, which I will enthusiastically support. Of the $1 billion in offsets being in the bill, $825 million comes from international programs. All of the proposed rescissions from the Foreign Operations bill will have detrimental program impacts, and I intend to work hard to remove them from the bill before it is sent to the President. The rescissions in the bill will hurt development programs such as health, education and even Child Survival. Cuts to our trade promotion programs lessen the number of U.S. firms we can help develop export markets. Cuts in peacekeeping accounts will severely hinder the training of troops from African countries in peacekeeping methods. Cuts to Eastern Europe will slow reconstruction in Bosnia. Congress agreed to fund these programs last year and we should not be pulling back from these commitments.

DEBT RELIEF

The response of the American people to this event was truly heartening and indicative of the widespread sympathy and support for the needs of our southern neighbors in this Hemisphere. There is no question that the vast majority of the American people support well directed humanitarian assistance. This aid package enjoys widespread support in the Congress and throughout the country.

Congress must move expeditiously on this request so that critical reconstruction efforts can begin before the onset of the rainy season. Our action here today will only complicate efforts to get this assistance to where it is needed. It is my hope that the provision of this assistance will become the springboard for economic and social development which lifts the poorest countries in Central America out of the grinding poverty they have suffered for so long.

Unfortunately with the offsets in the bill which have drawn a veto threat and action on the bill stalled in the other body for reasons unrelated to the Disaster, I fear we are still a long way from the day when assistance arrives.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE).

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

I am not a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but as a lot of other Members, I follow the appropriations and budgetary processes very carefully, and just three brief points, if I may:

First of all, I was in support of the rule, I am in support of the legislation, and I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the others who worked on this because sometimes in my 6 years here I have seen emergency bills that were, with all due respect, Christmas trees with a lot of decorations on them. A real effort was made here, I think, to look at this carefully and to make it truly an emergency bill.

Secondly, I feel we need offsets. I have been in support of this for some time. We just simply cannot continue to balance our budget if we do not offset the expenditures which we make, even if they are emergencies, and, frankly, one could argue the viability of some of the offsets here; I understand that. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has already made that argument.

With respect to certain of the issues, I know a little bit about the callable capital situation with the international financial institutions, but the bottom line is I believe that this is an acceptable and allowable offset. Perhaps, as we negotiate with the Senate, we will go through some changes on that, but I really also congratulate the committee on that. They made the effort to do this. A lot of us were concerned about it, and they have come to the realization that while there are going to be emergencies, in many instances we should be able to get offsets for this, and in this case they have done that.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would just say that I have been pushing legislation for some time to have a budget for emergencies so we could avoid these problems, so it is built into our budget at the beginning of the year as a rainy day fund approximating what the average of emergency expenditures have been over the last 5 years, which may be in the range of $5 to $6 billion; so, when these issues come up, we would have a methodology for reviewing them, to determine if they are true emergencies, we would already have the money set aside for that, we could apply this against that money. Then we do not get into the arguments about the offsets, the callable capital, the import export or it may be.

This is really not a matter before us today. It is not even necessarily an appropriation matter; perhaps it is a budget matter. But I think it is something we should do. But I congratulate all those who worked on this. I think we are taking steps in the right direction, and I am pleased to be in support of it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT).

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Chairman, the majority has in my view let down America's farmers because of the way they have responded to the President's request for supplemental aid. The President made this request nearly one month ago, and we are just getting around to it now, a month after the request was made and the need was demonstrated. They put forward a bill which in my view is full of items which will hurt our national security and weaken the international economy.

I do not like to say it, but I think the Republican party has given in to isolationist tendencies. By turning our backs on the world, we only hurt the global economy further and hurt exporters like farmers who are getting pummeled by the downturn in Asia and elsewhere. The delay has hurt the financial bottom line for thousands of farmers across America. There is a near depression happening in many parts of our farm economy. Hog farmers in my district cannot even sell hogs at half the break-even price, Mr. Chairman.

Let me just mention one young farmer from my district, Mike Kertz of Ste. Genevieve, Missouri. He comes from a farm family, and he wants to carry on the farm tradition. He raises hogs. At today's prices, the prices he was getting for months, he cannot survive, he can not have a future, he can not keep the farm. Missouri's farmers would get over $42 million in new credit loans in the President's request, and over 12,000 farmers nationwide would benefit from the supplemental funding for agriculture.

But we needed action last month, and we needed a bill today that would get to the President's desk with no strings attached and not a bill that is isolationist and which harms our national security. These are irresponsible policies that were injected into this bill. These objectionable policies should be dropped so we can get the aid to the people who have already been waiting too long for it. We must not deliver this aid at the cost of giving up on our obligations which are in the long term to the benefit of every American citizen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the majority to drop these objectionable provisions, I urge them to bring a bill that we can support, and if that does not happen, I urge Members to vote against this legislation in the hope that we can get a bill that is worthy of support.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I do not vote for the supplemental bills very often, and I give great credit to the new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and to our new Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT). Several weeks ago they began to figure out how they are going to get the votes to pass this bill, and they sort of looked at, I guess, the list of folks who have traditionally opposed these bills, and they called a meeting, and they said: Why? And I said: Well, my reasons are real easy; three of them:

One, they are not usually emergency supplementals; ought to be regular order, they ought to go the regular process. Two, they are never paid for; and, three, there is usually so much pork in some of those bills that it makes us sick, and I said, ''O for three; that's why I vote against them,'' and, to the credit of the chairman of the committee they are really batting three for three. It is paid for, they

whittled out some of the stuff that was in there that really was not an emergency, could be taken care of, and there was not a single bridge or armory or anything in there that someone might be able to call pork.

For those reasons I am voting for this bill this afternoon, and I would not only encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill, but also send a warning to our friends on the other side of this building. As I understand it, their bill is already larger; as I understand it, their bill is not paid for; and third, we can start hearing those words ''su wee'' for the pork that some of the Members on that side of the body have put in this bill that has got to be taken out, and I hope that our passage of the bill this afternoon proves our point: Batting three for three; not even Sammy Sosa can do as well.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me and thank him for his leadership on the committee in trying to strengthen this supplemental bill. I also want to congratulate the new chairman of the committee who has tried hard to put a bill together, but I must say to my colleagues it is truly inadequate. Certainly from the standpoint of agriculture America's farmers are in crisis.

Mr. Chairman, this bill should have been up here two months ago. We have been witnessing price declines at record levels across this country with an additional income drop for our farmers this year of over 20 percent. This House bill falls so far short of the mark. Though it contains much needed credit authority to help farmers over this spring planting period, it is too little, too late. As we stand here, equipment auctions are going on across the country, bankruptcies mount, and people cannot move product to market.

One of the most curious aspects of this particular measure is that one of the budget offsets in the bill is to reduce the P.L. 480 Program, which is a program at the Department of Agriculture where we take surplus, which we have plenty of on this market, and move it into foreign markets to help hungry people around the world, and there are certainly lots of those, but also to help our farmers here at home get out from under the weight of all this production which is helping prices to continue to plummet here in the domestic market.

□ 1145

So we should have been able to perfect a more perfect bill. Unfortunately, this is not the one.

I wanted to mention that the bill contains some very important language that has to do with the Russian food aid package that is currently being delivered, over a billion dollars of Russian food aid, and yet very few checks by the government of the United States in order to assure that that product is not diverted and graft does not occur.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD questions that we should ask the executive branch and expand congressional oversight of that Russian food aid package as it proceeds over the next several weeks.

Our American family farmers are suffering. While the general economy is strong, the U.S. agricultural economy continues to experience significant declines in agriculture commodity prices that began over a year ago. The price declines experienced by wheat and cattle producers over the last couple of years have expanded now to all of the feed grains, oil seed, cotton, pork and now the dairy sectors at record all-time lows. Farm income is expected to fall from $53 billion in 1996 to $43 billion next year, nearly a 20-percent decline.

The Republican Leadership has again let down the American farmer. The credit guarantee assistance needed by farmers to obtain credit during spring planting is again delayed by the inability of the Republican Leadership to deal with legislation on a timely basis.

Farmers and ranchers have a cash flow squeeze this year and the demand for USDA's farm lending programs has increased dramatically this year to 4 times the normal rate.

Many states have already exhausted their loan funds and farmers cannot get their crops in the ground without the credit to purchase their inputs.

USDA reports that the Farm Service Agency will begin to layoff temporary employees at the end of this week. These employees assist with the backlog in delivering assistance to farmers suffering from low prices and crop disasters.

The demand for Loan Deficiency Payments is exploding. For 1997 crops USDA paid about $160 million for farmers and ranchers for LDP's. For 1998, LDP's are currently $2.3 billion and that total is expected to climb to $3.2 billion before the season ends. We expect to issue about $3.5 billion in LDP's in 1999, 65 percent more than 1998. Farmers in my district have been waiting to get paid for LDP's since October, and they will wait because we have been unable to present them with a final bill prior to leaving on our recess.

UNITED STATES FOOD AID

1. Who is going to guarantee that the money from the sale of the commodities in the various regions of Russia gets into the Special Account for transfer to the Pension Fund? What will be done if the money is not deposited within the time specified in the Resolution of the Russian Government (70 days for wheat and rice, 90 days for all other commodities)?

2. How many rubles are anticipated from the sale of the U.S. commodities for the Russian Pension Fund? The Pension Fund has an arrears of around 23 billion rubles.

3. How many people on the Russian side with be actively involved in monitoring the U.S. food shipments?

4. There have been articles in the Russian press criticizing U.S. food aid, saying it is not needed and that it will destroy the private agriculture sector. What is the relationship between U.S. food aid and the development of privatized agriculture in Russia?

FUTURE FOOD AID

5. What is the evidence that Russia will need additional food aid later in the year? What are projections for grain and livestock production in the coming year?

6. If additional food aid from the USDA is requested by Russia, will it be conducted by Russia through an open tender this time around instead of a closed tender?

7. If additional food aid is extended from the U.S., how should funds resulting from the sale of this food aid be used? How can the U.S. be assured it will not be diverted to a bank outside of Russia or just disappear?

RUSSIAN AGRICULTURE

8. What is Russia's strategy for developing the agriculture sector in Russia and for improving the quality of life in the rural areas of Russia?

9. What is the future for private farming and for truly privatized farms in Russia?

INVESTMENT

10. What is being done to create a climate that attracts U.S. investment in Russian agriculture? How can the commercial risk associated with this investment be reduced given the current economic crisis in Russia?

11. Sector Reform: What are Russian priorities to revitalize growth in the agriculture sector given the Duma's opposition on such important questions as private land ownership and tax reform?

12. Farm Profitability: A key task for the Russian government is the creation of viable farms from existing, large-scale unprofitable farms. The main barriers to farm profitability include the lack of good, market-knowledgeable managers, over-staffing, and reluctance to abandon or significantly restructure operations on large farms that are unprofitable. In what ways will the government help large farms to restructure?

13. Private Family Farms: Small private family farms and dacha (garden) plots account for about 9 percent of total farm land in Russia, yet produce significant percentages of total agricultural output: potatoes—89%, vegetables—76%, meat—48%, milk—42%, and eggs—30%. What measures are being taken to assist private plot holders and owners of family farms to expand their holdings and to meet their needs for credit?

14. Private Investment: Many prior functions of the government under a command economy such as credit, supply and distribution of inputs and marketing of commodities and food products can no longer be provided by the state, nor is there an institution for extending improved technologies (both production and managerial) to farms. There is an increasing role for the private sector, both Russian and foreign, to help. What role will the federal and regional governments play in attracting private investment in Russian agriculture, and are there specific programs, policies or incentives which the Ministry of Agriculture will promote?

15. Agriculture Finance: What work is being done to encourage the establishment of private lending institutions for the farm sector other than commercial banks? In this regard, what is the status of the draft legislation on rural credit cooperatives? What other measures is the Russian government taking to establish a sustainable source of credit for agriculture—both for operating capital and for long-term investment?

16. Next Year's Harvest: What are the prospects for next year's harvest? Is there expected to be a shortfall, and how would Russia deal with this situation if it develops?

17. Investment Policy: Many foreign agribusiness companies willing to invest in Russian agriculture are hesitant to do so because of several factors: lack of land markets and long-term land leasing procedures, complicated and excessive taxation, contradictory federal and regional laws, particularly with regard to land ownership and use, administrative trade barriers imposed by regions which prevent the movement of grain, and lack of legal procedures for the enforcement of business contracts and resolving disputes.

What can the Ministry of Agriculture do to address these issues?

The bill before us $1.2 billion includes language directing the Executive Branch and USDA to strengthen monitoring effort on the $1.2 billion Russian Food Aid package.

This Russian food aid package was put together through existing authorities and has not been subject to congressional oversight. The Congress was not a part of the negotiating team but this is an effort to interject ourselves into the oversight of this assistance. These shipments are likely to be subject to graft and major diversion and, sadly, strengthen the hand of the very instrumentalities in Russia that have approved reform in agriculture.

The magnitude of this package is unprecedented.

Deliveries will be staggered over the next several months—but I believe it may even be necessary for us to suspend shipments for a short time frame in order to evaluate our progress in ensuring that our assistance gets to the people it is intended.

We have had discussions with the USDA over the past four months which have resulted in substantial changes being made to the monitoring effort but they simply are not enough. We have gone from two monitors locate din Moscow, to thirteen full time monitors and 30 individuals in the consulates and Embassies assisting with a country team effort.

Thus the report language in the bill states:

RUSSIAN FOOD AID

Based on past experience with regard to U.S. commodity shipments to Russia, the Committee is seriously concerned about the likelihood of diversion in the distribution of the current $1,200,000 Russian food aid package which was negotiated by the Executive Branch. The Committee urges the Secretary of Agriculture to implement swiftly the provisions of the sales agreement that allow suspension of shipments if and when diversions occur. In addition, the Secretary should ensure that sufficient staff is available for oversight, monitoring and control procedures to minimize potential misuse and improper losses of food commodities provided under the three food aid agreements between the Governments of the United States and the Russian Federation. The Committee expects the Secretary to directly involve the Inspector General in auditing these shipments.

The Secretary of Agriculture shall report to the Committee by June 15, 1999, regarding his efforts to increase oversight and monitoring; the extent to which other federal agencies and Non-Governmental Organizations have contributed to the monitoring effort; the number of frequency of spot-checks and their findings; how the agency handled reports of diversions; and the extent to which the distribution of commodities was coordinated with local government officials and private farming organizations. The Committee also expects the Secretary to report on how the food aid package was coordinated with the State Department to meet our strategic goals in the region and the involvement of the Interagency Task Force assembled by the U.S. Embassy in Moscow to oversee these shipments. The Secretary shall also report on how this and subsequent food aid shipments contribute to the development and reform of private agriculture in the Newly Independent States.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to engage in this particular argument now because of the great respect that I have for the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT). But I want to say to my colleagues, there is nothing in this bill that would have an adverse effect on the security of our Nation.

Those who have known me during the 4 years that I chaired the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense know that I have fought and struggled to do everything that I possibly could to improve the national security of our Nation and improve the quality of life for those men and women who provide the security of our Nation.

I know what he is talking about. We will discuss that more after the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) offers his amendment, but there is absolutely zero threat to our national security in this bill.

In response to the complaints about how much time it has taken to get here, we tried to do this in a responsible way. The agricultural money that was just mentioned was requested on March 1. Today is only March 24. That is 23 days ago.

So I think we have expedited it fairly well, but one of the reasons we did not come out here on the floor immediately was that I wanted to see firsthand exactly from the congressional standpoint what had happened and what had occurred in the region. I asked a bipartisan delegation from the Committee on Appropriations to visit the region, which they did the weekend before we did our markup. They came back with a very real report on what the needs were, what the requirements were. General Wilhelm, commander of Southern Command, who also accompanied them on that trip, pointed out what our own military had done in response to that national disaster.

So, yes, we did take a little time to be responsible, to find out for ourselves what the situation was in Central America, and to make sure that the offsets that we recommended were responsible offsets.

I will talk more about the offsets when we get into the amendment process here, but we can justify making these offsets because they were not going to be spent in fiscal year 1999 anyway, and if they were left they would have probably eventually been wasted in the future.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, although I oppose this bill, I rise today to discuss an important element in this bill, debt relief. The ranking member, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and the minority have been fighting very hard for debt relief.

We sincerely believe that debt relief is central to any bill that intends to stimulate the rebuilding of infrastructure and to provide other necessities such as health care and food. This bill would devote $41 million to debt relief, $25 million to the World Bank fund for making payments on multilateral debt during the moratorium that lasts until February 1, 2001, and $16 million for an eventual two-thirds write-off of Honduras' bilateral debt.

For just an additional $25.5 million, the U.S. could cancel all bilateral debts owed to Nicaragua and Honduras. That $25.5 million would cancel debt with a face value of more than $270 million. The supplemental came very, very close to alleviating this burden off of the families that have been suffering during this crisis but fell short by $25.5 million.

Bilateral debt cancellation would be a significant investment in Central American recovery. It would send a signal to other countries that these countries' bilateral debts must be forgiven to make way for recovery and development.

A few countries, Denmark, Brazil, Cuba among them, have already done such cancellation, but if the U.S. would do it many more would be expected to follow. More than the amounts involved, that would be the true and relatively small expenditure when one considers the enormous burden that this would lift.

Nicaragua and Honduras already had severe debt problems before Mitch. The hurricane made a horrible problem absolutely unbearable, Mr. Chairman. Moratoria and reduction of bilateral debt stock by the Paris Club are not enough. Before Hurricane Mitch, Honduras was paying over a million dollars a day in debt service; Nicaragua about $700,000 a day.

Once the moratorium ends, no one thinks that the recovery will be complete, but if in fact we go the extra mile and make the difference, we can take this burden off of these families.

Although I do not plan to offer an amendment on this subject, I want to bring this issue to the attention of my colleagues because I feel that debt relief is important for any country to rebuild.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the bill before us today in light particularly of the offsets that are being suggested and what they, in my opinion, will do to agriculture in this country.

Chairman Alan Greenspan made a speech last week in which he talked about the problems of agriculture, and I appreciated very much hearing his analysis and rationalization of what is happening to American agriculture. The point that he made over and over is our problems are that the rest of the world that we depend on for markets to buy that which we produce is having credit problems.

This bill cuts the commitments we have already made to back lending by international financial institutions such as the Asian Development Bank, laying groundwork for another year of dismal farm prices.

Secretary Rubin pointed out in a letter to the Congress the bill would increase borrowing costs and hinder growth in developing countries, the part of the world that before this crisis absorbed 40 percent of our agricultural exports.

In many States now we have a need for the credit. The first chapter in this bill is something that everyone agrees is needed to be done, but not at any cost. If the cost of having this particular emergency declaration or this particular spending is the offset that is in mind, it is not worth the price we will pay in agriculture and farm country.

This seems to come as an annual occurrence now, and I do not understand this. In 1996, the most dramatic change in our farm policy in a generation was held hostage by a leadership that did not trust the Committee on Agriculture, forced to vote on the bill or to have nothing for American farmers after we had already entered the planting season in parts of our Nation.

Last year, again, as farmers were making fundamental decisions, House leadership meddling in bipartisan consensus over a bill to secure delivery costs for crop insurance delayed final adoption of a bill reported from conference. In that case, a sound bipartisan majority defeated the leadership's rule that would have undone a carefully crafted and responsible compromise. Now farmers in dire straits, in the need of these lending programs, will have to wait even longer.

I am going to ask the majority to seriously consider an amendment that I will offer, and I will ask for unanimous consent that the emergency declarations in this bill be stricken and that instead of using the offsets in question for agriculture in the development bank and also the offsets dealing with nuclear, one of the most irresponsible decisions this body could possibly consider doing at this time with all of the problems in the world, Kosovo we are talking about today, how we could possibly do that I do not know.

I will offer, and hopefully by unanimous consent, that we strike it and pay for these emergency declarations with an across-the-board cut on every account. I believe that would make a lot more sense at this time and certainly avoid what could otherwise be a catastrophic happening for agriculture, that no one on this side of the aisle wants to see done any more than I do.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

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

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the way this bill has been handled.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for this bill, but it is very reluctant support.

First of all, I am deeply disappointed that there is no money for domestic disaster relief in this bill.

Most of the money in this bill, $687 million, is for foreign disaster relief efforts. There have been some terrible disasters in those countries this year, and I am fully in support of helping these countries out.

However, the Republicans didn't see it fit to include any money for recovery efforts in our own country.

According to USDA, there is approximately $102 million in disaster recovery needs across the United States at this time. We need $102 million—and the Republicans gave us nothing. (This money is in the Senate bill, but the House appropriators did not include these funds in this version).

As far as getting this money out, we all know that the committee was prepared to bring this bill up on March 4.

This bill was to contain desperately needed relief for our farmers ($109 million for credit insurance, and $42 million for FSA salaries and expenses), as well as the disaster relief in Central America.

These are all obvious emergency appropriations, but the House leadership decided that they wanted these appropriations to be offset.

This caused a three week delay in bringing the bill up, a three week delay in getting these funds to the farmers who desperately need it.

I don't know if the House Republican leadership realizes it or not, but they are putting family farms out of business every day that this bill doesn't pass.

And now, it looks like this bill won't be sent to the President until after the recess, where it faces a potential veto. Who knows how many farmers are going to be forced to close their operations between now and then.

I am certainly not happy with this bill. But I can't vote against this measure and delay money to farmers in my district any longer.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, this is a strange bill, particularly all of these speeches we hear about offsets. In my judgment, this bill is a legitimate emergency, under the budget rules can be handled as an emergency without being offset and that is how it should be handled, but we are going through this pretense that we are making offsets when in reality we are not.

Let me suggest to all the Members they look at this bill. Page 3, they will find this language: Provided that the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section so and so of the balanced budget and emergency deficit control act of 1985, as amended.

What does that mean? It means that the outlays in this bill are exempt from the budgetary caps, and the law we are passing, we are saying it is an emergency, the outlays are exempt from the caps, but then we get into a discussion of a whole series of offsets, which really are not offsets to the outlays. We are actually spending this money outside of the caps but then we do a whole series of offsets that do damage but does not solve the budgetary problem; primarily reducing the callable capital for the international banks.

What is the reality of this type of cut? It is as if I signed as a second signatory on a loan for $100,000, but then I decided I wanted to buy a new car for $30,000 and pay cash for it. What I would do is I would send a letter to the bank saying I am sorry, this guarantee I made is reduced from $100,000 to $70,000 and somehow think that gives me $30,000 of cash to go out and pay cash for a car. It clearly does not work, but that is the mentality we are using in these offsets.

The bank would probably call the loan back on the mortgage I had signed for because my guarantee was only now good for 70 percent of it and I would not get $30,000 to go and buy a new car.

That is what we are doing in this bill. We are still pretending or saying it is an emergency. That is real. The outlays are exempt from the caps, but then we do these series of cuts which do damage but do not change the nature of the fact that our outlays are still considered emergencies.

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

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

□ 1200

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has brought up an excellent scenario, an excellent explanation of what we are doing here. He is doing, in a sense, what Governor Wallace used to say; he is bringing this down to a level that I can understand, and that most people watching can probably understand.

We will use the gentleman's example of his endorsement of a loan for an automobile for one of his children. If the gentleman goes to the bank and signs that loan, he cosigns the loan with his child. The bank does not say to the gentleman, Congressman, put this money in a safety deposit box in

our bank. They simply use the gentleman's assets to give that loan, with the recognition and assurance that if the money is not paid, then the gentleman will have to pay it. They do not tell the gentleman which pocket to put in or which drawer.

We are not taking away the obligation of the United States. The obligation is still there. We are simply taking 5 percent of the appropriated callable capital and using it to balance the budget this way.

So the gentleman brings up an excellent point. That is that the United States has pledged this money in the event of an international monetary crisis. If indeed there is an international monetary crisis that exceeds $150 billion, then the Congress is going to have to reappropriate the money, but it is not unauthorized. Congress has authorized this. It is a debt and an obligation of the United States.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman, if we change these guarantees, how much outlay savings does it give us this year?

Mr. CALLAHAN. The money currently is sitting in a fund, an appropriated fund.

Mr. SABO. My question is, Mr. Chairman, obviously this bill declares these expenditures an emergency. The outlay is exempt from the budgetary caps. If we make this change that the gentleman is suggesting, how much outlays does that save us towards the discretionary caps?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I do not think it saves us any outlays.

Mr. SABO. No outlay savings?

Mr. CALLAHAN. No.

Mr. SABO. That is the heart of my point. This bill declares everything here an emergency, exempt from all the budgetary caps, but then we pretend we do these change of guarantees as an offset, which saves us no actual dollars of outlays.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. SABO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM), a member of the committee.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the committee for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I was listening to the debate, talking about what is happening with agriculture. We do have a very, very serious problem in agriculture. There was some concern expressed about using the P.L. 480 dollars for an offset in this bill.

The fact of the matter is the reason there are dollars there is because the administration did not use it last year. They did not use that tool to get rid of the surplus. That is why there are dollars left over.

It is also the case, when we look at the export enhancement funds, in the last 3 years we have had $1.5 billion available to promote exports of U.S. products around the world, and the administration has done nothing.

Also this year, the administration claimed that they had set new heights of using a little over $4 billion for export credits. The fact of the matter is, by law the minimum is $5.5 billion that is supposed to be used, and in the Democrat administration budget this year, they are cutting $215 million out of those credits. That is, again, going to cripple our exports.

I heard the minority leader earlier talk about the hog farmers. If we look at the Democrat administration budget being put forth to try and help that hog farmer, they have $504 million in new taxes on livestock producers that is going to come right out of the hide of that pork producer in the minority leader's district.

I believe we have to help farmers today, and not hurt them. We have to use the tools available to make sure that our exports are promoted, that we use every resource possible. What the problem is in agriculture today is just a failure by this administration to use the tools available for export to help our producers, and this bill needs to move, move now, so they have the credit this spring to put a crop in the ground.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I have before us a letter from the Bretton Woods committee. It reads, in part, as follows. It is addressed primarily to the Tiahrt amendment, but also applies to the base bill.

Among others things, it says this:

''This is to alert you to the enormously damaging impact of the Tiahrt amendment to divert appropriated World Bank callable capital to offset portions of the emergency supplemental.''

It then goes on to say, at a later point, ''Disturbing reports from Wall Street say that some bondholders are already growing nervous over the threat and are dumping World Bank bonds.''

It then goes on to say, ''This will undermine the recovery strategy for Asia and other vulnerable regions, and it creates new international financial instability at a time when we can ill afford it. Ultimately, this move will hurt U.S. exports.''

At a later point in the letter, it also says, ''This is a retreat from international commitments made by every president since Harry Truman, including Republican stalwarts Dwight Eisenhower and Ronald Reagan.''

Then it says, ''Disappropriating callable capital from which no outlays can be gained is a sham solution, but paradoxically, a congressional raid on appropriated callable capital could even force the United States to make new cash contributions with real outlays attached.''

I agree with that letter. What the committee is doing, as my good friend from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) pointed out, is a sham. In fact, if we take a look at the four items I am trying to deal with in my amendment, those items pretend to save $853 million.

In fact, they would save only $19 million on the P.L. 480 item and on the war chest. Possibly they might save $80 million more if CBO is correct on its assumption that $80 million of the amount which the majority is trying to rescind from the nuclear weaponry account will be spent.

The ironic point is that the majority party says that they are rescinding that money because none of it would be spent in this fiscal year, anyway. So we are left with this situation. If the majority party is correct, then no money will be spent, and there are no outlay savings in the amounts they are claiming. If the majority party is wrong, then we wind up doing huge damage to a key negotiation to make the world safer by removing plutonium that would make at least 15,000 nuclear weapons.

Either way in my view is incredibly misguided, so I would again urge passage of my amendment, and defeat of this bill if that amendment is not passed.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I thank the chairman for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of entering into a colloquy with the chairman of the committee.

As the chairman knows, the Senate, in its consideration of this legislation, has included a provision which provides for the disposal of 17,383 dry tons of zirconium other from the National Defense Stockpile. The Department of Defense inadvertently failed to include this in its legislative proposal to Congress last year. The Senate provision corrects this oversight. It also ensures that disposal of the material will not result in undue disruption of the usual markets of producers, processors, and consumers of the material.

It is my understanding that this is really a technical provision which is not controversial, and is supported by both the Defense Department and the Committee on Armed Services. I therefore rise to seek the chairman's support for receding to the Senate on this matter when this bill goes to the conference.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in responding to the gentleman from Michigan, he is correct. I have discussed this issue with not only the Department of Defense and the Committee on Armed Services, but also the chairman of our Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

We all agree that the Senate's language is not controversial, and would in fact be useful. On that basis, we are

certainly prepared to agree to it when we go to conference.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I am grateful to the chairman. I thank him very much.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, to close the general debate part of the consideration of this bill, the issue has been raised about whether or not we should use the emergency declaration. This is a technical argument. The truth of the matter is we are responding to an emergency. The only difference is we are going to pay for it. We are going to offset our response to this emergency, but it truly is an emergency to which we are responding to.

I do not see why anybody should be really upset about leaving that part of the language in the bill. It is truly an emergency. We are just being fiscally responsible, and we are going to offset it.

One of the discussions that has been of some concern to all of us is the issue of the purchase of plutonium from the Soviet Union. I want to tell Members about this fund. This was a fund of $525 million for the two Russian programs, $325 million for highly enriched uranium, and $200 million for plutonium disposition.

By the way, we spend a lot of money in programs like this, but this particular aspect was not high on anybody's radar screen. In the omnibus appropriations bill we dealt with last year, there were so many members and so many people in the administration having input into that bill, this issue was never part of the original consideration. It did not come down here from the White House or the Department of Defense or the State Department. As a matter of fact, the only time it was actually raised was when we went to the conference committee with the other body.

At that point, one member of the Senate offered the amendment to create this program and appropriate this money. We thought it was a pretty good idea. We still think it is a pretty good idea. But I would remind my colleagues that this fiscal year is basically half over, so most of that money would not be spent, anyway.

Second, I would remind my colleagues that the agreement that we were to reach with Russia on this issue to make way for spending this money has never been concluded. In fact, yesterday Prime Minister Primakov was on his way to the United States. One of the things we thought that he would do while he was here was to complete the negotiation on highly enriched uranium portion of the agreement and sign it.

Somewhere over the Atlantic Ocean Prime Minister Primakov decided, after a conversation with Vice President Gore, he decided not to come to the United States, and he turned around and went back home. So to this day, to this minute, no part of agreement has been signed.

What did we do? Of the $525 million that had been appropriated, we only rescind $150 million. I will remind the gentleman, the agreement is not concluded nor signed, and the fiscal year is halfway over. But we left $375 million in this fund that no one even wanted or suggested until we got into the conference committee.

So I do not think this is a serious problem that anybody should be concerned about. As I said, we took a little extra time to prepare this bill, to bring it to the committee, and to bring it to the Floor because we wanted to be responsible. We wanted to be fiscally conservative. We wanted to make sure that the money, the funds that we used to offset these emergencies, would not do severe damage to any of the programs that we dealt with.

So we went through the account, page by page by page, to find unobligated balances, monies that would not be spent in fiscal year 1999 anyway. That is where the list of rescissions came from.

I submit to all of the Members, and I understand we have differences, there are 435 of us, we are always going to have some differences, that this is a good, a responsible, conservative bill that meets the criteria of responding to an emergency, at the same time being extremely careful with the taxpayers' dollars that we have an obligation to be responsible for.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that we should pass this bill. We should respond to the emergency. We should help our friends in Central America, and we should repay to our own military the monies that they have already spent in the performance of their emergency duties at the time of the hurricane and at the time of the natural disasters.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in reluctant support of H.R. 1141, a bill to provide supplemental appropriations for hurricane relief in Central America and additional loan funding for our nation's struggling farmers.

Although I will vote in favor of the bill, I deeply regret that the majority has once again chosen to load an urgently needed relief measure with extraneous policy provisions and objectionable offsets. I am reminded of the supplemental fight of two years ago when relief for Grand Forks, North Dakota and other disaster stricken communities was delayed for weeks because the majority added unrelated and highly controversial provisions to the emergency supplemental bill. Rather than repeat its past mistakes, I had hoped that the majority would advance a clean measure that would gain the support of the President. Unfortunately, that is not the case.

The one and only reason I am supporting this legislation is because it includes desperately need loan funds for cash-strapped farmers in North Dakota and throughout the country. Without these loans, many farmers in my state will be literally unable to get into the fields this spring to plant a crop. When the House and Senate convene a conference committee to craft the final version of this bill, however, I hope the leaders have the good sense to reach accommodation with the administration so that the bill can be passed and signed into law as quickly as possible.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, this is a bad bill for farmers and for the American people. I support the funding in this bill for farmers, even though it is inadequate. But the cuts in this bill are entirely irresponsible, and will do more to harm agriculture in this country than any benefit it will receive from the paltry amount of money that has been included for farmers. The biggest challenge facing farmers and other businesses in this country is competing in the global economy. Talk about kicking farmers while they are down, this bill would cut critical funds for the development and expansion of global markets at a time when pork and grain farmers are suffering from plunging world demand sitting on record surpluses and tobacco farmers are dealing with a 35 percent cut in their income over the past two years. I cannot support a bill that gives farmers something with one hand and takes it away with another. This cynical bill will be vetoed, and the Republican leadership know it. They loaded this bill up with veto bait in an attempt to score political points and in the process have ensured that the relief farmers desperately need will be delayed. And that's wrong. Unfortunately, this bill puts partisan gain over the people's interests, and I urge Congress to reverse course and pass a balanced bill that will speed relief to the farms where it is needed the most.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, not because I do not believe that the programs it funds are necessary—because they urgently are—but rather because of the way that the majority in the House is handling these appropriations.

H.R. 1141 provides a total of $1.3 billion in emergency funding for many programs that are more than worthwhile, they are necessary to save human life. A sizable portion of that fund, $687 million, is set aside for relief efforts in Central America and the Caribbean, who have been ravaged by Hurricanes Mitch and George over the course of the past year.

Those funds are desperately needed. In Central America, it is estimated that one in three of the facilities that are used for public health or water treatment were damaged during the hurricane. In part because of the loss of those facilities, the hurricanes left in their wake over almost 20,000 dead or missing. In addition, reports indicate that together, both hurricanes created a homeless population of three million people. In the Caribbean, it has been stated that there remains over $2 billion in economic damage alone. Without this supplemental funding, we know that the road to recovery for these countries will be a long and difficult one. We have chosen to assist by helping rebuild their infrastructure and by providing humanitarian assistance, and this bill is required if we are to fill those obligations.

Additionally, and somewhat related to the disastrous hurricane season in Latin America, this bill contains $80 million in funding for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to better help them cope with the influx of people seeking to escape the intolerable living conditions in their home countries. Hopefully, as these countries recover from this tragedy, we will see the exodus from Central America return to the levels prior to the onset of last year's hurricane season.

Furthermore, this bill provides domestic relief for some of our most needy citizens—our

farmers. As a Member from Texas, I am acutely aware of the problems facing our agricultural industry. Our ranchers and farmers have been attempting to grapple with the implications of drought for half a decade, and they undoubtedly need our assistance if they are to persevere through this season. This bill contains some relief, by way of $1 billion in direct and guaranteed loans—that will help farmers keep afloat during this desperate time.

However, while each of these appropriations are necessary, the majority on the Appropriations Committee decided that, unlike other emergency appropriations measures, that this bill should contain offsets roughly equal to the expenditures. As a result, we now face budget cuts to last year's budget that were unanticipated when we passed the Omnibus Appropriations Act of 1999.

The largest and most unwelcome cut involves our international banks, which have been critical in the mitigation of the world financial crisis. This bill cuts funding to those banks by $648 million, in an environment where those banks are often the best option for borrowers seeking shelter from a hostile economic environment. If any of my colleagues have any qualms about how important this funding is, Secretary Daley has asked the President to veto this bill, should it pass, on the merits of this program alone. Although we are in a time of relative economic prosperity, we must remember that in our global economy, we cannot afford to gamble with the financial well being of our trading partners. By taking away these appropriations, we threaten to disturb all of the progress that our neighbors have made over the past few months—and we may destabilize industries that can do us great harm by continuing to dump their products into our markets.

Furthermore, this bill rescinds funding for other foreign operations spending packages that this Congress developed last year. Those packages include $25 million for the Export-Import Bank, that assists our citizens in penetrating new marketplaces abroad, and $25 million for the Global Environment Facility, which funds important and necessary environmental projects all over the world.

Most importantly, this bill also rescinds the funding for a program enacted by this Congress and the administration, which was aimed at stopping the proliferation of nuclear arms to rogue nations. Under the terms of the original appropriation, $150 million could be used to purchase materials, uranium and plutonium, that could be used in nuclear warheads by our enemies. This program was strongly supported by the President, and with good cause—it is well known that the current nuclear threat to the United States does not come from Russia, but rather from isolated renegade governments looking to become players in world politics. Just last week, we acknowledged that threat when we passed a resolution which stated that we should work towards developing a missile defense system—which, unlike this program, does not guarantee a reduction in nuclear arms.

Furthermore, the budget cuts also touch those in this country who are suffering the most—the unemployed and the poor. This bill rescinds $31 million worth of funds that are used by the Labor and Health Human Services Departments. A good portion of those funds, $21 million, go towards funding state unemployment funds, which are in great need in my district because of energy-crisis related layoffs which have reached unheard of limits.

For the aforementioned reasons, I urge all of my colleagues to vote against this bill, and vote for the Obey amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fiscal Year 1999 Supplemental Appropriations bill that will, among other things, provide disaster relief to Central America. Just a few weeks ago, I led a bipartisan delegation to Central America to assess the damage inflicted by Hurricane Mitch. What I saw was astounding. I saw debris hanging on treetops that reached twenty to thirty feet high. Mud slides buried entire villages, sweeping away homes in one fell swoop. The devastation blocked roads, leaving families without the means to obtain food, water and other emergency materials.

Our troops and other relief organizations have been in the region since the storm hit late last year, and have done an outstanding job of providing help and assistance to the citizens there. This bill before us will supplement what they have done so far. The funds we provide will help repair the infrastructure that literally crumbled under the force of Hurricane Mitch, and maintain economic stability in the region, which will bolster ongoing efforts by the U.S. to assist the democratic reforms already taking place there.

The assistance in this bill will be provided in a fiscally responsible way. We have to be mindful of our obligation to American taxpayers. We have offset almost all of the funding in this bill with unobligated funds—that is, money that would not have been spent in this fiscal year. Our commitment to offset this money contrasts with the President's decision to forgo offsetting the spending in this bill. It's also important to note that the U.S. is one of 21 countries contributing to disaster relief efforts; so American taxpayers are not shouldering the financial burden entirely on their own.

Again Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. Having seen first hand the devastating force of the hurricane, I believe we should support the people of Central America in overcoming this terrible disaster.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask the House to do its part to fulfill the nation's promise to the remaining World War II internees of Japanese descent, who were wronged by our government and who are still awaiting redress. Today we have an opportunity to meet our obligation to them at no extra cost to the taxpayers.

I am speaking about Americans and Latin Americans of Japanese descent who were interned in remote U.S. camps, or evacuated or relocated from their homes, out of the fear that they were a danger to America after war was declared with Japan.

No evidence has ever materialized to show that these Japanese Americans or Japanese Latin Americans ever sympathized with the Axis or engaged in espionage. Their internment was a shocking denial of their constitutional and human rights. They never recovered their lost property. But even worse, they lost their trust in the U.S. government which had the duty to protect them.

Four decades after the war, the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 finally gave the United States a ten-year window to acknowledge the injustice done to more than 120,000 Americans and legal residents of Japanese ancestry. The Act provided the internees with a Presidential apology and a $20,000 payment, as restitution for the terrible losses that they suffered.

To date, the Office of Redress Administration has paid out $1.64 billion in redress payments to 82,077 former internees. Unfortunately, the redress fund was exhausted as of February 5. Many eligible internees will be denied their rightful payments authorized by Congress if the fund is not replenished.

The shortfall resulted from several factors:

In the closing years of this 10-year program, the courts expanded the class of persons eligible for redress, to include railroad workers and miners who were fired from their jobs and whose families were evicted from company housing.

Added to the eligible class were a group of Japanese American servicemen who were denied the right to visit their families or who lost property during the war.

A January federal court settlement, Mochizuki v. U.S., made eligible for redress those Latin Americans of Japanese descent who were deported—at the urging of the U.S.—from 13 Latin American countries and interned in U.S. camps. They were brought here out of unfounded fears of possible espionage, and for use in prisoner-of-war exchanges with the Axis. These internees settled for a much smaller redress payment of $5,000.

During the final two weeks of the redress program, more than 50 cases were reversed on appeal, accounting for unexpected payments of approximately $840,000.

Finally, nine abandoned Japanese American cases were revived, as claimants unexpectedly submitted documentation at the last minute, causing an additional $180,000 to be paid out.

The Office of Redress Administration, which runs the redress program, estimates that $4.3 million is needed to pay the remaining eligible cases. This includes:

$1,580,000 for up to 79 eligible Japanese American cases at $20,000 each.

$1,978,455 for 395 eligible Japanese Latin American cases at $5,000 each.

$665,000 for 133 Japanese Latin American cases expected to qualify, at $5,000 each.

Adding more money to the fund does not authorize further expansion of the class of eligible persons. Rather, it simply pays for claims that are already well-established.

The Senate Appropriations Committee included a provision in its FY99 Supplemental Appropriations measure, S. 544 to reprogram $4.3 million of Department of Justice FY99 funding to replenish the redress fund to cover these remaining claims. This amendment was included in their final bill passed yesterday.

I urge the House to accept the Senate's $4.3 million reprogramming proposal and seize this opportunity to pay our debt to the remaining internees. It will not cost the Treasury additional money, and no offsets are required.

Let us close this shameful chapter of our nation's history in an honorable way. Let us fulfill the mandate of the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 and agree to this reprogramming request. Let us fulfill our commitment to the remaining internees.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, as one of the newest Members of Congress who has been recently appointed to the august House

Appropriations Committee, and one of the fewer than ten African Americans who have ever been appointed to this committee in the entire history of the United States, I take my duties very, very seriously. As such, I take the responsibility of guarding the purse of the American people very seriously. While we currently enjoy a soaring stock market and unforeseen surplus in our budget, common sense economics dictate that good times do not last forever. It is, therefore, couched against this background that I oppose the Emergency Supplemental Bill, H.R. 1411, that is before us today. Of course, I join my colleagues in support of assisting the people in those countries tragically hit by Hurricanes Mitch and George. As we enter increasingly globalized markets, taking measures to brace their economies is strategically wise. Assistance is also the humane response. This assistance must not come at the cost of delaying much needed aid to the farmers of our nation or by threatening our national security. Wise fiscal policy and a humanitarian response to those in need are not mutually exclusive.

First of all, H.R. 1411 hurts the farmers of our nation. The State of Michigan is the third largest exporter of agricultural products in the United States. Instead of moving rapidly to address the real needs and concerns of the farmers in the State of Michigan and our country, the Majority Leadership chose to delay for over three weeks millions in farm operating loans. These loans help farmers hurt by low world-wide commodity prices. This delay was unnecessary and is almost unforgivable. It does not take an economic genius to determine the effect that this isolationism will have on the commodity prices that these farmers, and other businesses, that are engaged in the world-wide marketplace. These rescissions will hurt commodity prices even more, and could further hurt the farmers and their families of Michigan and our nation. Secondly, this bill erodes our commitment to the global economy by rescinding several key guarantees to international lending institutions.

Furthermore, this bill potentially threatens the security of the United States by rescinding $150 million from the U.S. program that aids in the disarming of Russian nuclear weapons. This program buys and stores enriched uranium and plutonium from the production of various nuclear weapons. While this program is still in its nascent phases, this bill signals to Russia that we are not serious about solving the every burgeoning threat of nuclear weapons. Nor, it would seem, are we serious about eradicating this environmentally-dangerous material.

The regrettable aspect about this legislation is that it does many good things. The committee's report contains language that was of particular importance to me concerning the possible disproportionate impact that these natural disasters could wreak on women living in communities hit by the storm. Fully one-third of the households in Central America that lost homes are headed by women, and women are primarily responsible for taking care of the family health, finding emergency services for their families, and procuring adequate food and clean water. When attempting to return to normalcy, unfortunately, jobs that women traditionally tend to depend on have been hard-hit. For example, many of the agricultural jobs that women are at the end of the processing chain, such as packing fruits for export. These end-of-chain jobs will not be replaced for another 3–5 years; until new crops are ready for harvest. Frustratingly, women are most often barred from the kinds of short-term employment, such as construction, clean-up, and road building, that the disaster has created. Women must remain a focus as we provide disaster relief for these countries. I commend the emergency supplemental package's partial focus on microcredit programs, which are targeted primarily at women. And I urge those coordinating disaster relief programs to remain aware of the continued plight of women as they help to rebuild society, and to institute processes to ensure that women are able to participate in needs assessments. Programs must ensure that women workers are gaining equal access to employment and credit. Gender differences and women's specific needs must be taken into account in the emergency relief and development programs. The committee's report addresses this concern.

My second concern lies in the possible resulting long-term increase in debt that may be felt by these countries. I stand in strong support of the $16 million debt reduction provided for Honduras and Nicaragua. Neither country should be expected to use their scarce resources for debt payments while immediate humanitarian and reconstruction needs remain unmet. In addition to this $16 million in debt reduction, we are providing $25 million in debt relief to the Central American Emergency Trust Fund to help with scheduled debt payment to international financial institutions. I am concerned about the provision of temporary cash flow relief that is provided in such a way that there is an endgame increase in debt due to capitalization of interest. I believe we ought to do the most that we can to ease and reduce Honduras' and Nicaragua's debt burden and, to the best of our abilities, avoid increasing the amount of money Honduras and Nicaragua will owe in the end.

I am tired of playing games. I believe that the majority of my colleagues want to ensure that we deliver help when it is needed, and that Congress begin to address the real needs and concerns of our country. Although H.R. 1411 contains provisions that I fought for during House Appropriations Committee consideration, I cannot support legislation that hurts our farmers, erodes our commitment to the stability of world markets, or potentially threatens our national security. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill in its current form.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1141, the Emergency Supplemental bill.

I am particularly pleased that the bill includes the full funding necessary to allow National Public Radio to continue its services to public radio listeners.

In the early 1990's, NPR negotiated a 10-year lease for satellite ''transponders'' to assure nationwide coverage for public radio. In May of 1998, the satellite unexpectedly failed halting programming to public radio listeners across the country. The satellite vendor provided a temporary back up though the fall of 1999.

In order to lease the necessary transponders on the replacement satellite, NPR must have the necessary funding to contract with the satellite vendor. This bill provides the full $48 million to allow NPR to complete the negotiations and assure the continuation of service. It provides $30,600,000 in fiscal year 1999 and $17,400,000 in fiscal year 2000. Let me assure members that the fiscal year 1999 funding is fully offset with rescissions of unneeded funds in other accounts and the fiscal year 2000 funding will be absorbed within our allocation.

Mr. Chairman, the bill also contains several technical amendments to the omnibus bill we passed last year that are of concern to the administration and which correct errors made in the hectic last days of our negotiations and preparation of the bill for consideration by this House.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. YOUNG, for his assistance in including these provisions in the bill. I would also like to thank the ranking member of the Committee and of my Subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. OBEY, for his support and assistance in expediting the technical corrections and support for the funding of the NPR satellite.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The amendment printed in House Report 106–76 may be offered only by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) or his designee, shall be considered read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

□ 1215

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

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

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, namely:

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that there may be a lot of good arguments that he can make in opposition to our position on the plutonium issue, but he should not make the argument that he just made, and I would ask him not to make that argument again, because it is based on his perception that the administration does not really care very much about this amendment and this

issue. That is as far away from the truth as it can could possibly be.

Here is what the facts are with respect to that issue: The administration submitted its original budget in January. The omnibus appropriations bill did not pass until October. What happened between January and October is that it became clear that the Russians were not going to negotiate for the removal of plutonium from their country unless money was put on the table to help visibly finance those efforts.

So in the conference on the omnibus appropriation bill, Senator DOMENICI led the effort to insert the money, and he had the full, strong, four-square support of the administration. He had the support of the Energy Department. He had the support of the State Department. He had the support of the White House. He had the support of OMB. It should not be stated otherwise on this floor.

The fact is that the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) now very well knows that he has in his possession various letters from the administration, from the Secretary of Energy, from the Department of the Budget, which spell out in very clear terms that the administration believes it is of the highest priority that these funds not be rescinded.

The administration has made quite clear in letters to the gentleman and to me that, without that money on the table, our ability to move forward in negotiations with the Russians to remove the threat of 15,000 nuclear weapons that could be built from that loose plutonium, it has made quite clear that, if that rescission takes place, they put at risk our ability to get any results from those negotiations.

So use any argument my colleague wants, I would say to the gentleman from Florida, but do not suggest that this is not a serious matter. Do not suggest that the administration is not four-square for the preservation of this money, because that is at variance with the facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

CHAPTER 1

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FARM SERVICE AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses'', $42,753,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STENHOLM:

Page 2, line 9 through line 12, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 3, line 8 through line 12, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 3, line 25 through line 2 of page 4, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 4, line 21 through line 25, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 5, line 9 through line 13, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 5, line 17 through line 21, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 5, line 24 through line 3 of page 2, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 6, line 6 through line 10, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 6, line 13 through line 17, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 6, line 20 through line 24, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 7, line 3 through line 7, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 7, line 19 through line 22, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 8, line 4 through line 8, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 9, line 24 through line 10 of page 10, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended. *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

Page 10, line 19 through line 23, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 11, line 14 through line 17, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

Page 12, line 8 through line 12, Strike ''*Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.''

And on page 13, strike lines 3 through 10.

Mr. STENHOLM (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) wish to be heard on his point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment. It violates the rules of the House as it in effect calls for the en bloc consideration of two different paragraphs in the bill.

The precedents of the House are clear in this matter. Amendments to a paragraph or section are not in order until such paragraph or section has been read. This is Cannons Precedents, volume 8, section 2354.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STENHOLM. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I do. I concede all of the points that the gentleman has raised. I will at the conclusion of being heard on the point of order ask unanimous consent that these rules be stricken today and that they be waived in order that we might expeditiously handle this bill before us today, because I believe it would be a lot more expeditious to deal with a one-time vote on the differences that some of us have regarding how we shall pay for these emergency declarations. I am just trying to be expedient and try to speed up the work of the House today.

But if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) insists on his point of order, or there will be an objection, then we must do it according to the rules, which I certainly intend to pay strict attention to all the rules of the House.

But we are just saying that already in the debate we are hearing what the

differences are, and my objection to the bill is how it is being paid for. That is what we want to strike.

Basically what we are saying is we would rather have an across-the-board sequestration cut than to have two or three of these more egregious cuts. If by unanimous consent we can have a one-time or have my amendment carried, we could have a good debate on this issue and settle it and not take up as much time of the House.

So I ask unanimous consent of the gentleman might consider waiving the rules of the House in order that we might expeditiously consider the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not entertain unanimous consent requests at this point.

Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) insist on his point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do insist on my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) amends portions of the bill not yet read for amendment. For the reasons stated by the gentleman from Florida, which are recorded in chapter 27, section 9.1, of Procedure in the House of Representatives, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I then would ask unanimous consent that these rules that have been objected to, that I have readily conceded, might be in order; that we might expeditiously proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to present consideration of the amendment just ruled out on a point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly object to the unanimous consent request, and we will go by the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STENHOLM:
On page 2, strike lines 9 through 12.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, then, begins the process of talking about the difficulties that some of us are having. In this case, interestingly enough, it is the Department of Agriculture and it is the agricultural funds that are in question, the amount for salaries and expenses for the necessary employees to deliver the Emergency Disaster Program that we passed last fall and is now still awaiting execution.

Obviously I reluctantly offer this amendment, but by the same token, the argument that I made before in general debate and I will make again now, I believe that the emergency should be stricken. I happen to agree with the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) when he says we should pay for these emergency spending. My difference is I disagree with the manner in which the majority has chosen to pay for it. Two or three of those I think will do irreparable harm to this country's best interest.

But specifically speaking to agriculture, I think, for any reason, for the United States to call into question capital available for countries of the world that are struggling and that different financial institutions might consider to be creditworthy, and that if they are considered creditworthy, they might then be able to borrow money in order to buy that which we have produced in the United States.

As Chairman Greenspan pointed out in an eloquent speech last week, our problems with agriculture have been because our markets have dried up. He pointed out, and others are pointing out, that we are playing with fire when we begin to take what appears to be an innocuous, harmless something that we can attack as being foreign aid and that there is no repercussions, that there is no price to be paid.

I happen to believe very strongly that we are playing with fire. If the majority succeeds in these offsets today, it will do far more damage to American agriculture and farmers than whether or not there is a delay on providing the credit, because it will be a short delay. We have already passed unanimously in this House a couple weeks ago the Combest-Stenholm amendment in which we recognized that.

But here again, my argument would be, and what I ask unanimous consent for, is to just agree that the President asked that all of these be considered emergency. Do not blame the President for the impasse we have today. He has already declared it.

The majority has said we do not believe we ought to breach the spending by declaring it emergency, a perfectly logical decision to be made. I happen to agree.

The difference we have is how should we pay for it? I believe in an across-the-board cut in every account would be a much more logical and helpful way for us to progress. Even there, there are some offsets that I am sure that the committee can, in fact they have come up with some that makes sense, and, therefore, they can in the conference make those adjustments with the Senate and hold it down as much as we can as far as the across-the-board cuts.

That is all that I am saying today. That is my point of my amendment today. I will be offering this amendment. I would rather have done it en bloc, but I understand the rules, and I understand the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG), and I appreciate his handling of this.

But I would seriously say to my colleagues, please consider what we are saying and do not look at this as something that we can take frivolously of which there are no prices to be paid. This Member's humble judgment is that there is a potential very high price to be paid and that there is a better way for paying for this today. That is my argument, and I would ask support for my amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. Chairman, as I read this, what he is striking is from line 9 to 12, striking ''Provided, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement'', and it goes on to give the citations of the referenced Budget Act.

I am not exactly sure what the gentleman is trying to accomplish here, except I believe what he wants to do is to eliminate the offsets that we have suggested from the Committee on Appropriations and replace them with an across-the-board cut.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. The gentleman has explained the intent of what I would like to accomplish today as perfectly and honestly as I could have done it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for that. His credentials in attempting to be very careful and responsible with the taxpayers' money is certainly well known throughout the Congress.

But I would have to say, and the reason that I oppose the gentleman's amendment is that the committee was very careful in working with all of the subcommittees to find these offsets of unobligated funds that would not be spent in fiscal year 1999; and if they were spent in 1999, they might find their way into some wasteful spending program in the following year. So the money was not going to be spent this year. The committee and the Congress should make these decisions.

But across-the-board cuts are, frankly, the easy way out. Any time we have a problem with paying for a supplemental or reducing spending, putting an across-the-board amendment up is the easy way to go, but that takes the Congress out of the procedure.

When we are doing an across-the-board cut, then the administration and the agencies, they will decide where to make those cuts. Frankly, I do not want to give up the responsibility that the American people have given the Congress in our Constitution, to be responsible for the appropriated funds and the appropriation of those funds.

So, on that basis, I really have to object to the gentleman's amendment and suggest that we stay with the offsets that have been identified, that have been studied, that have been thoroughly scrubbed and are responsible offsets rather than relying on an across-the-board cut.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just have to say that I am very confused by the position

taken by the majority party on the Stenholm amendment.

□ 1230

This is the first time in at least a few days that I have seen the same train trying to run in both directions on the same track simultaneously. And yet that is what the gentleman is arguing.

One minute they are arguing their offsets do not do anything because the money is not going to be spent next year; the next minute they are arguing that their offsets are meaningful. Now, I do not know which argument is correct. I can debate somebody who is taking only one position at a time; I do not know how to debate somebody who takes two positions at the same time. That gets a little difficult.

So it just seems to me that while I do not believe the Stenholm amendment is necessary because I believe that these items, getting assistance to our farmers, given the collapse in their prices, is an emergency; it may not be to a comfortable Member of Congress, I think it is very much an emergency to those farmers; and I certainly believe that what happened with the hurricane was an emergency.

So I do not believe the Stenholm amendment is necessary, but if this bill is going to do what it pretends to do, then the Stenholm amendment is consistent whereas the base bill itself is not, and I think Members need to understand that.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Wisconsin. He is known for a number of things here, his insight and his parliamentary sharpness, but he is not always known for his sense of etiquette. That is his problem here. He has been eavesdropping.

The people on the other side have been making two arguments; one is for the conservative Republicans, in which they talk about how they have offset this bill; then there is another argument they make for everybody else in which they point out that the offsets will have no impact, either fiscally or any other way.

The problem is the gentleman from Wisconsin has, inappropriately perhaps, eavesdropped on the arguments that were not meant for his ears. Those were meant for the CATs, and it is not surprising that the gentleman's hearing did not quite understand it.

So when the other side is arguing that these offsets are really very important offsets, they are talking to conservative Republicans. Naturally, my friend from Wisconsin would not understand that. But when they talk then about how the offsets really do not mean anything, that they do not really save any money or really prevent any spending that would have occurred anyway, then they are talking to the other side.

So that, I think, might help the gentleman with his dilemma.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it reminds me of an umpire who calls the runner both safe and out at the same time. He is trying to satisfy both sides, but it leaves the audience very confused.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, perhaps this is a new civility. When there is a sharp division, we try to please both sides equally, and the fact it does not make any logical sense is simply a quibble.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the emergency aid and in opposition to these offsets.

Mr. Speaker, an emergency is an emergency. Hurricane Mitch hit a half a year ago in Central America and we are here today arguing emergency relief because of the offsets. We still have in Central America 2.4 million, almost 2.5 million people that are displaced or homeless. That is bigger than the population of a lot of States that are represented here on the floor. Why are we being so cruel in this process of saying, in order to help people that are disabled and homeless, in an area where we need to get the infrastructure and the economy going, that we have to penalize our domestic programs?

The epicenter for the 1989 earthquake in California, the Loma Prieta earthquake, was in my district. Do my colleagues know that we received aid from Japan, aid from Mexico, aid from European countries? They came to California, probably the richest State in the United States, because we were in a disaster and they knew we needed help.

We have 23 other nations that have responded to Central America. Some of these have debt with those nations, bilateral debt, far greater than what we have. And yet Brazil is able to give $179 million in debt forgiveness; France, $127 million; Sweden, small Sweden, $45 million; and the United States, the richest country of all, debt forgiveness is $41 million.

My colleagues have constituents who wrote checks to the International Red Cross; millions of dollars were received by the Salvation Army for relief in Latin America, and these donors did not talk about offsets. The men and women from our districts who are now in Central America working with the nongovernmental organizations, who have taken time off, are not asking for offsets. The 23,000 American troops and National Guardsmen who are building roads and bridges, who are building medical clinics, who are building schools, who are working at a 2-and-3-week period of time, are not asking for offsets.

It is really a sad day that we are here debating an emergency bill because of offsets, and it leads us to wonder whether the only time we are ever going to be able to respond to an emergency without offsets is if we declare war. I oppose the offsets.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. My friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I have sometimes misunderstood each other, and I want to make sure that he does not misunderstand what I am saying about the offsets.

Yes, these offsets are real, but they are offsets from funds that were not going to be obligated in fiscal year 1999 anyway. So they are real, and the fact that they were not going to be obligated says that we are not really damaging those programs.

But now when the gentleman from Wisconsin talks about how we are supporting two different versions of something at the same time, I have been sitting here wondering what he means. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is strongly against offsetting the emergency funding in this bill, but at the same time he is supporting the amendment by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) that eliminates the declaration of emergency as he proceeds to get an across-the-board cut. That is where I am a little confused with his position.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Did the gentleman hear me say I was supporting the Stenholm amendment? I never said that.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. OBEY. I do not think that the Stenholm amendment is necessary, but I believe it is preferable to the base bill. There is a distinction.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Kansas will continue to yield, I am glad to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) joins us in opposition to the Stenholm amendment.

I would also like to say to my friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), and incidentally the gentleman from California was part of the delegation who went to Central America at my request a week and a half ago, and came back with a very glowing report. And I can understand why he would want to appropriate these monies without offsetting, and I think that that sentiment would run through this House.

This is a true emergency. But the problem is the leaders of the party of the gentleman from California in the House and in the Senate, the leaders of my party in the House and in the Senate, and the leader of the free world at

the White House, the President of the United States, have all said we are going to live within the 1997 budget caps. And I say to my colleagues that unless we get serious about making offsets on some of these programs, we are not going to satisfy the President nor our own leaders in the House or the Senate, because we just cannot get to the 1997 budget caps unless we are willing to make some tough choices in offsetting some of the spending.

I appreciate my friend from Kansas yielding to me, and I appreciate the work that he does as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida, and I want to confirm that I stand with him in opposition to this amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I am a little bit curious now, having heard the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations saying that these in fact are real offsets but, as I understand it, they will not affect spending in this fiscal year. Now, they are offsetting, as I understand it, spending that will be in this fiscal year.

So I would like members of the committee to explain to me where, at what point will they be offsetting spending? What spending will these offsets avoid? When would that spending have occurred, and what will be the consequences of these offsets? Because I would like to get a focus.

So they apparently will not have an effect in this fiscal year but we will be offsetting next year. Would someone from the Committee on Appropriations, I will be glad to yield, explain to me exactly what is being offset? If not this year, when will it be offset and what will be offset?

Well, I guess I will go unsatisfied in my quest for specifics.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the majority party will not respond to the gentleman's question, let me give the gentleman my understanding of what the situation is.

The majority party pretends that by cutting $648 million in callable capital they are reducing the deficit. But as the gentleman knows, the deficit is measured only by what we actually outlay in any given year. And the fact is that the estimate of the outlay savings for that item, according to CBO, is zero dollars saved.

Secondly, with respect to the Export-Import item, they pretend because they are cutting $25 million in budget authority that they are saving a corresponding amount. In fact, CBO says they will save at most $3 million from that item.

With respect to PL–480, they claim that $30 million will be saved because of budget authority cuts, but in fact that translates only into a deficit reduction of $16 million.

Then we get to the nuclear weapons item. Our friends on the majority side say, do not worry, this money is not going to be spent this year anyway, so we will not hurt these nuclear agreements. But the Congressional Budget Office says that there they are going to take an $80 million outlay cut in those proposals this year.

So it seems to me that not only are their arguments inconsistent, they are inaccurate. And if they are right or wrong, the result in real world terms is most destructive in terms of the confusion that will be caused in the international markets and the setback that will be provided to our efforts to rid the world of plutonium which can make 15,000 nuclear weapons.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, and I will yield to the gentleman from Kansas in a second, but I just want to say, and I appreciate this, it does seem to me we have seen an unusual logical feat here.

The majority has presented two very inconsistent arguments, both of which are wrong. It is hard to do that. It is hard to be on opposite sides of the question and get it wrong from both directions.

Because it sounds to me like for much of what the chairman was describing these are offsets which will in fact save no money this year, but will cause us some harm and some damage in the understanding in the international community about what is available to the World Bank and the other banks. So we will accomplish nothing concretely but cause some difficulty in the process of accomplishing nothing.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I do have a copy of the bill and it does outline what the offsets are. If the gentleman is curious about which ones are there, I do not think that is a problem.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, I have to respond to that point, and then I will yield further.

I understood that, but I understood the chairman to say with regard to a couple of the offsets that they would not stop us from spending any money that we were going to be spending in this fiscal year, and I guess that is a wonderful kind of offset. Let us have offsets that we can claim as offsets but do not reduce any spending.

Maybe the gentleman from Florida could suggest a diet for me, because I would love to find the caloric equivalent of those fiscal offsets.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, what the chairman is referring to is unobligated funds, money that will not be spent and that we will keep from spending by rescission.

But I want to address callable capital. That is a fund, money sitting in an account, $12 billion sitting there, and this money will then go to a higher priority to help the people in Central America. And if it is not a real outlay, then why did the Secretary of the Treasury come to Capitol Hill and express his concerns about this outlay?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin in a minute, but I want to say two things.

First of all, it is not a real outlay in this fiscal year. It is not a real dispute. No one says it is going to be a real outlay. The chairman said we are not planning to spend it; we are going to set it aside.

I believe what the Secretary of the Treasury was citing was the uncertainty and confusion it will cause in the international community and the financial community if we rescind our obligation to make that available when it is going to be needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) has expired.

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

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say that what the Treasury Secretary is saying, and I would respectfully suggest that he probably knows more about international finance than all of the Members of this House put together on both sides of the aisle; the Secretary of the Treasury is telling us is that this money, indeed, will not be spent.

Callable capital is never meant to be spent. It has never been spent in the history of the international financial institutions.

□ 1245

It is there simply to send the message that the full faith and credit of the United States stands behind those financial institutions so that they can provide the credit necessary to keep our export markets going.

And when we, for the first time in our country's history, withdraw previously appropriated callable capital, we bring into question our commitment to those processes. That in turn creates the likelihood that interest rates are going to be raised in those markets, and that means that we wind up shrinking our own export markets. Why that is smart is beyond me.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I do want to note, and I am interested, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) has learned a lesson from the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) about

the cancelability of callable capital but he has apparently learned it too well.

And at some point I guess the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is going to explain the difference between $640 million of callable capital which does not mean anything and $800 million which does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say we are not rescinding the full faith and credit of the United States with our diminishing that fund that is out there somewhere. The full faith and credit of the United States remains intact. It is not diminished by this bill.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that. In other words, we are just as obligated to spend the money without this so-called offset. So now the offset is getting to the diminishing side.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) has just said, as he understands it, whatever our obligation is under our full faith and credit is the same, so the offset has suddenly disappeared.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to try to clarify again why I am offering the amendment. And precisely why I am offering this amendment is the possibility that the capital that is being rescinded might be needed in order to maintain agricultural markets.

It is precisely that reason, that just in case we find this year that that capital will be needed, I want it to be available. And I think it makes much more sense for this body to have that capital available in case agriculture or any other producers of anything in the United States might benefit by whoever might use that capital that it might be available.

And we are kind of into the never-never land here, because if this really was emergency spending, this debate would not even be taking place here today. I happen to believe it is emergency. But I happen to believe at this stage in the budget debate that we need to pay for all expenditures, even emergency spending, and that is why I am here striking ''emergency''.

The President asked this be emergency and not be offset. Some folks on both sides of the aisle believe it ought to be offset. I believe that unless we strike the particular offsets and do an across-the-board cut, we are playing with fire that will far more damage agriculture this year than any of the problems associated with the amendment that I offer in striking the funds for salaries, etcetera, at this time. That is the record.

And I could not agree more with the chairman a moment ago in his explanation of what he is doing and why, because he and I agree on this. But this does not take Congress off the hook. My amendment puts Congress on the hook, because my colleague and I both know that if we have across-the-board cuts, some things are going to be very meaningful. Some areas of the budget will have much more meaningful cuts than others because some are tighter than others.

So I do not say I am trying to take anybody off the hook. I am saying I am willing to put us on the hook, and I think across-the-board cuts are much more doable. I do not want to use the word ''honest.'' I just believe that they put Congress in a more responsible way of saying, yes, we want to pay for, we want to live within the caps and we mean it.

And I thanked the chairman a moment ago for agreeing that that is his interpretation of what I am trying to do. We have a difference on this. But to those who argue that this capital unexpended is not going to have any effect on Kansas wheat farmers this summer, be careful, be careful when they make that argument in case they win.

Because if the economy of the world should turn around and go even worse, Mr. Greenspan, in what he has warned us, and let me just quote: ''The disappointing export developments and pressures on farm prices over the past few quarters can be traced to an important degree to the recession that began in Asia more than a year and a half ago and has since spread to other regions of the world. Falling shipments to Asian countries accounted for more than 80 percent in the drop of value of farm exports over the past 2 years.''

Let us be careful what we do today. There are real prices to be paid if we are in error. I believe an across-the-board cut would be much sounder for national policy and agriculture policy than what is being suggested by the majority bill.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACKARD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to say to my friend from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) I know the sincerity of what he is doing, and what he and I are trying to do is not that different. The only real difference is the source of the offsets.

Let me explain again. Because when the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) was speaking, he confused what I was trying to do. But let me reiterate what it is that the committee bill is trying to do here.

The offsets that we recommend in this bill are monies that have been appropriated, and most of the money for those programs will be spent in fiscal year 1999. But portions of that appropriated money, money that has already been appropriated, will not be obligated in fiscal year 1999. And because this is ''no-year money'', if you allow me to use that phrase that appropriators use and budgeters use, ''no-year money,'' those funds will eventually end up being spent somewhere. So we are just going to take advantage of those unobligated funds and use them now to meet this emergency.

Then I would like to say to my friend from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) that should a real emergency arrive in agricultural areas of our country, I can assure him, as chairman of this committee, that we will respond quickly to any request from Members or from the administration that would deal with any emergency in agriculture or any other emergency, for that matter, in the United States.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I rise to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me bring out one point, too. As has been said by a lot of speakers here, the money poposed for rescission has been appropriated. We are not reneging on the obligation that we still have for these banks.

We are the only country of all the participating countries that are participating in these banks that has appropriated the money. None of the other countries have appropriated it. And yet the actuaries or bond rating agencies are saying, ''We are concerned because the United States is withdrawing an appropriated amount of money.''

We are not diminishing the obligation. We only represent 16 percent of all of the callable capital of the Asian Development Bank, which means that if they have to call up $1,000 in new callable capital, then other nations have to put up $840 of that and we must put up $160. So the other countries have not put that money in a reserve account.

So why is this a detriment to the international banking community, if we are the only country who has done this and it was done many, many years ago, and it has never been called?

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), if in fact this bill does fully offset the new expenditures in the bill, then why does the bill need an emergency designation? Is it not true that it would have no emergency designation if in fact these items were fully offset?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I think I explained this once before but I would be happy to do it again.

The emergency designation was established by our own Budget Impoundment and Control Act, or whatever it is referred to as these days, and it does provide for an emergency designation, that if the Congress determines there is an emergency and if the President signs off and agrees that it is an emergency, then the monies appropriated do not have to be offset.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, but he claims they are fully offsetting them, so then they do not need the emergency designation.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield to me, I was in the middle of my explanation so only half of it is finished.

The other part is that I have no objection to saying that this is an emergency. We are responding to an emergency. So having the emergency designation in the bill, as requested by the President of the United States, does not give me any heartburn at all.

I think we should say that we are responding to an emergency. We just go a step further, and we say that we should offset and pay for this emergency. That is the difference. If the emergency designation is there or is not there, I do not think it is going to have any effect on this bill, at least as it is before the House today.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the fact is that the reason they need the emergency designation is that they do not fully offset this. In fact, this bill will add $445 million to the debt and to the deficit because they do not fully offset it.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, we do not fully offset it, and we will discuss where we do not fully offset it in a further debate.

The gentleman is absolutely correct, we do not offset the amount of money that we appropriate in this bill for the Army and the military services who immediately responded to that emergency in Central America, the same ones is pulled the kids out of the mud, who pulled the people out of the flooded rivers, who brought potable water to the area so that people could have water to drink that was sanitary.

That is correct, we are not suggesting that we offset that because that is a true emergency, and we will debate that later. But we do not need to offset defense appropriations any more. We have already done damage to our military over the years by reduced budgets and by making us offset deployments of American troops that are sent all over the world. I am going to strenuously object to offsetting any more funds that the Defense Department is required to spend because they are sent on a mission, no matter where it might be, whether or not it deals directly with the security of our Nation.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield further, I would simply say that response is incorrect. The offsets for the military only are $195 million. The add-on to the deficit under their bill is $455 million. So they still have not fully offset this bill and they ought to quit pretending that they have.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am puzzled.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has expired.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I hear the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) say, the way this bill is worded, this cancellation of the callable capital will not prevent any money from being spent that would otherwise have been spent this year, that is, it does not cancel any proposed spending for the year and it does not reduce our obligation.

The gentleman is the chairman of the committee. He says the full faith and credit is still there. So if it does not stop any spending that was going to happen this year and it does not prevent any spending in the future, how did it become an offset? What is it offsetting?

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is offset because we have already appropriated the money and it is sitting there in the account. So we are taking it out of the appropriation account and putting it back into the general fund.

Let me make a brief comment in my final minute here on something that the gentleman said earlier on the floor. Did I hear the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) say that some Members of Congress have the audacity to be speaking out of both sides of their mouths?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, what struck me was not that they were speaking out of both sides of their mouth but that they were equally inaccurate. Usually people get it right one out of two.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I cannot help but marvel at the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts is accusing any Member of this body, Republican or Independent or Democrat, of speaking out of both sides of their mouth. This may be an historic occasion for this Congress.

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

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

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

The gentleman spoke very factually a moment ago. But precisely because America is one of the few if not the only country in the world that has been backing these institutions is why I offer the amendment today.

□ 1300

Because I worry that if we, this body, should call into question the reliability of whether we will be there, I worry about the effect of that. That is precisely why I offer the amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we will be there. We are also leaving a sufficient amount of money in reserve in the event of any emergency.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 77, noes 345, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

AYES—77

Baird	Gutknecht	Peterson (MN)
Baldwin	Hall (TX)	Pickett
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Bartlett	Jackson (IL)	Roemer
Bereuter	Jefferson	Rush
Blagojevich	Kaptur	Sanchez
Blumenauer	Kennedy	Sawyer
Boucher	Kind (WI)	Schaffer
Boyd	Kucinich	Shows
Brown (OH)	LaFalce	Sisisky
Capps	Lampson	Smith (MI)
Capuano	Lewis (GA)	Smith (WA)
Clayton	Lofgren	Stabenow
Condit	Lucas (KY)	Stenholm
Cramer	Luther	Tanner
Crowley	McCarthy (MO)	Tauscher
Danner	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
Davis (IL)	McIntyre	Thompson (CA)
Delahunt	Meehan	Thurman
Doggett	Minge	Udall (CO)
Dooley	Moakley	Udall (NM)
Emerson	Nadler	Vento
Eshoo	Neal	Watt (NC)
Ford	Oberstar	Wu
Gonzalez	Obey	Wynn
Goode	Pelosi	

NOES—345

Abercrombie	Bonilla	Collins
Ackerman	Bonior	Combest
Aderholt	Bono	Conyers
Allen	Borski	Cook
Andrews	Boswell	Cooksey
Archer	Brady (PA)	Costello
Armey	Brady (TX)	Cox
Bachus	Brown (FL)	Coyne
Baker	Bryant	Crane
Baldacci	Burr	Cubin
Ballenger	Burton	Cummings
Barcia	Buyer	Cunningham
Barr	Callahan	Davis (FL)
Barton	Calvert	Davis (VA)
Bass	Camp	Deal
Bateman	Campbell	DeFazio
Becerra	Canady	DeGette
Bentsen	Cannon	DeLauro
Berkley	Cardin	DeLay
Berman	Carson	DeMint
Berry	Castle	Deutsch
Biggert	Chabot	Diaz-Balart
Bilbray	Chambliss	Dickey
Bilirakis	Chenoweth	Dicks
Bishop	Clay	Dingell
Bliley	Clement	Dixon
Blunt	Clyburn	Doolittle
Boehlert	Coble	Doyle
Boehner	Coburn	Dreier

Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Frank (MA)
Sabo

NOT VOTING—9

Barrett (NE)
Brown (CA)
Fletcher
Lowey
Myrick
Peterson (PA)
Slaughter
Stupak
Weldon (PA)

□ 1318

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. COBURN, Mrs. McCARTHY of New York and Mr. OLVER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. EMERSON and Messrs. KIND, SMITH of Michigan, WATT of North Carolina, JEFFERSON and POMEROY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 67, the amendment from the gentleman from Texas, Mr. STENHOLM, I inadvertently voted ''aye.'' I would like the RECORD to reflect I intended to vote ''no.''

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment made in order by House Resolution 125 offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 13, strike lines 3 through 10 (relating to Department of Agriculture, Public Law 480 Program and Grant Accounts.)

Page 13, strike lines 11 through 18 (relating to Department of Energy, Atomic Energy Defense Activities, Other Defense Activities).

Page 15, strike lines 16 through 25 (relating to International Financial Institutions, Reduction in Callable Capital Appropriations).

Page 18, strike lines 9 through 13 (relating to Export-Import Bank of the United States).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very complicated, as the vote on the previous amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) indicated, so I apologize for the fact that I will have to ask for an extension of time to complete my remarks in explaining it.

Mr. Chairman, sometime in the near future, as we all know, we are likely to be in a state of high confrontation a quarter of the world away, in Kosovo and in Serbia. Of all the times, this is the least desirable moment for the United States credibility to be questioned. Yet the action that this Congress is taking today on this bill will bring into question our commitment to the international financial institutions that we built at the end of World War II in order to try to stabilize the world's economy. It will also bring into question our commitment to work out in negotiations with the Russians to see to it that 50 tons of weapons-grade plutonium is converted to a more safe use in nuclear power plants. So I am offering this amendment to remove the foremost egregious offsets that the majority party has inserted in this bill.

Very simply, Mr. Chairman, my amendment eliminates the cut of $25 million in the Export-Import Bank funding because I believe that we should not be disarming ourselves in protecting American jobs and in protecting our markets abroad. That is what we do when we reduce the amount of money in the Export-Import Bank war chest, which is there for the purpose of sending a signal to the world that if other countries artificially subsidize exports by their corporations into world markets, we will use that money to do the same, so that we do not lose jobs in the process.

The second thing this amendment will do is to say that we will not at a time when our farmers have seen huge drops in their market prices, we will not choose this time to cut back on Public Law 480 funds. This is the device we use to try to facilitate the export of American farm products abroad. The amendment does two other things. It says that we will not add to the uncertainty of international financial markets, by for the first time in our history rescinding previously-appropriated callable capital funds.

The Secretary of the Treasury has already indicated if this provision remains in the bill, this bill will be vetoed, and it should be vetoed. We cannot afford to add uncertainty to international financial markets.

Fourth, what this amendment would do is to eliminate the $150 million rescission which will in the words of our own Department of Energy and in the words of our arms negotiators make it much less likely for us to be able to resume negotiations with the Russians on the conversion of that plutonium which is now within the borders of Russia, to convert that plutonium to a use other than for the purpose of building 15 to 25,000 more nuclear weapons.

□ 1330

I think it is imperative that this Congress support this action this afternoon.

What I think is really happening here is this: We know that the gentleman from Florida (Chairman YOUNG) tried to bring a bill to the floor which would have been a bipartisan bill, but he was then given different orders by his House leadership.

He is being a good soldier, but we know that if the Committee on Appropriations had been left to its own devices, we would have a far different bill before us here this afternoon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. OBEY was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, what we really have here is this: The House could have produced a bill which would have epitomized cooperation between the executive and legislative branches on an item that the President felt was an emergency. Instead, because of the instructions given to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the Congress is instead choosing to follow the path once again of confrontation with the President. It is setting up a bill which is going to be vetoed, which will get no help to anybody.

Secondly, let me make this observation: We have had various Republican

voices say that this administration's foreign policy is faulty. I will be the first to admit it is far from perfect, but I would suggest that this action comes after a series of other actions taken by the majority party which calls into legitimate question its understanding of the world or its willingness to recognize our responsibility to lead.

This is the same party that has refused to pay our bills at the United Nations, which brings into question our leadership capacity in that institution. It is the same party which for over a year held up action on the International Monetary Fund request by the President. That action again added uncertainty, especially in the Asian markets, and made it more difficult for us to sell our products in those markets.

It is the same party that has really at various times come at the Bosnia and Kosovo questions from both sides. Now it is the same party which is saying that we ought to bring into question our commitment to support the international financial institutions, and their role, after all, is to help stabilize international markets primarily for our benefit. We started those institutions so we would not have to carry the full load.

Lastly, the majority party is also attempting to put roadblocks in the way of the administration's ability to negotiate that crucial plutonium agreement. It just seems to me that on that issue alone, this amendment ought to be passed. If this amendment is not passed, the bill before us should be voted down.

There is no rational reason to take $150 million off the table at a time when we put that there in order to make certain that the Russians would come back to the negotiating table.

I understand that the staff of the subcommittee is unhappy because they were not involved in the original decision to include this money in the Omnibus bill, but I think that staff pique over that issue is not sufficient reason to put our national interest at question when it comes to dealing with this plutonium question.

I would urge, in the name of responsibility, that the House vote for this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we actually could have gone ahead with a vote because we really have debated these issues all morning long. I am going to speak to just one of the issues and then other Members of the Committee on Appropriations will address several of the others.

The concern that the gentleman has expressed about the PL–480 program, this bill includes a $30 million rescission this program and as I have repeatedly said throughout this debate this should not cause any problem on that side of the aisle, certainly not at the White House. In fact, there have been very substantial carryovers in this account for the last few years. In fact, in 1999, there was a $40 million carryover in the PL–480 account.

The administration, the White House, has proposed cutting Title I funding in half for the past 3 years, and Congress has restored most of the program each year. So even with this rescission, the program will be operating substantially above the requested level.

For fiscal year 2000, the administration has again proposed to cut Title I in half and to reduce the other two food aid programs, Title II and Title III.

In testimony before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies in recent weeks, the administration said these cuts would not cause any problems, in part because the administration has created a new food aid program for Russia of more than $700 million using funds from the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So ours is a responsible rescission, and we still have more money in the fund than the White House would have. The White House would certainly not attempt to cut these funds if they thought it was going to hurt the program, because it is a good program, and I support the PL–480 program and I always have, even back years ago when the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I used to debate on callable capital almost every day of our lives. I support the PL–480 program, and we do not do any damage to it because there was a $40 million carryover. So I would suggest that this is not a real argument.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I am confused as to whether the gentleman's party intends to follow the CBO accounting on these issues or not.

Is not it, in fact, true that the CBO indicates that $16 million of the funds that the gentleman is rescinding would, in fact, be spent absent the rescission on the PL–480 issue? Is not that the case?

Does not that, therefore, demonstrate that those funds are needed?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I am not sure that I understand exactly the point that the gentleman is trying to make. All I am saying is that our rescission is less of a rescission than the administration asked for when they sent their budget up here.

Mr. OBEY. The point I am trying to make is this: The gentleman is saying this will have no significant programmatic impact, and the gentleman has indicated numerous times that this money is not going to be spent anyway.

The fact is the Congressional Budget Office, which scores these items for all of us, indicates that, in fact, $16 million of that would, in fact, be spent without the rescission; that $16 million which is unavailable to assist American farmers in exporting their products, and if ever they need assistance to export their products this is the time.

The administration did not volunteer to support the agricultural funds that were provided in last year's supplemental either, but both parties ran to do that because we recognized the severe need out in farm country.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. The key issue here is how much money is left in Title I of the PL–480 fund. The funds that are left there, in our opinion, are substantial.

Now, when we go to the CBO scoring issue, this is something that the gentleman and I are going to have to work with very diligently over the next few weeks and few months because CBO scoring, as the gentleman well knows, is very much different than OMB's scoring.

We are going to have to deal with this great difference between the scoring of the OMB and the CBO. We are not going to solve that problem here today. We will talk more about that tomorrow when we deal with the budget resolution, but the gentleman is correct. CBO scoring is a serious problem that we are all going to have to face up to, especially since it is so different than OMB, but we will discuss that tomorrow.

This rescission is less of a rescission than the White House would make, and I am satisfied that there is more than enough money left to carry out the intent of the PL–480 program.

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

Mr. Chairman, the House Republicans have loaded up this bill, which should be noncontroversial, with all sorts of peculiar provisions. Remember, this bill was supposed to be a bill to help out the victims of Hurricanes Mitch and George and to provide loans to United States farmers hurt by low commodity prices, but instead the Republicans have loaded it up with controversial proposals that virtually guarantee a presidential veto.

For whatever reason, the Republicans have apparently decided to demand offsets, that is, cuts in other programs, in order to ensure the emergency relief that is in this bill. So they decided to use the bill, in other words, as a mechanism to target cuts for programs that the isolationist wing of the GOP simply does not like.

Forget that we have a budget surplus. Forget that we can afford to help our Central American neighbors and help our farmers here at home without having to slash these other programs.

No. The House Republican leadership wants to use this bill to rescind programs for international financial banks, slash funding for safeguarding of dangerous nuclear weapons material from Russia and slash funding for global warming studies.

First their supplemental would cut $150 million that would have been used

to dismantle and safely store fissile material, bomb grade material, from thousands of Russian nuclear bombs. This is material which could be used for thousands of nuclear bombs. It could be sold to rogue nations or terrorists for use against the United States.

It is in our national interest to help the Russians dismantle their weapons and to store them in a form which is no longer usable for nuclear explosive purposes.

Just one week ago, the Republicans felt so strongly about the need to spend tens of billions of dollars on a dubious missile defense system to protect us against nuclear attack that they actually brought up a resolution to this floor saying that it was the policy of the United States to deploy a missile defense system.

Now this week they are apparently no longer concerned about weapons of mass destruction except, of course, when it comes to blaming Bill Clinton for the fact that the Chinese spies had penetrated Los Alamos back during the Reagan and Bush administrations.

Apparently it is Bill Clinton's fault that the Governor of Arkansas failed to prevent the Chinese from penetrating Los Alamos during the Reagan and Bush administrations.

So based upon the record of the last few weeks, we now find that the GOP is willing to spend billions on missile defenses of doubtful utility, it is willing to blame Bill Clinton for things that happened when we had a Republican in the White House, but it is not even willing to spend even $150 million to dismantle nuclear warheads that might end up in the hands of Saddam Hussein or Slobodan Milosevic.

Of course, if that ever happens I am sure that they will try to blame Bill Clinton that this money was cut.

Right now we are in a very sensitive situation with the Russians. Russian Prime Minister Primakov actually has turned his flight around in mid-air on the way to the United States to protest the NATO plans to bomb the Serbians.

At this point in time, do we really want to send the Russians the message that we are no longer interested in helping them dismantle their nuclear warheads? At this tense moment in our relations with Russia, is that really the message we want to send?

Despite our disagreements with Russia over Serbia, we still have a vital national security interest in working with the Russians to prevent bomb grade materials from getting into the wrong hands. This bill undermines that effort.

In addition to this fatal shortcoming, the Republican supplemental bill would rescind $648 million appropriated to guarantee the U.S. commitment to the World Bank, to the Asian Development Bank and to the Inter-American Development Bank.

□ 1345

Now we are living in a global economy. We can no longer insulate ourselves from what happened around the world. If the economy of Russia or Brazil collapses, our stock market, our investors, feel the effects. If the financial markets conclude that this Congress is walking away from its commitments to sustained financial stability, then it would be a mistake.

I hope that the Obey amendment is adopted.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the rules of the House require that when we are speaking on this Floor, that we ought to address our comments to the Speaker or Chairman, and certainly during this debate the Chairman has paid close attention and probably better understands where we are than most any Member of the body.

But just to reemphasize our position, let me just say that 30 to 40 odd years ago many nations got together and decided that they would create these regional multidevelopment banks. As they did in 1945 with the World Bank, each nation would put in some usable capital, which they did. This paid-in capital funded each bank's initial operations.

The Founding members told them to be responsible in their efforts; that when a bank loans this money to a foreign country, they should be able to pay it back.

They told the banks: ''We want you to remain solvent. Just in case, we are going to put up a designated amount of callable capital. In the event you get into a crisis and you need additional monies, you will be able to call on these various countries to receive additional capital, called callable capital.''

The United States was the only nation that chose at that time to put up these billions of dollars into a callable capital account, which has never been used. It has been sitting there unobligated for all of these years. Congress stopped appropriating callable capital in 1980.

The problem, I would suggest to the Secretary of the Treasury, is not really the rescission of the callable capital. This is not going to impact the solvency of the bank. This is not going to do anything to the creditworthiness of the banks.

The full faith and credit of the United States stands behind all capital subscriptions entered into by the Secretary of the Treasury, after authorization by Congress. All of this $52.5 billion in callable capital for the World Bank and the Inter-American and Asian banks has been authorized by Congress. Only $11.5 billion has been appropriated. We are not rescinding the authorization. Whether or not 22 percent or 21 percent of the callable capital is appropriated or not, the full faith and credit of the United States still stands, so we are not changing anything substantive.

Naturally, the bond-raters would like to have the money sitting in the left-hand drawer rather than the right-hand drawer.

I should suggest to the people who are making the determination whether or not a multilateral bank is creditworthy to look into their loan portfolio. Are the banks lending monies to countries—such as Russia—that cannot or will not pay it back? They ought to be concerned about that. I'd suggest that they consider the tremendous pressure to forgive all debt owed to MDBs by poor countries. I'd suggest they be concerned that there is no appropriated callable capital for the African, European, or North American development banks.

Are the multi-lateral development banks, in such sorry financial condition that they cannot be sure of their own solvency because of the bad loans they hold? We are not removing the full faith and credit of the United States, we are just taking the money back that we never needed to appropriate in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I would want to urge Members to vote against the Obey amendment.

There has been some threat about a presidential veto. Let us keep in mind the whole scenario. The President went to Central America. The First Lady went to Central America. They are the ones who went and said, ''help will be coming.'' They are the ones that came up with the designated request for money that we are going to spend.

I think that the President of the United States is not going to be in a position to veto a bill, just because we are rescinding some callable capital that has no substantive impact at all on the solvency of the bank. I know that the Secretary of the Treasury has indicated that he is going to recommend a veto. However, I do not think the President could stand on the world stage and say, ''the Congress is giving me the Hurricane Mitch reconstruction money, but I do not like where they are offsetting the money, so we are not going to accept the money and send it to help these people in Central America.'' The President has not told me that. I do not think he has told anybody in the Congress that he is going to veto it. This is coming from the Secretary of the Treasury.

If the President wants to veto the bill, tell him to veto it. Let him cut off the aid to these needy and desperate people in Central America. In my opinion, he will not do it because he cannot do it, because this is not going to impact the solvency of the banks.

Secretary Rubin is aware of this. Secretary Rubin is more concerned about the precedent; the fact that if we do this a second time, we are going to be coming back in a few years trying to rescind more callable capital. He is concerned about the precedent, rather than the reality of the problem.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment, thank the gentleman once again for his leadership in bringing this to the Floor, and recognize our distinguished chairman for his first bill on the Floor, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

I regretfully disagree with my distinguished chair of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, of which I am the ranking member.

Just reviewing Mr. CALLAHAN's own words at the end of his comments is an argument for the Obey amendment when he said, in his view, that Mr. Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury, was not concerned about this amount of money but about the precedent it would set. That is known as uncertainty. Uncertainty is not a plus in the financial world.

The crisis in Asia speaks to our not taking this money from callable capital for the multilateral development banks, in particular the Asian Development Bank, because we need money for an emergency.

As appropriators we all know the hard fights that go into determining what an appropriation will be for a particular year. We should respect that process. We thought these were important priorities. We voted for this funding. Now, with this bill, we are saying, we did not need to spend that money anyway.

We should respect the regular order, and the regular order says that under the budget agreement we have caps, yes, but we also provide for emergencies not to be offset.

As I have said earlier in my comments against the bill as presented, if thousands of people die, millions of people homeless, entire economies wiped out in the countries hit by this storm, the hurricane, if that does not constitute an emergency, it is hard to see what would. There probably never would be an emergency, if the worst natural disaster to hit the Western Hemisphere is not considered an emergency.

What we are saying to the people of Central America is, we feel sorry for you but we do not consider you an emergency.

Our process calls for our appropriating funds in a very deliberative process. It also calls for us to have this emergency fund, just as any family in America would have some savings for a rainy day. Well, the rainy day came to Central America, and it came again and again and again, and those people were wiped out, both their economies, their personal lives, their homes, et cetera.

What we want to do is to help rebuild their economies. With our assistance, we want them to develop the private sector. We want them to be self-reliant. We want certainly to provide the emergency assistance to begin with, but we want them to develop their own economies.

Why should we have to do that at the expense of the callable capital for the multilateral development banks, some of which lend into that area? Why should we do that by thrusting uncertainty into the markets about the credit rating of these multilateral development banks?

The Secretary of the Treasury said he was recommending a veto to the President of the United States for this bill if the callable capital provision was in the bill, for reasons of dipping into that fund in the first place, and as a precedent, certainly, to make matters worse.

So let us not try to gloss over the importance of a credit rating. Let us not gloss over the importance of certainty versus uncertainty. That is why we appropriated the money in the first place, because it needed to be there for us to do our share. If we pull the callable capital, what if the other countries do, too? Why is it not okay for them, if it is okay for us?

We are getting on some dangerous territory here. I think we should not confuse the message by having two fights, here. What we are talking about is the very reasonable amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that addresses the four areas we have talked about, one of them being the callable capital; another, the Exim-Bank and the war chest of the Exim-Bank, again putting our assistance for trade or export financing in doubt; the $40 million cut from development assistance; and the $45 million in cuts from Eastern Europe and the new independent states, just at a time when those countries are faced with such uncertainty.

Why, facing one problem, are we making matters worse in other parts of the world, when what we should be doing is using the money that the American people think we have saved for a rainy day to help meet the needs of the people who are devastated by the consequences of Hurricane Mitch, the worst natural disaster in the history of the Western Hemisphere? Certainly it is an emergency.

I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, what I am understanding in this amendment is basically that the gentleman from Wisconsin is opposed to any offsets, Mr. Chairman. He has sort of designated some of the bigger ones, and particularly the Department of Energy defense activities, where there is $150 million.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has misstated my position. I am not opposed to all offsets. There are a number of offsets in this bill that I have no objection to. My amendment is aimed at the four that I consider to be the most egregious, but I am not opposed to all offsets.

Mr. TIAHRT. If I may continue, Mr. Chairman, most of these four amendments that the gentleman put forth, or the four items in the account that he has attacked, are about 90 or 95 percent of the offsets.

The bottom line is, if we do not offset the bill, the money has to go from somewhere. It has to come from somewhere and go down to Central America. The only other amount of money that is available is the social security surplus. So if we do not offset this money, it is going to come from social security.

I think if we stopped the average person on the street in either Wisconsin or in Kansas and asked them, what would you rather spend your money on, social security or a foreign aid emergency, I think nine times out of ten they are going to say, we want to save social security.

So what we are trying to do is save social security and still provide money for the people who need it very much down in Central America.

Mr. Chairman, one of these accounts that we have heard so much about is the $150 million that was supposed to go to properly secure and store the uranium or plutonium. There is still $375 million in the account that the Department of Energy has to properly store and properly secure uranium that is in Russia.

There is some talk about putting the Nation at great risk because we were pulling back this $150 million. This $150 million was not obligated. There was no plan to spend it during this year, and there has been no agreement on how plutonium is going to be properly secured and properly stored in the country of Russia, so we had no immediate designation for this money. It was money that was put there, but now we are going to move it to a higher priority someplace where there is a greater need.

In the callable capital account, we heard the subcommittee chairman from the Subcommittee on Foreign Operation, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), tell us that we are only 16 percent of the obligation of the international commitment in callable capital. The international commitment is some $150 billion. We are only about $35 billion out of that.

None of the other countries have set aside money in an account like we have. We have $12 billion sitting in that account. It is a checking account. What we are going to do, once again, is take money and move it to a higher priority. We are going to move it to the great need that currently exists in Central America.

If the money does not come from somewhere, we will have to turn to the social security surplus. That is the only money that is available. So the choice is very clear. If we vote for the

amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Members are choosing to take money from the social security surplus and send it down to Central America.

If Members choose to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, they will be accepting offsets, money that is unobligated, money that we have no current plans to use, and instead, establish a much higher priority by moving it down to the great need that exists in Central America.

□ 1400

So with this very clear choice, I think that most Americans would agree with this, that it is time that we secure the future for ourselves, for our seniors, for our children by choosing to preserve Social Security and by taking unobligated funds, funds that we did not have a plan to spend, and moving it to the priority down in Central America, in Honduras and Guatemala and Belize and those places that were so severely hit by Hurricane Mitch.

So I would urge my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to vote against the Obey amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The comment that we just heard, that without offsets this money will come from the Social Security Trust Fund, is absolutely ludicrous, absurd, and false. The fact is the committee pretends it is going to cut $648 million out of callable capital. There is not one dime saved in outlays.

The way we measure what is available for Social Security or anything else is on the basis of outlays, not budget authorities, as the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) well knows or should know.

The gentleman from Kansas misstated my position, so let me correct it. The fact is that out of the $648 million that my colleagues claim to save, there is not one dime of savings, so that does not cost Social Security one dime. If we take a look at the entire package, unless my colleagues assume that their committee chairman is correct, if they assume their chairman is correct and that the Act will not harm our agreements with the Soviets on uranium, then out of the entire amount of this amendment, only $16 million will ever accrue as outlay savings. That is less than one-half of 1 percent of all the funds that we are talking about. So do not misconstrue this as being an attack on Social Security. That is blatant nonsense.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I rise in support of the Obey amendment, and I do so on the basis of two particular aspects of the supplemental bill that I believe are particularly egregious. The first one is the provision which would strike the ability to purchase from the Russians 50 tons of weapons grade plutonium.

Just a week ago we had a bill on the floor of this House which called upon our government to deploy a ''Star Wars'' system, a ballistic nuclear defense system, the physics of which are not even at this moment understood. There are serious questions as to whether or not this apparatus would ever work effectively.

Nevertheless, we are prepared to spend tens of billions of dollars on that program to deploy it, and at the same time we are rescinding from this supplemental bill a small amount of money which would enable us to purchase 50 tons of weapons grade plutonium from the Russians.

If we do not purchase that 50 tons of weapons grade plutonium, the likelihood is that some portion of it is going to end up in the hands of some terrorist organizations and the hands of some person like Saddam Hussein or someone else in some other part of the world that has the ability to threaten this country and threaten others.

The logic of this is absolutely astonishing. There is no logic to it whatsoever. How can my colleagues come here and be for a ballistic missile defense system one week, and then the next week come back and say we ought not to be purchasing weapons grade plutonium from the Russians when we know if we do not, it is going to get in the hands of people who mean us and others harm? This is totally ridiculous.

The other provision would, and this is more than half of the offsets which were offered by the majority, come from the multilateral development banks. We live in a global economy. We are still involved in a situation where there is a serious economic crisis in Southeast Asia, a serious economic problem in Central and South America, a terribly serious economic problem in Russia, all of which impact upon our economy.

We are seeing it particularly in our commodities, particularly in our agricultural commodities. Part of this bill is to help our farmers around the country. At the same time we pretend to be helping our farmers in the supplemental bill, we are going to make it more difficult for them to sell their commodities on the open market. Why? Because the crisis in East Asia has closed up markets there for commodities. The Canadians and the Australians which normally sell into those markets are finding it difficult if not impossible to do so. Therefore, they are impacting on our markets.

Our farmers are finding it difficult to sell in the markets that we normally have access to, let alone those that we hope to have access to. That is the principal reason why we are seeing such difficulty in the agricultural community all across our country.

In this supplemental bill, by these offsets, my colleagues are threatening every farmer that sells outside of the United States, whether it is wheat, corn, soybeans, cotton. Regardless of what it is, my colleagues are threatening that part of our economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HINCHEY was allowed to proceed for 4 additional minutes.)

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, these are two critically important deficiencies in this supplemental bill. We have before us some genuine emergencies as a result of the hurricanes and the devastation that those hurricanes caused, genuine emergencies. We have an emergency also in our agricultural community across the country. We should respond to those emergencies in the spirit of emergency. They are serious problems. They need to be dealt with, and they need to be dealt with now.

But instead of doing that, we have a bill before us which has within it an extraordinarily high political quotient. It is not designed to deal with the emergencies. It is designed to play a little bit of politics and to play some politics with the administration particularly.

I beg my colleagues, please, on behalf of the farmers of our country, on behalf of our national security, change this bill, support with us the Obey amendment. Do not take the rescissions from the multilateral development banks. Do not take the rescissions from the money that is required to buy 50 tons of weapons grade plutonium from the Russians. Let us help agriculture truly, and let us improve our national security by taking those provisions out of this supplemental appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I very much support the Obey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to follow up on some of the earlier debate that I was having with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). On one hand, if I understood him correctly, he is opposed to the offsets because there is no actual outlays. But then it would seem, if he is opposed to offsets since there is no actual outlays, he would support using callable capital since it does not really cost anything.

On the other hand, if we do offset, if we do take the money from callable capital, then we are going to create a worldwide depression because of this. So I am a little puzzled on that.

The last part I would like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to address is that he says this money cannot come from Social Security. All the money that we have in the Federal Government is obligated except for what we have outlaid right here.

The money has to come from somewhere if it is not specifically designated in this piece of legislation. The only other money available is in the surplus that we have. The only money in the surplus is from Social Security.

So I would submit logically that if we do not offset the money in the bill, it does have to come from Social Security.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) yield?

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman is a new member of the committee, fairly new anyway, but I assume he understands the following: When we determine what our deficit is, we determine that not on the basis of what budget authority is, but what is outlaid in any given fiscal year.

Would the gentleman grant that?

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) yield?

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, that is correct. I would agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, let me give my colleagues the numbers. This bill pretends that it saves $853 million for Social Security. In fact, the most that it saves is $19 million, unless the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is wrong on his assumptions about what will happen with the plutonium agreement. The fact is that the $648 million so-called saving from callable capital results in no savings on the outlay side, so that does not put one dime in Social Security.

The $25 million which my colleagues cut out of Ex-Im results, according to CBO, in only $3 million of actual outlaid savings. The $30 million which the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) said would have no impact, in fact CBO says does have $16 million in impact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) has expired.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, that means in effect that there may be $19 million in play as far as Social Security is concerned. The rest of it is not, unless the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is wrong on his assumptions on plutonium.

I would simply say this. If he is, I would ask every citizen of this country one question: What is more important, to save that $80 million today that CBO estimates will be outlaid for that, or to use it to make sure that we do not have enough plutonium floating around the world for the Russians or terrorist organizations to build 15,000 additional nuclear weapons?

I think every Social Security recipient in the world would like to see us, first of all, make certain that we make this world more safe from the possible threat from nuclear weapons. So do not bring that red herring across the table about Social Security. This debate has nothing whatsoever to do with Social Security except in the gentleman's own mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) has expired.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of the $150 million, the reason we left $375 million in that account is so that we do not completely abandon the efforts that we have in Russia. In fact, we are very dedicated to the efforts in Russia.

But I do want to make a point about where this money is going to come from. We are going to write a check and send it to Central America. It is going to be used for the infrastructure. That money has to come from somewhere. It is not going to come out of thin air.

That money, $648 million of it, is going to come out of a checking account that is at the World Bank. It is called callable capital. If we write a check, it gets a debit. It is going to go down to Central America. If my colleagues say there is no outlay, no savings, well, the money has to come from somewhere. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the only place it is available is the surplus. The only surplus that is available is Social Security.

So I would just in a very clear way say that we are going to write a check. That check is going to Central America, and the money has to come from somewhere.

In our personal lives, we do not write checks unless we have money to cover it. This is the money to cover it. If we do not take it from here, we take it from Social Security.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) will continue to yield, let me simply point out again on one item that the gentleman from Kansas just cited, he is just flat-out wrong on the facts.

He indicated that if we rescind this $150 million in the plutonium and uranium account, that there will still be $375 million left. There will not be. Mr. Primakov is about to sign an agreement with the United States Government which will use $325 million for the uranium agreement that we are working on with the Russians.

If my colleagues rescind the $150 million of the $200 million that is remaining in the account, and that is all there is, there will be only $50 million left for us to proceed on our negotiations with the Russians on the plutonium account. That $200 million was put on the table in order to bring the Russians into the negotiations. If we get an agreement from them, that agreement will cost far more than $200 million. It will cost at least $1 billion.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Obey amendment, and I want to really thank the gentleman for crafting a careful amendment that looked at every single detail of this bill.

Truly, others have dealt with the plutonium issues and with other aspects of the offsets, but in the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), he specifically targets the PL–480 program, and I really want to focus my remarks there in the time that I have.

I cannot believe that in the bill that the majority has given us, that they would attempt to take $30 million or any amount, actually, from the PL–480 program. Now what is that? That is a program that lifts commodities off our market and sends them around the world. To not fund this program at the level requested really, and that is inadequate from the administration standpoint simply because they know Congress will add funds to that account in view of the situation, if we choose to cut these dollars, we are basically saying there are no more hungry people in the world.

□ 1415

That is an absolutely ridiculous position. Not only that, but here at home the need, the need, to move commodities is simply profound.

What is happening in rural America is something that we have not seen in our adult lifetimes, with the levels of price drops, whether we are talking about the milk market, whether we are talking about hogs, whether we are talking about grain, or whether we are talking about cotton. I mean, go down the list. Rice, historic price drops. We know what has happened in the Asian markets, we know what has happened to our former market in Eastern Europe because of the collapse of the ruble, the situations all around the world which have hurt our export markets. But here at home, because of good weather, we have an enormous surplus which has driven prices to all-time lows.

People in my part of the country are burying animals. This seems so illogical in a time when our feeding kitchens are absolutely begging for food. This is one tool that we have, PL–480, to help lift some of America's surplus, our bounty, to share it with those in the world that many of our esteemed Members, like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TONY HALL), of my own State, and former Congressman Bill Emerson of Missouri, worked so hard to sensitize this Congress and the American people on the needs of the hungry around the world.

So I just find it incredible that this particular measure was inserted into this offset provision. And I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for bringing it to the attention of not just this Congress but the American people and people of good heart everywhere. There is absolutely no reason that America cannot lift this bounty and share it worldwide, and why the PL–480 program was selected leaves me in a state of disbelief.

So I rise, Mr. Chairman, in strong support of the Obey amendment, particularly because of the ill-advised provision that deals with clipping the wings of PL–480, which does not need to be cut but in fact increased to benefit our farmers, our communities here at home, as well as those around the world who beg us for food.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman yielding to me, and I am looking at testimony here by Keith Kelly, who is the Administrator of the Farm Service Agency, and he talks about ''The 1999 budget provides a total program level of $979 million for PL–480, foreign food assistance.'' The Congress raised that to $1.1 billion. According to his testimony, he says, ''This will ensure the availability of adequate resources to meet the most serious food assistance needs.''

So even with this rescission, we leave more money in the PL–480 program than the administration asked for in their hearing.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much for pointing that out. If we look at what has happened with prices, the figure that the gentleman stated, the over $1 billion figure, will help us to buy more with the American tax dollar to send abroad. That is true. But the amount of surplus that we have on domestic markets is drowning our rural communities.

As we sit here and argue today, and we will not produce a bill that will aid our farmers this spring, this Congress is going to fail in that responsibility. This should have been the first bill this Congress considered when we convened this year, and we have failed that responsibility to our own people. The surplus is gigantic, but the need abroad is even greater, if we look at what is happening in Russia, what is happening in Asia, and what is happening in Central America and Honduras.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Ms. KAPTUR was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, our very esteemed ranking member.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I would simply make this observation, Mr. Chairman.

We have people in both parties in this House who, on a daily basis, are putting out press releases talking about what they are going to be doing to try to help farmers get out from under the collapse of prices for many commodities. I would suggest in those circumstances that what we ought to be doing on both sides of the aisle is pushing the administration to provide more assistance to farmers, more assistance to increase our ability to export farm products to other markets, rather than cutting back on the funds in the budget available to do that.

If people are serious about the press releases they are putting out, that is what they will be doing rather than voting for this bill this afternoon.

Ms. KAPTUR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I might also say that the administration's request to us through the Department of Agriculture was cleared through the Office of Management and Budget in the executive branch. My own guess is that the Department of Agriculture would like to increase the PL–480 program a whole lot more than the budget submission that reached this Congress. It has to go through the filter of OMB, and that is an unrealistic way in which to make decisions about policy.

We reflect the will of the American people here, and rural America is crying out to us. We ought to use every single tool that we have, and we should not cut a dime out of the PL–480 program, with all due respect to the gentleman, who represents a great citrus-producing State, a great beef-producing State, a great milk-producing State. There is a lot that happens there in the State of Florida, and I know the gentleman has to defend his party on the floor today, but truly this should not be in this bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me once again, because I wanted to respond to the comments the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just made when the gentlewoman yielded to him, about the agricultural request and what we should be doing and should not be doing.

Here is a copy of the communication from the President of the United States. He signed the letter on the first page. This bill does what the President asked for in the agricultural program. He asked for a specific amount of money, and that amount of money is in this bill.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I would mention to the gentleman, with all due respect, the President never asked for these offsets. And, also, I know that inside the Department of Agriculture they are drowning in commodities. When the administration sends a request up here, it is not always perfect because of what happens over at OMB.

I know, and the gentleman obviously knows, that silos across this country are bursting at the seams. We have food to send around the world, and our farmers need help on the price in order that they can make it through this planting year. The tragedy is that the credit program that is buried in this bill, that will help our farmers get their spring crops in the ground, will not happen fast enough for them.

They do not even have the assistance that was passed last year in the emergency bill that was passed at the end of the year. They will not get that until June. So shame on this Congress and shame on the administration, too.

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

Mr. Chairman, in some respects I am delighted this debate is going to be on C-SPAN today and the American people can see it. In other respects, though, this is almost an embarrassment.

Earlier, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) offered an amendment to make the rescissions across-the-board to pay for this special bill. I voted for it, but there were only about 75 of us that joined with that amendment, and I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that I am glad he joined.

But in listening to this debate I became more and more frustrated just watching in my office, because what we hear from everybody is, well, I would like to have offsets too, but do not touch this program. We cannot touch PL–480. I like PL–480. There are lots of programs I like.

What this debate really is all about, if we stop and step back for a minute, is we are being asked to fund a little over a billion dollar bill which essentially is about 90 percent foreign aid, and yet we are not willing to make the tough decisions.

Now, a lot of talk has been made here on the floor about what is happening to farmers out there. And let me tell my colleagues it is tough out in farm country. Every farmer, every farmer, whether they are in Florida or they are in Iowa or whether in Kansas, they are trying to figure out how they are going to tighten their belts to get through the next year. To put that in context right now, we are looking at a Federal budget of about $1,700 billion.

I hear the debate here on the floor today that we cannot find a billion dollars worth of offsets. Now, I am not good in math, but that is something like one-tenth of 1 percent. Now, maybe there are Members in this room who believe that we cannot find one-tenth of 1 percent worth of offsets. Maybe there are Members in the room who really believe that, but I got news for them, there are a lot of people outside of this room, a lot of people outside of this beltway who believe that is ridiculous. We can find the offsets and we should find the offsets.

Let me explain why. Because we are going to have a budget on the floor later this week, and we are going to say for the first time to the American people and for the first time to the senior citizens in the United States that we are going to save every single penny of Social Security taxes for Social Security. Now, I think that is a very important statement. That is a giant step forward, in my opinion.

And while it is only a small step, it seems to me if we do not find the offsets today, whether it is PL–480 or other foreign aid programs, whether it be offsets from the reduction in the callable capital, whatever it happens to be, if we cannot find those offsets today, it seems like we are taking a very small step in the wrong direction.

As I say, I think a lot of my colleagues in this room believe we cannot find those offsets, but I have news for them, a lot of people outside this room believe we can and believe we should.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply observe that there were 71 Democrats who voted for that amendment; there were only 6 Republicans who did.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I thank the gentleman for the arithmetic.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Let me applaud the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the committee for their leadership and their wisdom for trying to explain to us that this emergency supplemental appropriation is, in fact, creating an emergency and a crisis.

I am particularly interested in having our colleagues, Republicans and joining Democrats, recognize that we have a vital problem in the cuts that have been made in our international monetary efforts. In particular, the largest and most unwelcome of these cuts are in the international banks. This bill cuts funding to those banks by $648 million, in an environment where those banks are often the best option for borrowers seeking shelter from a hostile economic environment.

This is so important to the Secretary of Commerce that he is threatening a veto if this legislation, the appropriations legislation, passes in this condition. And let me cite the comment of the minority commenting on these offsets that really tells us where we are internationally:

''It is also true that other member nations and many investors around the world are increasingly uneasy about the willingness of the U.S., and particularly the U.S. Congress, to make good on its legal and moral commitments. These same investors watch the Congress repeatedly refuse to provide the International Monetary Fund with the needed infusion of capital through the debts of the Asian financial crisis, and are also aware that the Congress continues to refuse to provide the funds necessary to pay off the billion-plus in back debts of the United States.''

These international monetary banks help our products. It helps our farmers' products get from production to market, it gives access to credit, it also helps to infuse dollars into the international economy and, therefore, keeps the American economy, of which so many people have come to not only accept but to think this is the norm, it helps to keep it stabilized. Why would we think that $648 million, doing great jeopardy to this very fragile system, is where we need to go? I am very surprised we would even go in that direction and gamble with the financial future of this Nation.

I would also say the $25 million from the Export-Import Bank, albeit seemingly small, this bank has been most useful in helping some of our smaller nations with small projects that generate jobs and opportunity, in fact keeping individuals home in their nations because they have the opportunity and access to credit, and as well, creating jobs.

I would also say that even though I have heard a number of explanations on why we are cutting $150 million that deals in particular with funds used to purchase materials, uranium and plutonium, that could be used in nuclear warheads by our enemies, a program that has been unanimously supported by the President, and I think if we would inquire, by individuals in the street who say that we should bring down the possibility of more and more of our enemies having nuclear warheads, that, too, raises a question of balance and why we would do that.

Let me say also, having worked with the Department of Labor on the issue of a rapid response team program dealing with our hardest hit communities when there are enormous layoffs, particularly in my district and my community where there have been enormous layoffs because of the energy crisis, I am somewhat disappointed in the cuts that we have seen relating to job training, and would hope that we would be able to balance that.

Let me say finally, also, Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims for the Committee on the Judiciary, I am certainly gratified that we have in this supplemental appropriations, and viewed as an emergency, some $80 million for the Immigration and Naturalization Service for increased border enforcement. I, however, raise the concern, as many experts have, that border enforcement without trained, experienced Border Patrol agents is of no value. So I hope that we recognize that we need trained Border Patrol agents. We need to have dollars as well to prohibit and inhibit border violence.

And the question of adding additional beds is not going to be the panacea that we would like it to be.

□ 1430

In fact, the real issue is the 1996 immigration reform legislation that in fact caused the INS to have to deal with locking up, if you will, immigrants who have been here, who 20, 30, 40 years ago may have had an infraction such as a traffic ticket. They are then arrested, separated from their families, filling up these private prisons; and the real criminals that we do not want to have on the street are not able to be incarcerated.

We have got to reform the INS legislation to go back to reality and sanity. We also have got to get these people out of private prisons and put them into the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

I hope some of these more reasonable aspects, Mr. Chairman, can be addressed later on. And I hope the Obey amendment will pass. I add my support to it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate somewhat to wade off into the number of issues that are being discussed, but there has been a lot of discussion today about the offset dealing with some of the nonproliferation funds. I think this is a very important issue. It is a very important part of our security. I want to take just a moment to discuss this in the larger context of our nonproliferation efforts.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I share some of the concerns that have been expressed over the course of the day. I think at the end of this bill, when it comes back from conference, it would probably be better if this offset were not taken, if this money were left alone. But I also think that we should not over-play the dangers that may result from this particular program.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, I speak as one who on this side of the aisle has strongly supported much of what the administration has tried to do in our nonproliferation efforts and in our cooperative efforts with the former Soviet Union, but in those efforts there are priorities. Some things are more important than others.

For example, if we can spend money this year to put better security around plutonium or uranium which could be used for a bomb, that ought to come first. That prevents someone from walking out with it. That prevents someone from stealing it and selling it to someone who we would prefer not get their hands on it.

The program we are dealing with here is a different kind of priority. It is a long-term, a long-range sort of approach, and I think it becomes much more difficult to argue that the results would be catastrophic this year if this money were taken aside.

What is going on is that there are negotiations which have just recently begun with Russia on taking some of the weapons-usable plutonium that Russia now has, turning it into a fuel

which could be burned in a nuclear reactor, and thus preventing it from being used for weapons.

This involves international consortiums. This involves nuclear power companies from a variety of countries and some very delicate negotiations from Russia and from the United States. The goal is to take 50 tons of weapons-usable plutonium and ultimately turn it into a fuel for nuclear power.

We should not forget that we are sure that Russia has at least 200 tons of weapons-usable plutonium now. So what we are talking about, in the best circumstance, is taking about a fourth of this plutonium that we know they have and turning it into a fuel for nuclear reactors. That is going to take 20 to 25 years under the very best circumstances.

The Department of Energy indicates that under the very best circumstances, if everything goes perfectly in their negotiations, they might be able to obligate about half of this money in the year 2000 and maybe spend about a third of it. So taking this money off the table, as it were, would not have a catastrophic effect on this program designed to last 20 to 25 years.

The concern is that taking it off the table would make the Russians question the seriousness of our negotiations, and I think we ought to think about that. There are a lot of negotiations underway now with Russia, and they need to know that we are serious about working with them to control the proliferation of this kind of material, and that is not easy to quantify. It is hard to put our finger on exactly what the result would be. It is a concern that we certainly ought to take into account. But to say that this would have catastrophic consequences I think is not accurate.

As a matter of fact, the committee's action would leave $375 million left in the fund for nonproliferation activities. It is possible that that could all be used for the uranium purchase this year. If the plutonium issue becomes a higher priority, of course it may well be possible to rearrange those priorities.

I think at the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, for me it would be better if another offset is eventually found for these funds, but it is not true that this would completely obliterate our nonproliferation efforts, which are very important to our security.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to my good friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), a leader in the area of dealing with issues of nonproliferation. He and I have worked together on a number of these issues and that is why I respect his opinion on this, but I wanted to respond specifically to some of his comments.

The first one was, at the end of the day in this process, after the conference committee has finished its work, he would probably hope that this cut of $150 million to take 50 tons of bomb-grade plutonium off the Russian marketplace, he hopes that rescission, that cut, would be thrown out.

And what I would suggest is that if this is such a terribly dangerous area we are dealing with, if we know it is the right thing to cut it out at the end of the day, why do we not cut it out on the first day right here in the House, let the House speak its voice today, saying we do want to do anything that might possibly risk the proliferation of such potentially catastrophic levels of nuclear bomb materials.

Secondly, he made a good point that I do agree with. He said that we should fund other programs to protect nuclear materials, whether they be in Russia or the United States, or elsewhere for that matter, and I agree with the gentleman. I want to work with the gentleman. But that does not in any way take away from the argument that when we have a real opportunity, as we speak today, to take 50 tons of nuclear materials off the marketplace that could be exposed to purchase and purchased by international terrorists or the very powerful Mafia in the former Soviet Union, we ought to take advantage of that today.

He talked about very delicate negotiations, and I would agree with that. And I would say to my respected friend that that is one of the very reasons I would use to argue during the middle of very delicate negotiations that not only include Russia and the United States but bring in other nations of the world, we ought not to be tinkering with this.

I do not know if there is a 5 percent chance, a 10 percent chance, a 95 percent chance this $150 million cut could destroy those negotiations. I do not want to take a 1 percent chance that we might potentially unload bomb-grade nuclear materials on the world marketplace for terrorists. And I do not think there is any Member of this House, Republican or Democrat, who has spoken with the negotiators on the American and Russian side who would come to this floor and honestly say, after having talked with the negotiators involved in this process, there is a 99 percent chance that the negotiations would go on.

When we talked about national missile defense the other day, no one said there is a 90 percent chance someone is going to send an ICBM into New York City. But through the Republican leadership and bipartisan support of people like myself, we said we want a national missile defense system even if there is a 1 percent chance that a foreign nation would send their missiles into our Nation.

I have got to say to my friend that I recognize and I am fearful of the fact of the 200 tons of plutonium in the Russian area in terms of what we need to get our arms around. But where I disagree with my colleague, I do not think that fact makes it any less important to try to take 50 tons of that 200 tons off the international terrorist marketplace while we have that opportunity.

Ultimately, I think we have to have some respect for the people directly involved in this. And I would like to read briefly the statement made by the Secretary of Energy, who has direct responsibility for overseeing these negotiations, part of which have already proven to be extremely successful.

He says, ''Such a reduction,'' as proposed in this bill today, ''would have severe consequences,'' severe consequences, ''for the ongoing negotiations in pursuit of a bilateral agreement with Russia on disposing of enough plutonium to make tens of thousands of nuclear weapons.

''To now withdraw this earnest money,'' he says, ''would be to call into question U.S. reliability. Russia may well perceive such a withdrawal as a breach of good faith. Withdrawing this money would severely set back, and might even bring a halt to, our constructive discussions on this important nonproliferation and national security issue.''

Now, if any of the proponents of this $150 million cut have talked to the chief American negotiator and the chief Russian negotiator, I would be willing to donate my time at this time to listen to that Member tell me what they were told by those negotiators and to assure me that it is no risk to my family or their family to risk the breakdown of these negotiations.

The truth is there is not a House Member who has spoken directly to either one of those sides of negotiations and can come to this floor and say this is not risking potential catastrophe for the American civilian population or our servicemen and women abroad.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the Obey amendment and to address primarily the issue that comes under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee which I chair, and that is addressing the two issues of the Russian programs.

I think there has been a lot of misunderstanding and misinformation that has been put out. Number one, the 50 metric tons of plutonium is not to be purchased by the United States. The money was not to be used to purchase it. It simply is to provide facilities in Russia that would degrade it and bring it down to fuel grade rather than weapons grade.

And secondly, that will continue. That effort will continue. It is not a one-year or a 1999 issue. Actually, it is a decade-long issue, but we will be funding it for the next few years. The negotiations are not even completed or hardly begun on how to do it and how to spend the money and what to do. So the money that we are rescinding this year would not be used for this year to any great extent.

Secondly, let me refer to the highly enriched uranium issue. That uranium

will not be converted into weapons of mass destruction. That uranium is already here in the United States. It is not in Russia. And so to use the argument that it would be used if we do not fund the $150 million that we are calling to be rescinded, that it would be used to make weapons out of the highly enriched uranium, that is simply not true. The Russians do not have it, it is not there. It would have really no impact whatsoever upon proliferation because it is already here in the United States.

Thirdly, as has been mentioned several times, we are rescinding or asking to rescind $150 million of the $525 million, not $200 million. The $200 million for plutonium could be reduced to $50 million during the 1999 budget year. It does not have to be.

The administration still has the options and the flexibility to subtract $150 million any way they wish. It can be from the enriched uranium program or the plutonium program. They can choose and decide where it would best serve the needs of our international relations with Russia.

Another point that needs to be made. The $200 million was not originally planned to come from the taxpayers of the United States. That was planned to come from the international community. That was where the $200 million was to come from. The United States was only to fund a prototype plant to determine how to deal with the Russian plutonium, and that is what the $25 million per year that we funded last year, this year, and is in the President's budget for the coming budget year.

□ 1445

That money was to be used to build a prototype and the international community would fund the rest of it, in building the actual facilities that would degrade the plutonium from weapons grade to fuel grade. We have missed that point entirely. We have now funded the $200 million in the omnibus emergency bill, and no one called for it. The President did not call for that. The Senate bill did not call for it. Our committee and the House did not call for it. But the fact is it was put into the emergency supplemental bill last year, and of course the President would support it after it was put in. Here was a half a billion, over a half a billion dollars that all of a sudden we gave to him that he could use for his public relations overseas. Of course he would support it after it was put in. But he did not feel it was of high enough priority to put in or request it when it was being processed through the normal process.

Now, let me speak to the plutonium issue itself. The negotiations are just beginning. Even if the $150 million was taken out or $50 million of it would be taken from the $200 million of plutonium disposition, there would still be $50 million remaining plus the $25 million. There is still a significant amount of money in that program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) has expired.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, the fact is it is a long-range program. There is money to start it this year if the negotiations are finished, and we have time to then address it in the normal process of budgeting through our committee process.

Let me remind Members that the Prime Minister of Russia, Mr. Primakov, as a result of the President's decision to bomb Kosovo, has gone back to Russia. So we have no assurance that there will be a signing of the agreement. We have no assurance that they will come back to the table. It could be delayed, and certainly it is for now. It could be delayed for the balance of the year. It will be very difficult to complete those negotiations and to draft the agreement and to get it implemented before the end of this fiscal year. Thus, the money will not and cannot be spent during this fiscal year in my judgment.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We can either look at this issue like we are green eyeshade accountants or we can look at this issue in terms of what will create the most security for the United States. The fact is that what the Energy Department tells us, what the Secretary of Energy tells us is as follows, in the letter he sent today.

He said the entire cut, in this bill, ''would have to come from the $200 million appropriated to dispose of Russian plutonium. Such a reduction would have severe consequences for the ongoing negotiations in pursuit of a bilateral agreement with Russia on disposing of enough plutonium to make tens of thousands of nuclear weapons. It could also severely impact the wide range of cooperative nonproliferation engagement under way and planned in Russia, including efforts to protect, control and account for weapons-usable nuclear material and to prevent the flight of weapons scientists to countries of proliferation concern.''

Now, the facts are very simple.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) has again expired.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to continue to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. The administration did not put this in their original budget because at the time they submitted the FY 1999 budget, nobody thought there was a prayer of getting negotiations going on plutonium. Senator DOMENICI saw an opportunity in October to take advantage of the fact that the facts had changed and it looked like we would now be able to move toward sitting down with the Russians on plutonium. And so he put the $200 million in the Omnibus bill. It now remains available precisely because it is used as a magnet to draw the Russians to the table. It sends a signal to them that we are serious about this issue and we all know that if we do in fact get an agreement, the cost of that agreement is going to be at least five times the amount of the money which is presently available.

All I am saying is that it is absurd for us in my view to be arguing about fiscal years and expenditures in this year or that year when the fact is that the overriding concern ought to be to get that fissile material converted before it falls into the hands of terrorists or anybody else.

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

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, first of all, if the administration is saying that the full $200 million would be lost by rescinding $150 million, I just do not understand their math.

Mr. OBEY. That is not what it says.

Mr. PACKARD. Number two, it is their choice. They do not have to take it from the $200 million. It can come from the other area, the enriched uranium. Let me conclude my statement and then the gentleman may wish to speak further on someone else's time.

It is not as if we have neglected Russia. Since 1994, we have spent over $1 billion in Russian programs to deal with their nuclear problems. There are Members of this Congress who feel that we could spend that money here in the United States because we have not adequately addressed our own nuclear waste disposition problem. We have not solved our own nuclear waste problems. They are saying, ''Why don't we take care of problems here at home before we deal with overseas Russian waste?''

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe what I just heard. The gentleman said that if the administration wants, it does not have to take this money out of the plutonium agreement, it can take it out of the other agreement, the highly enriched uranium agreement.

Is he seriously suggesting that it would be in the national interest of the United States for the United States to blow up an agreement—which Mr. Primakov was ready to sign this week until Kosovo got in the way—is he seriously suggesting that that should be a serious option that the administration looks at?

Mr. PACKARD. Yes, I am suggesting, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. OBEY. Let me finish and then I will be happy to yield.

I cannot believe that any thoughtful person in this House would say it is in the United States' interest to throw away the agreement on enriched uranium that we are about to get, that the Russians have already agreed to, except for signature.

The second point I would like to make, the gentleman says we have got a lot of Members who would rather see this money used in this country. I would say I am not at all worried about uranium and plutonium in American hands. I am very worried about uranium and plutonium in Russian hands, because their scientists and their military people have not been paid for months, and we are worried that for a small expenditure of money, they might very well be willing to supply some of that material to terrorist organizations around the world. I would suggest that anyone who believes that it is more important to worry about fissile material in the United States versus fissile material in the hands of the Russians simply does not understand the history of the last 50 years.

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

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that he feels that this Member is not a thoughtful Member of this body because I disagree with him on this issue, but the fact is the President does have the option to determine where the priorities are in terms of the $325 million project versus the $200 million plutonium project. He has that option. If it is more important to fund the highly enriched uranium program, he can do that. But obviously he does not feel it is.

Mr. OBEY. Taking back my time, I would simply say it is crucial that we get both agreements. If you are blown up in a nuclear explosion which is delivered to this country by a terrorist organization, it does not much matter whether the bomb was made out of uranium or plutonium. You are just as dead. That is why we need both agreements.

Mr. PACKARD. If the gentleman would yield further, in reference to the matter of the highly enriched uranium, again there is not a threat there because the uranium is here in the United States. So the money can be devoted to the plutonium program if that is what the administration chooses. The threat is not there for the highly enriched uranium. We may disagree on the issue.

The fact is, also, in reference to people wanting to have the money spent here, we are not neglecting Russian programs. The fact is we have a crisis on disposal of nuclear waste in this country and we have not solved that problem. We ought not to solve that problem in another country before we solve it in our own country.

Mr. OBEY. Again taking back my time, I would simply say, Mr. Chairman, that the threat to the security of the United States, to the survival of the United States, comes from nuclear weapons. The gentleman's party seems to be very concerned about building a Star Wars program at huge expense to defend us from nuclear weapons but they apparently are not willing to proceed as fast as possible to get tons of plutonium out of the hands of the people who might be firing those weapons. With all due respect, that dichotomy makes no sense.

Mr. PACKARD. If the gentleman would yield further, if our committee were neglecting the programs that we are talking about in Russia, it would be a different story. But we are not. We are funding significant amounts every year with the American taxpayers' dollars to build facilities to dispose of enriched uranium and plutonium in Russia, not here.

Mr. OBEY. With all due respect, I think the gentleman is dead wrong on the issue.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Obey amendment to H.R. 1141, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 1999.

This supplemental bill was supposed to have been a bipartisan effort to provide desperately needed funds to assist American farmers, respond to hurricane damage in Central America and the Caribbean, support the new government of Jordan and correct the amount of money appropriated to the Office of Minority Health. Unfortunately, this bill now contains provisions masquerading as offsets that are both unnecessary and harmful. So much for bipartisanism.

As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, I am particularly concerned about a provision that would rescind $648 million in funds that were previously appropriated to guarantee the solvency of multilateral development banks. Neither the Committee on Banking and Financial Services nor my subcommittee were ever given an opportunity to consider this controversial rescission.

There are three multilateral development banks—the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank—that provide loans to developing countries to promote economic growth and development. These banks have collected guarantees from the United States to sell bonds to commercial banks. The development banks use the proceeds from these bond sales to make their loans to developing countries. These guarantees, known as callable capital, ensure that the bank's lenders will be repaid even if a substantial portion of the loans made by the banks are not repaid.

Prior to 1981, the United States appropriated funds to provide for our share of the callable capital of the multilateral development banks. The development banks have always been able to repay their bonds on time without calling upon the United States. The United States Government's guarantees to these banks have never cost the American taxpayers one dime.

The supplemental appropriations bill includes a provision to rescind a portion of the banks' callable capital. The Republican supporters of this provision claim that it is an offset for the emergency spending in the bill. However, this is smoke and mirrors. This provision does not actually save any money and cannot be considered an offset.

Since the United States has never had to provide any money to the multilateral development banks to cover their bonds, there were never any outlays. Furthermore, it is unlikely that there ever will be any outlays. In other words, the supplemental appropriations act is rescinding money that would never have been spent, anyway. The proposed rescission of callable capital contained in the supplemental bill will have no effect whatsoever on the size of the budget surplus. Shame on them for making people think that this is a legitimate offset that is going to save some money.

Although the rescission of callable capital will not increase the budget surplus, it will, however, jeopardize the effective operation of the multilateral development banks. If the United States rescinds any of its callable capital, it will be a signal to worldwide financial markets that the United States may no longer be willing to meet its international financial obligations.

Over the past 50 years, loans to developing countries from the multilateral development banks have promoted economic growth and created new businesses and job opportunities as well as markets for American exports. These banks are especially important to the world economy today. Many nations in Asia and Latin America are facing a serious economic and financial crisis. They are dependent on loans from the banks to stabilize their currencies and allow their economies to recover. Asia and Latin American markets are desperately in need of this capital.

□ 1500

Let me just close my remarks by saying this was supposed to be a bipartisan effort, and the American farmers, the agricultural community that both sides of the aisle claim they care so much about, stand to benefit. That is Republicans and Democrats alike. If they mess up this supplemental appropriation by insisting on these offsets, they are going to hurt the very people that they are always mouthing off about that they care so much about.

Let us stop playing games. Let us stop with the smoke and mirrors about offsets that do not realize one single dime, one single cent. Let us get on with the business of a supplemental appropriation bill. We will do what we started out to do.

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

Mr. Chairman, this has been a long debate already, and it is about a topic that I guess every one of us on both sides of the aisle basically agrees that the human disasters that brought this bill to the floor in the first place were true emergencies. The devastating flood in Central America where Hurricane Mitch left 9,000 dead, 9,000 more missing, 13,000 injured and over 3 million homeless, the region's economy and its infrastructure and its environment has been totally devastated; and the second human disaster, namely the collapse of farm prices here at home, across the heartland of America where rural Americans are losing their farms and their livelihoods and their homes.

Under those circumstances, with true emergencies, we could well have funded these emergencies without the shenanigans that are going on here, but this bill finances our response to these crises with offsets which themselves have disaster written all over them, and I would just want to talk about one of these. I support the Obey amendment, which covers four of them, but I particularly wanted to talk about one of them that I consider to be the most dangerous, and that is the cut of $150 million for nuclear disarmament nonproliferation programs with Russia.

Last year the Congress provided the Energy Department with $525 million, we have talked about it, to dismantle nuclear warheads, dispose of excess weapons-grade plutonium and enriched uranium, mostly in Russia. Some was actually here in the U.S. Well, this $525 million supports two of the most important ''swords into plowshares'' agreements reached by the United States and Russia since the end of the Cold War. And the critical $200 million of it, although we have had at least one suggestion that we ought to virtually throw out the agreement that is already ready to be signed, which relates to the uranium, but I think that is not a very sensible thing to do, the critical $200 million is to be used to implement a bilateral plutonium agreement to dispose of 50 tons of weapons-grade plutonium that is currently on hand in Russia, 50 tons of weapons-grade plutonium which could make 15,000 to 20,000 nuclear weapons.

This $200 million does another job along the way. It leverages the nonproliferation contributions from others of the G–7 countries which are necessary in order if we are ever going to manage to get hold of all the plutonium that is around that might get loose among terrorists and rogue nations. The $150 million cut in these two nuclear nonproliferation programs is an extremely dangerous move, in my view, and it is certainly one that I cannot support.

Last week 317 of the Members of this House were concerned enough about the dangers of nuclear proliferation to vote in favor of deploying a national missile defense system that would cost us billions of dollars and do nothing about the possibility of terrorists getting hold of this kind of material. Today we are being asked to endorse a $150 million offset which will make more likely the transfer of weapons-usable plutonium from Russia to rogue nations like North Korea, Iraq, Iran and Libya, and surely make it more likely that it could fall into the hands of terrorists.

If we are serious about eliminating nuclear threats to our national security, and this is one way of eliminating a major nuclear threat, we should do all we can to keep nuclear weapons material from ever reaching terrorists or the rogue states. We should not cut the nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation programs. Please support the Obey amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Obey amendment, and if the Obey amendment fails, in opposition to the supplemental.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this emergency supplemental bill in its current form. I emphatically disagree with the offsets proposed by the committee. Before I address the troubling offsets included in this bill, let me comment on the nature of emergency supplemental appropriations, quote, unquote.

Emergency supplemental appropriations are by definition, and again, Mr. Chairman, I quote: discretionary appropriations that the President designates as emergency requirements and which are similarly designated by Congress in legislation subsequently enacted into law.

We anticipated the situation in which we now find ourselves and made provisions for it. Any spending designated as an emergency bill will result in discretionary spending caps being increased to accommodate the additional spending. That is in our rules.

We now are facing a serious situation which requires immediate action for American farmers who are encountering dire financial straits, and victims of natural disasters in Central America. These circumstances clearly fall in the category of needs that are urgent and immediate, unanticipated and essential; in other words, emergency requirements that deserve prompt action, without offsets.

American farmers, Mr. Chairman, are dealing with serious challenges that threaten their very existence. Not since the Dust Bowl days of the 1930's have farmers faced such severe economic difficulties. Forecasts for continuing low commodity prices in 1999 have significantly increased the demand for Department of Agriculture farm loans, as many farmers are being turned away from their normal sources of financing. The funding requested by the President is essential to finance the roughly $1.1 billion needed for spring planting.

Of equal importance, Mr. Chairman, is providing the necessary assistance to the victims of hurricanes Mitch and Georges. Mitch has already been described as the worst natural disaster in the history of the Western Hemisphere, causing over 9,000 deaths. Even before Mitch hit Central America, nearly one half of all Nicaraguans and Hondurans existed on a dollar a day or less. In the wake of Mitch's devastation it will be years before they can regain that level of poverty. This Congress needs to act expediently, quickly, decisively to provide relief for these victims.

Now I want to say my very good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, stood up here just a little while ago when I was on the floor and he said the President cannot veto this bill. The President went to South America, the First Lady went to South America, some of us have gone to South America and said we are going to help, it is an emergency. We told our farmers the same thing.

My friends on the Republican side of the aisle, they make this mistake almost every year, that they have the President in a box from which he cannot extricate himself, that they are going to intimidate him, they are going to buffalo him, they are going to push him around. They wanted to push him around when the Mississippi overran its banks and thousands and thousands of Americans were displaced, and they said, ''Well, we know you want the emergency aid. Yes, we know it's necessary. We know it's needed now. But we're going to put some things in the bill that we know you don't like and try to shove it down your throat.''

It did not work.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida who I know did not want to do this.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my friend that there is nothing in this bill that was done for that purpose. I want him to know that.

Mr. HOYER. Now I understand what the gentleman from Florida is saying, Mr. Chairman, but I respectfully disagree with him, not in the sense that he wants to shove something down his throat perhaps this time, but there are things in this bill that the President said, ''I view them so seriously that I will veto this bill.'' Now, he has not said that personally, but the Secretary of Treasury said it, and we know he is one of the President's closest advisers.

I want to say, as the ranking member said, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), Both of us, of course, have absolutely unrestrained affection and respect for the chairman of our committee. We are pleased to have him as our chairman, and like his predecessor, Mr. LIVINGSTON, he did not want to do this. He stands here because the leadership has told him to stand here and defend this policy, which is bad policy,

which is policy inconsistent with our rules, which is policy hoisted on the petard of their CATs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) has expired.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, we have a number of other amendments that we have to consider this afternoon, and I am not going to object, but I think I will notify the Members that I have been very generous in allowing time extensions and in allowing Members to speak more than once on the same subject. I think in any future request on this amendment I will have to object, but I will not object to this one.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, can I amend my request to an additional 5 minutes?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I wish the gentleman from Maryland would not.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland for 2 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. My point is this, and I will ask that the balance of my prepared comments be included in the RECORD. My point is this:

My colleagues, our neighbors sent us here to represent them and to represent America. They know we are going to play politics from time to time; that is the nature of this collegial body. But I was struck, as I said, when my friend from Alabama, who I also have great affection for and unlimited respect for, said that the President cannot veto this bill.

Why do they take this risk with peoples' lives and peoples' welfare? Why do they delay when they know that the President will veto this bill? He has shown us he will do it. He has done it before when the Mississippi floods came, and they said unless we take it their way, we are not going to give the folks in Mississippi and all up the Mississippi Delta the relief they need. We saw on television people floating around in their cities and towns.

Why do they do this? Why do they force the Committee on Appropriations to do it when their leadership on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and others, and Mr. LIVINGSTON before him, said this is emergency spending, we ought to pass it, pass it now and give the relief where it is needed.

I thank the gentleman from Florida for not objecting to that extra time, and I want to say to my friend that this is an important piece of legislation, but it is also an important principle, and I would say to my chairman it is an important principle for the Committee on Appropriations itself and frankly we ought to stand as a committee and say to our friends who are not on this committee, when we have an emergency, when we need to act quickly, when we need to act without political controversy, this is the way to do it, the way the gentleman originally proposed, Mr. Chairman.

That is my point, and that is my hope for the future.

These provisions would jeopardize both this country's strong economic security and our Nation's efforts to keep weapons of mass destruction out of the hands of terrorists.

The provision to offset $648 million from money that was appropriated for the capitalization of multilateral development banks, alone will invite a veto from the White House. Treasury Secretary Rubin warned this committee of the negative impacts of this provision—significant pressure on MDB interest rates and destabilized currencies and markets in developing countries around the world.

Just last Congress, we appropriated $525 million for the safe disposition of fissionable material from Russia. Now, less than a year later, the Republican leadership has proposed to rescind a critical portion of those funds.

This will severely impede efforts to continue the dismantlement of Russian nuclear warheads and the safe disposition of plutonium extracted from their nuclear weapons. This, to say the least, is a devastating possibility. What perception do we leave the Russian negotiators with if this money is refused?

Just last week, this House passed H.R. 4 which calls for U.S. policy to deploy a national missile defense system. How can we turn around and take away funding that will assist in the deactivation of Russian warheads and keep fissionable materials out of the hands of rogue states and terrorists.

Mr. Chairman, to conclude, I cannot support the offsets included in this bill. I, therefore, must oppose it.

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

Mr. Chairman, this debate has gone on for a while. Most of us, virtually all of us, agree that the supplemental, the motives of the supplemental, are appropriate. We ought to have a supplemental to relieve the needs that are met in that bill. But the offsets, the offsets are the issue. We do not need, we should not need offsets at all on this supplemental appropriations bill. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the offsets that are given to us today, specifically the cuts in the Russian plutonium disposal program, the World Bank and other development aid.

I sit on the Committee on Armed Services which is charged with providing for our Nation's security, and from where I sit these offsets are bad for our national security.

□ 1515

Last week, the House passed the bill to commit us to deploy a national missile defense system. Such a system is designed to defend against a limited ballistic missile attack, meaning a handful of missiles, from, at most, a North Korea or Iran.

That national missile defense system would cost somewhere between $18 billion and $28 billion. Last week, we committed $18 billion to $28 billion, or said we would commit that amount, to a narrow response to a limited threat.

This week, this bill cuts $150 million from a program designed to prevent excess Russian plutonium from ending up in the hands of terrorists.

Mr. Chairman, what are we doing here? What kind of defense are we providing our country when we gut a key nonproliferation program to keep nuclear materials away from terrorists, yet commit billions to an untested system to intercept missiles? It does not make sense to me.

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

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Chairman, it has been mentioned earlier in the debate today that the Russians have over 200 metric tons. If they are inclined to sell to rogue or to terrorist groups, they would still have 150 tons after subtracting the 50 metric tons. So if they are inclined to do it, they can do it with or without this rescission.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the point is that this $150 million can allow us to acquire and dispose of, safely enough, fissile material to make 20,000 nuclear weapons. To take that material potentially out of the hands of terrorists is a major advance. There is no point to cutting this $150 million.

This bill also cuts funds to promote economic stability overseas and raise the standard of living in poorer countries. Our national security depends on our economic security. We do our prosperity a disservice by cutting vital funding from multilateral development banks, food aid, Russia and Eastern Europe.

Congress must not reject a cheap, wise and effective first line of defense against terrorism and nuclear weapons when just last week we chose to move ahead to a more expensive and technologically dubious line of defense.

I would just go back, I know it has been mentioned before but the Secretary of Energy Mr. Richardson has said since the Department of Energy has already negotiated an agreement to purchase uranium from Russia for $325 million, the entire cut, this entire $150 million, would have to come from the $250 million appropriated to dispose of Russian plutonium.

This is a very serious matter. I do not understand the other side. It seems clear to me dismantling Russian nuclear warheads and disposing of plutonium is solidly in the national interest. I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment and make the right vote for our national security.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just wish to add my thoughts to the remarks that have already been made. I will not take the full 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Strictly, I am troubled and I say this to the chairman of the committee that my understanding is that, in fact, this committee has had every ability of working and bringing to us a basically contest-free nonprovocative motion here and that the leadership on that side has in fact imposed on us this debate and this particular decision that we must now make.

I think that the American public ought to know that and ought to know that the committee is perfectly capable of functioning and bringing things forward in a nonpartisan manner but that it is the party over there that chooses to make this into a partisan issue several days after some left Hershey under the misguided belief apparently that some chocolate was going to resolve everything and get people working on the same plane. If we are talking about doing what is in the best interest of this country's national security, then simply the vote that we took last week on national missile defense is a step away from that. It is technologically not feasible at present. The costs have not been considered and the impact it would have on treaty negotiations, I think, was not served well and not considered appropriately.

I would compound that today by saying that we are not going to put nonproliferation in the forefront of our national security interests. We are instead going to move and cut monies for a reduction in the plutonium and uranium. I think it sends the wrong message internationally. I think it sends the wrong message to the American people. In our first line of defense, we should be setting our priorities where the greatest danger lies, and we clearly are not doing that through this action.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would note that by destabilizing the economies in Asia and elsewhere we do not do anything for our national security. This particular attempt is not in the interest of our people and I think that the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) ought to pass and I think we ought to move forward with that amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Obey amendment to eliminate the funding offsets in this bill. We should not appropriate this money by putting the burden directly on the backs of our Social Security recipients.

The FY99 omnibus bill passed last October included $525 million for two Russian programs, $325 for highly enriched uranium and $200 million for plutonium disposition.

The highly enriched uranium agreement was to be signed this week with the arrival of the Russian Prime Minister. However, with his visit being canceled, the use of this $325 million remains in doubt.

Furthermore, the plutonium disposition initiative was funded at the $200 million level, but with no request from the Administration, nor any information on how the funding will be used.

Today, we have immediate needs in Central America to be funded through this bill. There is no evidence either from the Administration or the Members from the other side of the aisle, that the $200 million will be spent in fiscal year 1999. Although negotiations have begun, it appears doubtful, at best, that such funds would be spent during this fiscal year. And, although it is unlikely that any of the funds would be used in fiscal year 1999, we leave in tact $50 million which will remain available. That is $50 million in addition to the $25 million appropriated in the regular budget process—for a total of $75 million.

Once the negotiations are completed, the Administration plans to expend the $200 million over the next 2 to 3 years. I am certain we can work with the Administration once they have a plan in place to provide the necessary funds to make sure this program is adequately funded.

The record is clear. The House and Senate have consistently supported U.S. programs to protect Russian nuclear weapons materials that could fall into the hands of terrorists or rogue nations. We have supported efforts to make sure Russian scientists will not be lured away by terrorists or rogue nations. And we have supported efforts to upgrade the Soviet-designed reactors to prevent another Chernobyl type accident.

Mr. Chairman, people are suffering in Central America. Let's do the right thing and vote to provide funding for those in immediate need. But let's offset this bill, so we don't have to put the burden on those who rely on Social Security.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 228, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

AYES—201

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Strickland
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—228

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Morella
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease

Peterson (MN)	Sanford	Tancredo
Peterson (PA)	Saxton	Tauzin
Petri	Scarborough	Taylor (MS)
Pickering	Schaffer	Taylor (NC)
Pitts	Sensenbrenner	Terry
Pombo	Sessions	Thomas
Porter	Shadegg	Thornberry
Portman	Shaw	Thune
Pryce (OH)	Shays	Tiahrt
Quinn	Sherwood	Toomey
Radanovich	Shimkus	Traficant
Ramstad	Shuster	Upton
Regula	Simpson	Walden
Reynolds	Skeen	Walsh
Riley	Smith (MI)	Wamp
Rivers	Smith (NJ)	Watkins
Rogan	Smith (TX)	Watts (OK)
Rogers	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Rohrabacher	Spence	Weller
Ros-Lehtinen	Stearns	Whitfield
Roukema	Stenholm	Wicker
Royce	Stump	Wilson
Ryan (WI)	Sununu	Wolf
Ryun (KS)	Sweeney	Young (AK)
Salmon	Talent	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Fossella	Slaughter
Myrick	Stupak

□ 1541

Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. HALL of Texas changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. MEEKS of New York changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1545

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) for the purposes of holding a colloquy.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to first thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), chairman of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations and also the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the full committee chairman, for the opportunity to work on disaster assistance funds.

I say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) that today I was prepared to offer a second amendment which would have transferred the Disaster Assistance For Unmet Needs Program from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to FEMA because of the various problems associated with HUD management and the ineffectiveness of this critical program.

However, after discussions with the gentleman from New York and his staff, I will not offer this amendment. Instead, I will look forward to working with the gentleman during the Conference of this bill and make this a reality.

During the Senate Appropriations Committee markup of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill, Senators BOND and MIKULSKI successfully offered this same amendment which would have transferred funds from this important program to FEMA, the one agency which has primary responsibility for assisting and responding to all natural disasters and for administering the most primary programs of disaster assistance.

As the gentleman knows, my congressional district recently suffered a 500-year flood which resulted in tens of millions of dollars in damage to homes, property, and infrastructure. During this one-day flood, nearly 600 homes and 100 businesses were destroyed, and many more lives were devastated.

Many of the families impacted by the flood were on fixed incomes and were simply unable to rebuild and move on with their lives. While current FEMA programs have been able to provide some temporary assistance, most of the families impacted are relying on this program to receive additionally needed buy-out assistance.

Unfortunately, HUD's track record has been disappointing. In particular, HUD has been too slow in releasing funds, and they have demonstrated their unwillingness to shed more light on how grant awards are made. In short, HUD is simply the wrong agency to administer this program.

I ask the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), will he be willing to work with me during the conference to see that the funding is transferred to FEMA and to direct FEMA to work to ensure that communities with legitimate unmet needs, like those in South-Central Kansas, receive such assistance as is necessary and appropriate to compensate homeowners who are eligible to receive the buy-out assistance?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, let me first thank the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) for his hard work in the area of disaster assistance. I know personally that he has been active and a vocal advocate in making sure that both FEMA, and in particular this committee are fully aware of the legitimate and urgent need for additional flood disaster assistance in Kansas.

I, too, share the same concerns that the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) has expressed regarding the current management of this vital program, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from Kansas during conference to see that this program is managed more effectively.

Furthermore, I plan to work with both FEMA and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) to ensure that the State of Kansas and, in particular, Butler, Cowley, and Sedgwick counties, receive such assistance as is necessary and appropriate to compensate homeowners who are eligible for the much-needed buy-out assistance.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 15, line 15 be considered as read, printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill from page 2, line 13 through page 15, line 15 is as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For additional gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, $1,095,000,000, as follows: $350,000,000 for guaranteed farm ownership loans; $200,000,000 for direct farm ownership loans; $185,000,000 for direct farm operating loans; $185,000,000 for subsidized guaranteed farm operating loans; and $175,000,000 for emergency farm loans.

For the additional cost of direct and guaranteed farm loans, including the cost of modifying such loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to remain available until September 30, 2000: farm operating loans, $28,804,000, of which $12,635,000 shall be for direct loans and $16,169,000 shall be for guaranteed subsidized loans; farm ownership loans, $35,505,000, of which $29,940,000 shall be for direct loans and $5,565,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; emergency loans, $41,300,000; and administrative expenses to carry out the loan programs, $4,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 2

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

ENFORCEMENT AND BORDER AFFAIRS

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses, Enforcement and Border Affairs'' to support increased detention requirements for Central American criminal aliens and to address the expected influx of illegal immigrants from Central America as a result of Hurricane Mitch, $80,000,000, which shall remain available until expended and which shall be administered by the Attorney General: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emegency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

MILITARY PERSONNEL

RESERVE PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Reserve Personnel, Army'', $8,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided, further,* That of such amount, $5,100,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Army'', $7,300,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That of such amount, $1,300,000 shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount, that includes designation of the entire amount of

the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

NATIONAL GUARD PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''National Guard Personnel, Air Force'', $1,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, ARMY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Army'', $69,500,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, NAVY

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Navy'', $16,000,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, MARINE CORPS

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Marine Corps'', $300,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, AIR FORCE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'', $8,800,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DEFENSE-WIDE

For an additional amount for ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', $46,500,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OVERSEAS HUMANITARIAN, DISASTER, AND CIVIC AID

For an additional amount for ''Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid'', $37,500,000: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CHAPTER 4

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for an additional amount for ''International Disaster Assistance'' for necessary expenses for international disaster relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction assistance, pursuant to section 491 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for an additional amount for ''Economic Support Fund'', in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, to provide assistance to Jordan, $50,000,000 to become available upon enactment of this Act and to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN EMERGENCY

DISASTER RECOVERY FUND

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for necessary expenses to address the effects of hurricanes in Central America and the Caribbean and the earthquake in Colombia, $621,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2000: *Provided,* That the funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the provisions of chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and, except for section 558, the provisions of title V of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)): *Provided further,* That up to $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this paragraph may be transferred to ''Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development'', to remain available until September 30, 2000, to be used for administrative costs of USAID in addressing the effects of those hurricanes, of which up to $1,000,000 may be used to contract directly for the personal services of individuals in the United States: *Provided further,* That up to $2,000,000 of the funds appropriated by this paragraph may be transferred to ''Operating Expenses of the Agency for International Development Office of Inspector General'', to remain available until expended, to be used for costs of audits, inspections, and other activities associated with the expenditure of the funds appropriated by this paragraph: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading shall be obligated and expended subject to the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further,* That funds appropriated under this heading shall be subject to the funding ceiling contained in section 580 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in Division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)), notwithstanding section 545 of that Act: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for nonproject assistance: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEBT RESTRUCTURING

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for an additional amount for ''Debt Restructuring'', $41,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That up to $25,000,000 may be used for a contribution to the Central America Emergency Trust Fund, administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

FOREIGN MILITARY FINANCING PROGRAM

Notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91–672, for an additional amount for ''Foreign Military Financing Program'', for grants to enable the President to carry out section 23 of the Arms Export Control Act, in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, for grants only for Jordan, $50,000,000 to become available upon enactment of this Act and to remain available until September 30, 2001: *Provided,* That funds appropriated under this heading shall be nonrepayable, notwithstanding section 23(b) and section 23(c) of the Arms Export Control Act: *Provided further,* That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 301. The value of articles, services, and military education and training authorized as of November 15, 1998, to be drawn down by the President under the authority of section 506(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, shall not be counted against the ceiling limitation of that section.

CHAPTER 5

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

RECONSTRUCTION AND CONSTRUCTION

For an additional amount for ''Reconstruction and Construction'', $5,611,000, to remain available until expended, to address damages from Hurricane Georges and other natural disasters in Puerto Rico: *Provided,*That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further,* That the amount provided shall be available only to the extent that an official budget request that includes designation of the entire amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further,* That funds in this account may be transferred to and merged with the ''Forest and Rangeland Research'' account and the ''National Forest System'' account as needed to address emergency requirements in Puerto Rico.

CHAPTER 6

OFFSETS

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM AND GRANT ACCOUNTS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under Public Law 105–277 for the cost of direct credit agreements for Public Law 480 title I credit, $30,000,000 are hereby rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

(RESCISSION)

Of the amount provided under this heading in P.L. 105–277, the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999, $150,000,000 are rescinded.

EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–277, $5,000,000 are rescinded.

BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–118 and in prior acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, $40,000,000 are rescinded.

OTHER BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–277 and in prior acts making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs, $17,000,000 are rescinded.

ASSISTANCE FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE BALTIC STATES

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances of funds available under this heading, $20,000,000 are rescinded.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE NEW INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances of funds available under this heading, $25,000,000 are rescinded.

MILITARY ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–277, $10,000,000 are rescinded.

MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

CONTRIBUTION TO THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–277, $25,000,000 are rescinded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REDUCTION IN CALLABLE CAPITAL APPROPRIATIONS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under the headings ''Contribution to the Asian Development Bank'', ''Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank'', and ''Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development'' for callable capital stock in Public Law 96–123 and in prior acts making appropriations for foreign assistance and related programs, a total of $648,000,000 are rescinded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. TIAHRT:

Page 15, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $195,000,000)''.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, the bipartisan Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment will guarantee that this House will stand for integrity by keeping its promise to protect Social Security.

I want to first thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for his commitment to this country and for his dedication to the House of Representatives. His commitment to our national defense and to our national interest is second to none.

I also want to thank the chairman for selecting me to join others in the congressional delegation he sent to Central America to survey the mass destruction brought about by Hurricane Mitch. I will never forget the stories I heard firsthand or the human trauma and unspeakable devastation that hit our neighbors to the south.

Mr. Chairman, each of us who have worked hard to balance the budget can take great pride in what we have achieved. For the first time in a generation, we have balanced the budget. The CBO estimates confirm that we will have a surplus in fiscal year 1999. However, current projections for the surplus are made up of revenues that are completely derived from the FICA tax which employees and employers pay in to cover Social Security obligations.

Why does this matter? It matters because, if we do not reduce spending by $1 for each $1 in new spending in the emergency bill, the money will be taken from Social Security, just plain and simple.

That is why I am offering this amendment today, to fully protect Social Security and to prevent this Congress from sending to the President a bill that will use money intended for Social Security but to pay for this foreign aid package.

To offset the remainder of this bill, I have chosen the same account the Committee on Appropriations selected to offset 50 percent of the bill. It is the callable capital account. This is an account that the World Bank may draw on in case of defaults on international loans. The callable capital account has over $12 billion in unobligated, underspent funds.

During the nearly 40 years of history, this account has never been used for its intended purpose. However, this account has been used previously as an offset.

In 1994, former Representative Vic Fazio successfully used $900 million in this fund to offset funding for disaster relief in California. I am simply following the lead of the Committee on Appropriations and the precedent set by a former Member from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I came to Congress from the aerospace industry, and I served 2 years on the Committee on National Security, and I understand very well the problems with our underfunded military. Even the President recognizes the need for additional funds. That is why this is appropriate. It is appropriate to use a foreign aid account to pay for the foreign aid disaster bill and not a Department of Defense account.

To my friends on the Committee on National Security, I will say, if we are unable to offset emergency bills, there will be no money available to cover the supplement for our Nation's defense.

So why do I come to the floor today with this amendment? My goal is to improve upon this bill. The Committee on Appropriations agreed to find offsets for 85 percent of the bill because they wanted to act responsibly and not grab over $1 billion from Social Security. My amendment simply goes the distance on the path towards financial integrity.

Other outside groups also see the significance of providing offsets for this foreign aid emergency bill in order to protect Social Security.

The policy director of the Concord Coalition, Robert Bixby in his letter to me stated ''tapping into the Social Security surplus for emergencies only leads to a breakdown in fiscal discipline. . .We therefore heartily commend your efforts to ensure that the FY 99 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill is fully offset.''

In the 60 Plus Association letter to me, they said, they ''enthusiastically endorse'' this amendment. The United Seniors said they ''strongly support'' this amendment.

Each of these groups realize the importance of fully offsetting this foreign aid bill. They have heard the promises made by the President and by Congress that we would protect Social Security. That is what the Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment does, fully protects Social Security.

If my colleagues agree that we should avoid using Social Security to pay for foreign aid spending, then support this amendment. If my colleagues agree that keeping Social Security safe from 85 percent of this bill is good, then they must conclude that protecting 100 percent of Social Security from this bill is even better. Mr. Chairman, it is not just the most prudent path politically, it is the right thing to do for our seniors, ourselves, and our children.

I encourage my colleagues to join with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and myself and support our bipartisan amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk just a few minutes in support of this amendment. I fully concur and commend the

gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) for standing up in a courageous way to fully offset this supplemental.

I can tell my colleagues, if I went back to the Fifth District of Virginia and said they have a choice between a callable capital account and Social Security, overwhelming support in the district would be in favor of Social Security.

I have heard those words repeated roundly in these halls a lot this year and a lot last year. We have heard it on the hustings all across this country. This is an opportunity to say, yes, we are going to go with Social Security first, even in supplemental situations where there is an emergency.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tiahrt amendment. I have to say, and I mentioned this earlier today on the House floor, when a number of us met with the Speaker and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the new chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, earlier this year, we talked about this bill and how we would like to support it but, for a number of reasons we were not able to.

Much to the credit of Speaker Hastert, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the committee, and now the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), we are really offsetting all of the costs of this supplemental appropriation bill. Because of that, we are not adding to the debt. We are not adding to the deficit. We are looking to make this bill work in the right way. I think all of our colleagues should support this bill and this amendment to make it even stronger than the committee reported out. I rise in strong support.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we have got to support the Tiahrt amendment. It is important that we fully, fully put aside the Social Security funds. But the Tiahrt amendment is simple, fair, and fiscally responsible.

Some of my colleagues are concerned that this amendment would affect our defense programs. With our forces committed and fighting in Kosovo, our military must be strengthened, and everybody knows that this administration has slashed military spending. We know troop levels are dangerously low, retention is short, recruiting is down, and morale is at the bottom of the barrel.

I agree Congress must step forward and reverse these trends by putting more money in our defense budget. Our fighting men and women deserve the best.

This amendment does nothing to harm this goal. The Tiahrt amendment takes $195 million of foreign aid money from a $12 billion bank account that has never been used. It takes no money away from defense. No Member should oppose taking $195 million from a $12 billion nondefense account that is not being used for anything.

I would also like to make clear that this is not a military emergency. The defense portion of this bill is a reimbursement for disaster assistance by our National Guard which it provided to our neighbors in Central America.

□ 1600

It is money that has already been spent. It is not an emergency and, therefore, should not be funded as one. I understand the concerns that some of my colleagues have, but in this case offsetting $195 million from nondefense accounts is practicable, is reasonable and is fiscally responsible, not dangerous.

We are in Washington to be responsible. The Tiahrt amendment simply allows us to keep our promise to the American people that we will stop big government spending. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment today. It is good for America.

Mr. UPTON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that this is a small step but it is a small step in the right direction. Full accountability, full offsets, keeping our promise to the American taxpayer is something that I think we all believe in here, and if we are going to be a fiscal conservative and think about the dollars going out, we have to support this amendment to make sure it is 100 percent pure.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to say this only once. Do my colleagues know how many dollars are saved for Social Security by the Tiahrt amendment? Not one dime. Do my colleagues know how many dollars are saved that would otherwise be spent under the Tiahrt amendment? Not one dime. Do my colleagues know how many dollars are saved that would otherwise be added to the deficit if the Tiahrt amendment passes? Not one dime.

The fact is that callable capital to our international financial institutions, is appropriated but it is never spent. There is never an outlay expenditure. When we measure the deficit, what we measure is not what the government thinks about spending. What we measure is what the government actually spends, and that is called an outlay.

If we take a look at this committee report, if we take a look at the Congressional Budget Office scoring of this bill, we will see that the Tiahrt amendment saves not one dime for Social Security or the deficit or anything else because this money was not scheduled to be outlaid. The only way that we can measure savings is on the outlay side. And since there were never going to be any outlays, there are no savings.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT), by his amendment, is suggesting to the House that $195 million will not be spent that otherwise would be spent. That is false. Callable capital, by its nature, is never meant to be spent. So if anyone says that they are saving one dime for Social Security or saving one dime for the surplus or the deficit by the Tiahrt amendment, they are telling this House something that simply is not true.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I rise in opposition to the Tiahrt amendment. And with all due respect, I went on the same trip with the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) to Honduras, but his amendment does not help the situation in Honduras nor does it help the situation at home.

We have letters from the Department of Treasury, we have letters from the Bretton Woods committee suggesting that his amendment would indeed create financial risk. The logic of saying that we are going to protect Social Security when we are going to put the whole market at financial risk is just not practical.

The bill, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) just indicated, does not fully offset the outlays in terms of new spending, because the bill will be measured by outlays, not by the Tiahrt amendment. This amendment does damage, not good; it does not protect and it does not get the funds to Central America which need it badly right now.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to the Tiahrt amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, and in closing, let me simply say this bill, if it passes, will actually add $445 million to the deficit, and the Tiahrt amendment, if it is adopted, will not save one dime of that number.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words and, hopefully, in the process of doing so, have a dialogue with my friend, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TODD TIAHRT).

I would hope in the process of this discussion I might urge my colleague to consider, at least consider, withdrawing his amendment. Let me explain why I would even begin to suggest that this might be appropriate when I know very well how serious the gentleman is about this amendment and how hard he has worked to develop it.

The circumstances in Central America are critical circumstances involving humanitarian efforts that very much relate to our efforts to build relations south of our border. At the peak following that disaster we had some 5,000 troops in the region. We have flown nearly 1,000 humanitarian air sorties there. We have rescued over a thousand people from floods. The military was involved in building temporary bridges that allowed lifelines, food and medicine, to be delivered. Indeed, there are hundreds of temporary

structures built by those military personnal in an effort to respond to this emergency.

These are not classic military activities, but, nonetheless, we raised the American flag there in defense of the well-being of a sizable population of our neighbors for reasons well beyond just the humanitarian reasons alone. The American military is ofttimes the only one who can respond quickly enough and effectively enough to get the life saving job done.

In this case we are talking about the prospects of an offset that arguably is not really an offset. It is very clear when we are dealing with callable capital that we do not impact funds that might be available for Social Security, and I would urge us to be very careful about further discussion about that possible implication.

The reason for my touching on the edges of suggesting that the gentleman might consider responsibly to withdraw the amendment involves the fact that at this very moment American troops and materiel are involved in an incursion in Kosovo, a very, very serious circumstance where, in combination with our allies in NATO, we are involved in an effort that could cost not hundreds of millions of dollars, but a billion dollars or more.

Let me make this point to my colleague. Indeed, the amendment that the gentleman has before us could be a very serious precedent that could impact future requirements as it relates to Kosovo.

One of the most impressive experiences I have had in the time I have been in Congress has taken place over the last 10 days, an experience in which the President of the United States has invited Members from both bodies to the White House and, together, we have spent almost 10 hours discussing questions which swirl around how we meet the challenges in Kosovo and the Balkans. Democrats and Republicans from both bodies argued on both sides of our being involved. It was a very, very healthy discussion, bringing us to the point where there was a very healthy debate last evening in the other body, after which, finally, a vote took place in which support was given for America's effort, along with our NATO allies, in that region.

Today, we find ourselves in a circumstance where, indeed, action is moving forward. It is very important that the debate we have from this point forward be as nonpartisan, as positive as possible, and as nonsensational as possible. And, indeed, we must recognize as we go forward that there will be very real military costs. There will be a bill one day soon that will request a supplemental that may involve the kinds of dollars that I was describing earlier, maybe as much as $2 billion.

Indeed, if one were to begin to talk about offsetting that expenditure, either from social programs, from callable capital or otherwise, we could find ourselves in a debate that could undermine our ability to respond to that very critical circumstance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) has expired.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this is the very time that we need to bring the House together with a unified voice in support of our troops in Kosovo and in the Balkans and, indeed, exercise our responsibility to lead in the world at this very important moment.

So I would urge my colleague to consider the question, a precedent, that says a $195 million expenditure for an emergency in Latin America, asking for offsets in a very special category, could lead to a circumstance where $2 billion becomes the question and should there be an offset. I would ask my colleague to recognize that this may very well be before us in a very short period of time, and I would urge the gentleman to respond, if he would, briefly.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, who is very knowledgeable about the extreme needs we have in our defense at this point in time. The gentleman brought a very sobering point; that there is currently activity going on in Kosovo where our young men and women are at risk, and I hope that we will all keep them in our thoughts and prayers.

Mr. Chairman, I am very proud of the job our soldiers have done in Central America in meeting the immediate disaster needs. My concern is that if we do not find offsets now, we will never be able to achieve the future requirements that we need for our defense, and that is why I wanted to offer this amendment. But I thank the gentleman from California for the opportunity.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I guess the point that needs to be repeated is that callable capital does not provide real offsets that provide real funding for the military.

Indeed, if we go forward with this approach, we will be further taking these kinds of monies out of the hide of our basic military requirements. If we find ourselves later attempting to pay for the Kosovo requirements in a similar fashion, it could undermine many a critical program entirely across our military base. I urge the gentleman to reconsider his amendment, otherwise I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the gentleman's amendment.

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

I stood up, Mr. Chairman, to talk again about the multilateral banks and to talk about callable capital and to try and urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle not to identify this as meaningful and real offsets. However, before I do that, I would like to join with my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), in asking that we do nothing at this point that would prevent us from coming back with a supplemental that we may need in case we have to expand our operations or support our operations in Kosovo.

I think that is real. He is absolutely correct. We have spent a number of hours with the President, Republicans and Democrats alike, listening to and understanding what is going on there. And I think that he has done a favor to all of us by pointing out that we do not want to take this kind of action without understanding the seriousness of it.

Beyond that, I think that at this moment every member of the Congressional Black Caucus, every member of the Hispanic Caucus, every member of the Asian Caucus should be on this floor. They should be on this floor right now because what they are seeing is a precedent that will destroy the ability of developing countries to be able to have any kind of reasonable economic development and to develop.

I think every member of those caucuses, who have fought for so many years to try and be of assistance to these developing countries and develop markets there for our own economy, should come to this floor and help to make the argument why this should not go forward.

□ 1615

What is the reason for this when everybody understands now that this is not real capital, that this simply is money that would not be spent, that it is not money that is going to be added to the budget? Then why are they doing it? If they cannot answer that question, then they should not proceed with this.

This is not money that can be used to reduce the budget in any way. This is like a guarantee that in the event they are not able to pay back their loans it could be used. So if in fact the money is not going to reduce the budget, if in fact they are literally putting their foot on the necks of the most vulnerable countries in the world who desperately need the assistance of the multilateral banks, if they understand what we are trying to do in Africa and in Asia and in Central America, why then would they proceed with literally diminishing their ability to try and develop and to be independent and to feed their people and to provide markets for us? Why would they do it? It just does not make good sense.

And so, I am going to ask them, in addition to the argument that has been made about Kosovo and the possibility that we will have a supplemental bill on the floor to help out, to also think

about what I am saying. Why would anybody in their right mind want to do it if they are not going to yield any dollars for them?

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding. And I would like to remind her that this is a precedent that was established in 1994 when a previous bill came to the floor and $902.4 million was taken out of callable capital.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, no, that is not correct.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. WATERS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, let me simply say the statement that this is similar to what happened in 1994 is again totally, absolutely wrong. What happened in 1994 was very, very different. It did not involve rescinding one dime of obligated callable capital.

I would simply recite from the Secretary of the Treasury the following from his letter. He says, ''Some have cited the 1994 rescission as a precedent for this goal. The 1994 action and the current proposal are not analogous. In 1994, the U.S. had not subscribed to paid-in capital and callable capital which were rescinded. The current proposal, however, would reach back to capital to which we have formerly subscribed and on the basis of which we have exercised voting rights for many years. This proposal has rightly become a concern of the markets.''

If any Member says that this is identical to what had happened in 1994, they are either ill-informed or they are misleading the House.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment. Last week the House Committee on the Budget, on which I have the privilege to serve, approved the budget resolution that saves the entire Social Security surplus, 100 percent of payroll taxes, and 100 percent of interest for future budgets. It is a budget resolution we will debate on this very floor tomorrow, and it stops the reckless practice of spending Social Security payroll taxes on non-Social Security programs.

My fellow committee members and I proudly held a press conference last week declaring that this Congress for the first time would no longer spend the Social Security surplus. And we are right. Over the next 10 years, the budget resolution locks away $1.8 trillion for our seniors' retirement both for Social Security and Medicare; and that is $200 billion more than the President called for in his budget.

This budget is an important first step towards our ultimate goal of real, long-term structural reform of our Nation's retirement system; and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this budget later this week.

But would it not be ironic if the House passes an emergency appropriations bill that spends today's Social Security money in the same week that it passes a budget resolution that tries to save future Social Security funds? And that is exactly what will happen if the House does not adopt the Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment that fully offsets the supplemental emergency appropriations bill. We have got an obligation to ensure that that does not happen.

The $1.3 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill as written offsets all but $195 million used to reimburse the Defense Department for its response to Hurricane Mitch. Any spending not offset in this bill will come from the Social Security surplus because the Federal Government still has an on-budget deficit in fiscal year 1999. The only surplus is the Social Security surplus.

My objection is not the Defense Department. It should be reimbursed for its work. My objection is certainly not the Committee on Appropriations. They have worked hard to offset the vast majority of the emergency spending in this bill. But we have come so close. Just 15 percent of the bill is not offset. And we should finish the job.

Our amendment finishes the job. It offsets the remaining $195 million in emergency spending by rescinding budget authority for an account already used to offset in this bill. The Callable Capital Account has over $12 billion in unused budget authority. It has not been used this decade. That is why democratic Congress used this same account as an offset in 1994.

Mr. Chairman, I consistently told senior citizens in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District that Congress should not spend Social Security dollars on anything other than retirement. And that is exactly what we should do.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment.

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

Mr. TOOMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is some impression out here that there is no money that is going to change hands here, that we are going to write a check to Central America but there is no money that is going to leave the Callable Capital Account and how this money will miraculously reappear down in Central America.

We are going to write a check to Central America and it is not going to bounce. The money is going to come from somewhere. It is either going to come from the surplus or callable capital. If it comes from the surplus, it has to come out of Social Security. It is really that simple.

I want to step back in time to 1994. In 1994, this Congress committed capital stock to the Callable Capital Account of $902.4395 million. It was committed to the Callable Capital Account. But in the piece of legislation that was called the Fiscal Year 1994 Disaster Supplemental Appropriations, we rescinded that. We took the money back.

Now, they want to say it is completely different. We were going to send capital stock, $902.4 million, and then we took it back, we rescinded it back; and now they want to say they did not have anything to do with it and it is not like it is this time. But if we look at the votes, it passed with a significant margin, 415–2.

Now, the gentlewoman said that I would like to have my foot on the neck of developing countries? Well, just a couple years ago the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) joined with the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and they voted for it. They voted for the very same thing they are arguing against today. And they are trying to demonize it somehow I guess by saying I want to put my foot on the neck of developing countries. Nothing could be further from the truth.

What I want to do is make sure that when we send money down to Central America that it does not come from Social Security. I want to find unobligated money, money that we can use to save Social Security. And that is what I have done with this amendment, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the Tiahrt amendment. Let me try to address some of the points that have been made.

First of all, with respect to the so-called 1994 rescission. I think the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has pointed out the definite distinction that exists between the present case and 1994. He also cited the letter from Secretary Rubin that says, ''it is like apples and oranges, you cannot compare the two''.

But most importantly, the vote that he referred to was the vote in favor of the final supplemental bill. There never was a discreet vote on the particular rescission in question, and so I hardly think that that is analogous. It certainly is not precedential on today's vote.

Secondly, I do want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) because he understands the significance of what we are doing today. We might be unable in the future if we act on behalf of the Tiahrt amendment and we act on the basis of the Tiahrt amendment's underlying rationale to

ever pass necessary emergency supplemental appropriations without wreaking havoc with prior past commitments. This is a dangerous precedent to get into.

Perhaps more important than anything else, it is imperative that we understand that we live in a very fragile global economy. The House Committee on Banking and Financial Services attempted in early 1997 to develop a legislative framework to deal with this fragile global economy by passing IMF legislation. It was from early 1997 until October of 1998 that we were able to pass that authorizing and appropriating legislation so that our multilateral development institutions could more appropriately deal with the deteriorating global economy.

In other words, this Congress played Russian roulette with the global economy. And we had a lot of problems in Russia, in Brazil, in addition to Asia. And now they want to do the same thing. They want to say the United States has made commitments, we have paid in those commitments, we have voted on the basis of those commitments because our voting rights are coextensive with the commitments that we have entered into, subscribed to, and paid.

And now they want to renege on them. They want to pull the carpet from underneath the IMF, the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, etc. They want to play more Russian roulette with the global economy. This is a dangerous game to enter into.

That is why I am so pleased that the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) spoke against it. I understand he can speak for himself. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services (Mr. LEACH) strongly opposed this I have been advised. He can speak for himself. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations (Mr. YOUNG of Florida) might want to oppose this, too.

Clearly, Secretary Rubin said that he would strongly recommend a veto of the bill with a rescission of $640 million of callable capital. This adds $195 million more. It goes from terrible to far, far worse. This is not just veto bait. This is an absolute veto. Do not play this dangerous game.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think we are coming to the end of this debate. I hope so because we do have other amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I would have to say that I am somewhat reluctant because the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) is a very important member of our conference, a very important member of the Committee on Appropriations, and a very thoughtful and studious Member. And I do not disagree with what he is trying to do here by way of offset. But I have to tell my colleagues that I do disagree with what he is offsetting.

For some years now, starting in fiscal year 1995 up through 1999, we have had deployments of American forces overseas in my opinion some very questionable deployments that have been very costly to the American taxpayer.

In that time period, we spent $5.2 billion in Iraq, and that is after Desert Storm was over. $9 billion in Bosnia. That was a deployment that was supposedly going to last for a year but is still going on today. It was supposedly going to cost a billion dollars. It has already cost us $9 billion. In Haiti, Somalia, Rwanda, Cuba, Korea and others we have spent another billion dollars for deployments of U.S. forces.

In the fiscal year 2000 budget sent here by the White House, there is another $1.8 billion for Bosnia, another $1.1 billion for Iraq. That does not include the $300 million that we used in Desert Fox in that 3-day campaign against Saddam. And this total does not include what is going on in Kosovo today. And this whole thing in Kosovo could cost as much in one deployment as all these other numbers that I have mentioned because the situation in Kosovo could become far, far more dangerous and serious than what we have dealt with so far.

The point I am making here by reciting these numbers, we were asked to offset most of these monies and most of them were offset from the budget of the Army and the Navy and the Air Force and the Marine Corps.

□ 1630

We already have a declining investment in our national security. We already have many airplanes that cannot fly because of a lack of spare parts. We have housing needs for our troops that are terrible, places that Members would not let one of their kids live and they would not live but some of our kids in the military are living. We have 11,000 of our kids on food stamps. That is not right. We need to do more for our military and the men and women who serve in the military.

I have stated as chairman of this committee, I am going to object to offsetting money for the Defense Department when it is used in a national security deployment or an emergency other than for our own national defense requirements. And so I would say to the gentleman from Kansas that I do not really like to oppose his amendment, but we have got to make a stand somewhere on the issue of national defense. Our party in this Congress has made a strong statement on national defense.

Tomorrow during the debate on the budget, Members will find that there is a very serious problem with national defense, not so much from the standpoint of budget authority but the outlay figure is going to be unworkable. We have got to put a stop to offsetting anything from the defense budget. We need to be increasing our investment in our national defense. I do not want to set the precedent that we are going to offset these type of deployments. This was a true emergency. American soldiers went to Central America, and they saved lives and they made it possible for people to have sanitary conditions. They made it possible to get medical care. This money is to replace the funds that they spent.

At this point in the RECORD I want to insert a letter from General Wilhelm describing the trip that our delegation took to Honduras. It provides insight into the terrible conditions there and the great job our troops did. I have eliminated some portions of his letter as a matter of confidentiality.

Mr. Chairman, I must reluctantly oppose the Tiahrt amendment on the principle of we are not doing enough today for our national security effort, we need to do more, and we have got to stop raiding the budget as it relates to national defense deployments.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
U.S. SOUTHERN COMMAND,
Miami, FL, March 8, 1999.

Hon. C.W. BILL YOUNG,
Chairman, Majority Members, Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I am deeply grateful for the personal interest that you have taken in our humanitarian and disaster relief operations in Central America. I regret that other obligations prevented you from traveling to the region this past weekend, but the committee and its interests were well represented by Congressmen Hobson, Tiahrt and Farr. I wanted to take just a moment to share with you my impressions of the visit and the status of Department of Defense humanitarian assistance/disaster relief operations.

While enroute to Honduras on Friday, I gave the delegation a detailed overview of DOD activities in the region to date. I started with our life saving and life sustaining activities during the first 30 days of the crisis when members of our Armed Forces plucked 1,052 men, women and children literally from death's door, delivered three and a quarter million pounds of food to communities cut off from the rest of their countries and the world by flood waters, and provided 65 tons of medical supplies and the clean water needed to successfully stave off feared epidemics of cholera, typhus and vector borne diseases which would have claimed many more lives. To place the disaster in an historic perspective, I mentioned that the 17,000 plus dead and missing in Central America equate to all of our losses in the Korean War. I stressed, however, that these grim statistics are parts of a closed chapter in our humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. I emphasized that four months have passed since Hurricane Mitch unleashed as much as seven feet of rain in less than five days on portions of Northern Honduras and turned it into an inland sea; that the waters have subsided, the dead have been recovered and buried, and that Hondurans, Americans and the international community have been working around the clock to replace despair with hope and restore some degree of normalcy to the region. The bottom line as I expressed it to the delegation was that rather than the absolute desolation and devastation that they would have seen during late October and early November, they would see an unfolding success story as key infrastructure is restored or recreated. Over the next two days, as we drove through Tegucigalpa and overflew or visited hundreds of miles of the

North Coast, I hope these observations were reinforced.

Upon our arrival in Tegucigalpa on Friday we immediately boarded helicopters and conducted an aerial and ground tour of key bridge and other rehabilitation sites in and around the Capital City. The members were given a bird's eye view of a representative sample of the projects that were undertaken to reconnect Tegucigalpa with the rest of the country. This was an early priority for forces from the U.S., Mexico and other international participants in the relief effort. The effort in and around the Capital was sustained by the U.S. after withdrawal of other international contingents in mid-November. Among other projects, the members viewed the Juan Molina Bridge which will be a key point of interest during the Presidential visit. Upon landing, the USAID representative gave the CODEL a guided tour of temporary resettlement housing, after which we proceeded to the Presidential Palace for an extended and very significant meeting with President Flores that I will discuss later in some detail.

On the second day of the visit we again boarded U.S. Army and National Guard Blackhawk helicopters, one of which was piloted by a Chief Warrant Officer who had flown some of the critical early life saving missions. His inflight commentary was invaluable. During our lengthy overflight of the north coast the delegation was able to view at least a cross section of the infrastructure repairs that have been made throughout Central America during the second or ''rehabilitation'' phase of our operations. We landed and walked across bridges built by our engineers. We watched commerce laden 18-wheel tractor-trailers rumble over culvert bypasses that U.S. troops have built over rivers pending the reconstruction of permanent bridges. The members took the time to flag down passing pickup trucks and talk about conditions in Honduras with the simple people from the countryside who have been most affected by the disaster. I'm sure they will pass along to you the comments made by ''mainstream'' Central Americans about our presence and what it has achieved.

Later in the day, we landed in northeastern Honduras and the members had the opportunity to visit a base camp established by members of the Guard and Reserve who are supporting the third and final phase of our engagement, the expanded New Horizons Exercise program. During this phase approximately 23,000 engineers, medics and support personnel from the Guard and Reserve will deploy to the region in two-three week increments during which they will build 33 schools and 12 clinics, drill 27 high capacity wells, repair and rehabilitate more bridges, bypasses and secondary roads and conduct medical, dental and veterinary outreach programs that will touch from 70,000 to 100,000 Central American men, women and children in remote parts of the countryside. I expect the members will describe to you the outstanding organization of the base camps, the uniformly high morale and positive attitudes of the troops involved in this undertaking, and the relevance of the work they will do.

I would like to mention two specific events that took place during the visit that I considered to be particularly meaningful. The first was the CODEL's visit with President Flores on Friday evening.

I was pleased and surprised when the 45-minute planned visit by the CODEL stretched out for an hour and a half, going well into the evening. I have never seen the President as relaxed, cordial or communicative as I saw him Friday night. Congressman Hobson speculated that perhaps this was because he found himself in the company of fellow elected officials as compared and contrasted with career diplomats and senior military officers. In sum, I think the members of the Delegation built a remarkable instant rapport with President Flores, put him at ease, and received from him a very personal, open and unabridged assessment of conditions past, present and future in Honduras.

The second event was a ''casual conversation'' that Congressman Hobson and I had with * * *. This exchange was significant because it involved a member of the private sector, well placed in the business community, with no real personal or professional ties to the Flores administration. Congressman Hobson asked * * * very directly what he, as a businessman, thought the United States should and should not do for Honduras. I found * * * 15 minute answer very instructive and more than a little bit reassuring from a DOD standpoint. * * * stated emphatically, that our emphasis should be on infrastructure repair and development. He mentioned specifically reinstallation of bridges and repair of secondary and tertiary farm-to-market roads. He stated emphatically that we should not give Honduras ''checks''. In his words ''we are lousy managers,'' and he went on to assert that between local politics and bureaucracy there was reason for concern that this type of aid would not accomplish the purposes for which it is intended. I should add that * * * had absolutely nothing disparaging to say about the Flores administration. In fact, he later volunteered to me that he thought this was a fundamentally honest government doing its best to cope with a difficult situation. Congressman Hobson and I took these comments on board with considerable interest because this gentleman had no ax to grind. This was another example of the value of congressional visits. The conversation between Mr. Hobson and * * * was essentially one that took place between two businessmen. They spoke the same language and it provided some unique perspectives on the issues and decisions that confront us.

I believe that my testimony before Chairman Lewis and the members of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee last week was timely and their questions were very relevant. This visit was a useful adjunct. I'm sure that the points that I emphasized at the hearing and to this CODEL will come as no surprise. First, I think DOD resources are being applied in precisely the right way in Central America. We arrived in force on the front end of the crisis and provided the emergency support and assistance that only DOD can provide. We are now concluding the second phase of our involvement during which we have exploited our unique expeditionary capabilities, assisting the host nations to regain their equilibrium and restoring their ability to provide for the essential health and welfare needs of their people. Finally, as the third phase unwinds we will revert to our normal engagement activities but at a higher tempo and intensity. At the end of this phase we will resume normal activities in the region and complete the DOD disengagement that has occasionally eluded us at other times in other places. I am firmly convinced that if we skillfully play this hand out, at the end of the day we will emerge with a significantly strengthened posture in the region and with a ''good will account'' on which we may be able to write checks from some time to come.

Mr. Chairman, as you know better than most, none of this has been free. During the three phases of the operation, DOD will write checks totaling about $215.3M. I hope that you will be able to provide supplemental funding for these unanticipated and unfunded requirements. If required to provide offsets, I'm afraid there will be little recourse other than to extort funds from our readiness accounts and other programs that support and sustain our regional strategies. As you know, time is of the essence because at this moment important accounts that support other crucial worldwide engagement programs have been frozen to underwrite our expenses in Central America. As examples, because the $50M Overseas Humanitarian Disaster and Civic Aid (OHDACA) account is encumbered, we lack resources to pursue important, high visibility humanitarian demining programs throughout our region and around the world. Because the $20M CINCs Initiative Fund (CIF) is similarly committed, I have been unable to proceed with the publication of a crucial human rights handbook and training program that is designed to help the Colombian military overcome its deficiencies in that very contentious area. These are merely illustrative of stalled initiatives in Southern Command. The list could go on and on with other examples for EUCOM, PACOM, CENTCOM and ACOM.

I learned this morning that you are considering a visit to the region, perhaps during the third week of this month. I hope this can be arranged and I am clearing my calendar to accompany you, assuming I can wrangle an invitation. I believe you would gain valuable insights by observing what has been done and what is being done by DOD and others to help Central America get back on its feet. As I mentioned to Congressmen Hobson, Tiahrt and Farr on several occasions, it is important that we not lose sight of the fact that during the decades of the 70's and 80's Central America was engulfed by civil wars and was anything but a bastion of democracy. Today, all the nations are led by heads of state who serve at the pleasure of the people and all have market economics. However, these institutions are fragile and immature. We need to help them over the rough spots, and there is more than a little self-interest at stake. As I asserted in my annual posture statement, ''In a larger strategic context, this unparalleled theater engagement opportunity may stem waves of migrants who might otherwise seek to rebuild their lives in the United States or neighboring countries.'' Again, many thanks for your interest in our region and for your support of DOD.

Very respectfully,

C.E. WILHELM,
General, U.S. Marine Corps,
Commander in Chief, U.S. Southern Command.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) took the floor——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will suspend. A question of personal privilege may not be raised in the Committee of the Whole.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to correct the record.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wonder if I could inquire whether this relates to the debate. It is getting late. There are other amendments to be considered. I am not going to object if it relates to the debate that we are having, but if it is on a personal matter, the gentlewoman might want to take it up with the Member in question.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would not be here unless it related to the debate that we are involved in.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas indicated that I had voted for such an action as he is prescribing for the offsets. There is a letter that has been disseminated by Secretary Rubin that says, ''The 1994 action and the current proposal are not analogous. In 1994, the U.S. had not subscribed the paid-in and callable capital which were rescinded. The current proposal, however, would reach back to capital to which we have formally subscribed and on the basis of which we have exercised voting rights for many years. This proposal has rightly become a concern of the markets.''

For the record, it should be clear that it is not analogous and that I and others did not vote for money that had already been appropriated.

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

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, let me once again address the chair, as I think the rules tell us we should do, and to sort of give a brief history of where we are with respect to the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas.

The Republican Conference and others came to us and asked us to offset this emergency supplemental spending bill. Originally I was opposed to it, but when we finally agreed to it, we found areas within our scope of jurisdiction in foreign operations to offset every single penny of foreign assistance. We found ways to offset the necessary money for Jordan. We found ways to offset all of the money for the problems with respect to aid to Central America, and we found them within our own jurisdiction, our own little pot of money that we have that we call foreign operations. I think that that was a responsible thing to do and it is exactly what we did.

Now comes the gentleman from Kansas, and I know his mission is noble and I do not question that, but I think if he wants to find offsets, he should recognize that those of us on this small subcommittee of the Congress and the Committee on Appropriations have found our offset within our jurisdiction, within our little area of responsibility. Now he is saying, take some more money out of foreign assistance and give it to the military. Maybe that is right, maybe it is wrong. I think it is wrong. If he wants to find offsets from some other area, that is fine with me. But I think that history will show us that for the last 4 years that we have acted very responsibly with respect to foreign assistance. We have cut the President's request every year by more than $1 billion every year since I have been chairman of this subcommittee. We are probably going to cut his budget even more so this year, maybe as much as 3 or $4 billion. We are doing the responsible thing. We did exactly what the people of our own conference requested; we found offsets. We found them within our area of jurisdiction.

I think if the gentleman from Kansas wants to find additional moneys to offset the military portion of it, he should do it elsewhere. I happen to agree with the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) with respect to the fact that we are going to have to have another supplemental bill in just a few short months to handle this situation in Kosovo. And to raid the foreign operations account which has been handled in an admirable and I think efficient manner during the last 4 years is wrong.

I would urge my colleagues to vote against the Tiahrt amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Tiahrt amendment. As chairman of the Committee on International Relations, I cannot support gutting the funding of the International Financial Institutions. I want to remind my colleagues that these financial institutions help guarantee the IRAs of millions of Americans whose mutual funds are invested in Asia. Currently we have a financial crisis in Asia that the financial institutions are key to combating. We are currently conducting military operations in Iraq and in Kosovo. We cannot afford an Asian crisis on top of those costly operations. This is the wrong time to undercut our financial institutions which are supporting reforms in Indonesia and in South Korea. In Korea, we face a crisis in North Korea and the strength of our South Korean ally's economy is critical to deterring aggression in that area.

I join with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) in strongly opposing this amendment. Cutting callable capital is not the way to save a dime but can trigger yet a third crisis that could involve our troops in Asia. Let us stick with the bill as drafted by the gentleman from Florida, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

I commend the gentleman from Kansas for defending Social Security. I support that goal. But cutting callable capital for these institutions will not save one dime for Social Security. Let us work on reductions in other accounts not directly related to our Nation's security.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the debate on this amendment be limited to 15 minutes and that the time be equally divided, with the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) controlling 7½ minutes and that I would control the other 7½ minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. It is understood that the limitation is on the amendment and any amendments thereto.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Yes, that is correct.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will each control 7½ minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in very strong support of the bipartisan Tiahrt-Goode amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by complimenting the Committee on Appropriations on their work. They did a tremendous job of offsetting 85 percent of this supplemental appropriation and they are to be complimented for that. But in point of fact, it is possible to offset the balance, to offset 15 percent. I think the most eloquent spokesman on that point was my Democratic colleague the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODE) who pointed out quite clearly that if we went home to Americans and asked them, do they want this additional $195 million which would be offset by the bipartisan Tiahrt-Goode amendment, do they want that taken out of the callable capital account, an account which has never been used by the World Bank, or do they want that taken out of Social Security, their answer would be very clear, they do not want it taken out of Social Security, they want it taken out of the callable capital account.

There is a very good reason for that. This is an account which is there for the World Bank to draw on as a backstop. But as the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) pointed out earlier, the United States is unique in the world in its funding of this account. Every other country participating in this account pledged their credit to fund the account if ever called upon. The United States by contrast put up the money. The money is sitting there and right now not being used for any purpose. It can clearly be used to offset the remaining 15 percent of the bill, of the emergency spending bill, and protect Social Security.

For the gentleman from Alabama who says we should not do this and for the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, I would point out that in 1994 an amendment passed this House, sponsored by Mr. FAZIO of the other side, going into the callable capital account to the tune of $902 million. Now, if it was okay in 1994 to dip into that fund for $902 million, tell me why then it is not appropriate to keep our word to the American people on

Social Security, to dip into it now for a total of $843 million which is the figure which would occur if the Tiahrt amendment passes?

The simple truth is that we can dip into that account, the callable capital account, and protect Social Security. To my friend from the other side who was very offended that we are breaking our word to the world by not funding this account, where is it more important, that we would break our word, which, by the way, we are not breaking our word because we have put up the cash—the rest of the world has only put up their promise—but what about our promise to the American people that we would fund the Social Security trust fund?

I suggest that the Tiahrt amendment keeps faith with the American people. It keeps faith with our national accounts. The callable capital account is an account which has never in its 40-year history been dipped into. I suggest that Members of this body interested in protecting Social Security without a risk should support the bipartisan Tiahrt-Goode amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have the great privilege of representing a congressional district that has more people receiving Social Security checks every month than almost everybody else in this Chamber. I can promise Members that I would not cast a vote or take a position here that in my opinion would be detrimental to the Social Security program. To the contrary, I recall a few years back when Ronald Reagan was President, we had a very large tax increase to save the Social Security, and despite much criticism from many people in my district, I voted for that as a commitment to Social Security.

Tomorrow we are going to be debating the budget resolution where we talk about how much we will set aside for Social Security. I am going to support every effort to protect the Social Security program and to set aside all of the FICA tax because that is why we created that tax in the first place. We are dealing with fiscal year 1999 money here. We are not dealing with next year's budget surpluses or anything like that. We are dealing with fiscal year 1999 money.

I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The bill as presented by the committee which the House has supported to this point is a good bill. The offsets are reasonable and responsible. I am concerned, as I said just a few minutes ago, that we would begin the precedent over again of offsetting from our defense requirements and our defense needs and the needs of the men and women who serve in our military. I do not want to begin the precedent of offsetting their extraordinary deployments that they are required to attend.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for not only opposition to this amendment but I ask for support of the bill. Let us get this bill into conference and let us get the bill to the President and let us get the support to our friends in Central America where the commitments have been made.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I would just like to remind Members of the House that half this bill is currently offset by the callable capital account. That is a total of 85 percent of this bill that is offset. I do not find any reason why we should not offset the full amount.

I noted that the gentlewoman from California says she has a letter from Secretary Rubin. I have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. What happened in 1994 was that the increases to capital stock going into the capital account was rescinded under the disaster bill. That vote passed by 415–2.

So a precedent was set then, and I think I am just following that precedent was set, I am following what the committee has done before, and I would encourage my colleagues to vote for the Tiahrt amendment. I think it is sound fiscal policy, it is pay-as-you-go policy, I feel strongly about these offsets that they are good offsets, and it is very much needed for the disaster down in Central America.

So I would ask for support for the Tiahrt-Goode-Toomey amendment.

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

Mr. TIAHRT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I simply applaud the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) for offering this amendment because to me what this amendment is about is simply asking the question: ''Can you be one half pregnant?'' I do not think that one can be. Someone either is or they are not, and what he has boldly said here is that either we are going to set aside every dime for the things that we say we are going to set aside for or we are not, because if not, though this number is small, we run down a very slippery slope on the things we end up spending for and end up not spending for.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 264, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

AYES—164

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bilbray
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Camp
Campbell
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Dickey
Doggett
Doolittle
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kingston
Kucinich
LaHood
Largent
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mica
Moran (KS)
Morella
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Young (AK)

NOES—264

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
Leach
Lee

Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Myrick
Peterson (PA)
Sanders
Slaughter
Stupak

□ 1704

Messrs. HINOJOSA, HILL of Indiana, SCOTT, FARR of California, GEORGE MILLER of California and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. GILCHREST, DAVIS of Virginia and BOEHLERT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 36, line 10, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill through page 36, line 10, is as follows:

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds appropriated under this heading in Public Law 105–277, $10,000,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the budgetary resources provided for ''Small Community Air Service'' by Public Law 101–508 for fiscal years prior to fiscal year 1998, $815,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANKS

(RESCISSION)

Of the available balances under this heading, $6,500,000 are rescinded.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

TRUST FUND SHARE OF TRANSIT PROGRAMS

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the budgetary resources provided for the trust fund share of transit programs in Public Law 102–240 under 49 U.S.C. 5338(a)(1), $665,000 are rescinded.

INTERSTATE TRANSFER GRANTS—TRANSIT

Of the available balances under this heading, $600,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL PROVISION—THIS TITLE

SEC. 1001. Division B, title I, chapter 1 of Public Law 105–277 is amended as follows: under the heading ''Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide'', strike ''$1,496,600,000'' and insert in lieu thereof ''$1,456,600,000''.

TITLE II

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS AND RESCISSIONS

CHAPTER 1

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for ''Salaries and Expenses,'' $921,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCIES

RELATED AGENCY

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

BUYING POWER MAINTENANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $20,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER 2

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

For necessary expenses for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, as authorized by title II of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–292), $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances of funds available under this heading, $25,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER 3

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 105–83, $6,800,000 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR AMERICAN INDIANS

FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

For an additional amount for ''Federal Trust Programs'', $21,800,000, to remain available until expended, of which $6,800,000 is for activities pursuant to the Trust Management Improvement Project High Level Implementation Plan and $15,000,000 is to support litigation involving individual Indian trust accounts: *Provided*, That litigation support funds may, as needed, be transferred to and merged with the ''Operation of Indian Programs'' account in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the ''Salaries and Expenses'' account in the Office of the Solicitor, the ''Salaries and Expenses'' account in Departmental Management, the ''Royalty and Offshore Minerals Management'' account in the Minerals Management Service and the ''Management of Lands and Resources'' account in the Bureau of Land Management.

CHAPTER 4

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

Under this heading in section 101(f) of Public Law 105–277, strike ''$3,132,076,000'' and insert ''$3,111,076,000'' and strike ''$180,933,000'' and insert ''$164,933,000''.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

FEDERAL CAPITAL LOAN PROGRAM FOR NURSING

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under the Federal Capital Loan Program for Nursing appropriation account, $2,800,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in section 101(f) of Public Law 105–277, $6,800,000 are rescinded.

RELATED AGENCY

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

For an additional amount for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, to remain available until expended, $30,600,000 to be available for fiscal year 1999, and $17,400,000 to be available for fiscal year 2000: *Provided*, That such funds be made available to National Public Radio, as the designated manager of the Public Radio Satellite System, for acquisition of satellite capacity.

CHAPTER 5

CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

HOUSE PAGE DORMITORY

For necessary expenses for renovations to the facility located at 501 First Street, S.E., in the District of Columbia, $3,760,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Architect of the Capitol shall transfer to the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives such portion of the funds made available under this paragraph as may be required for expenses incurred by the Chief Administrative Officer in the renovation of the facility, subject to the approval of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5) shall not apply to the funds made available under this paragraph.

O'NEILL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

For necessary expenses for life safety renovations to the O'Neill House Office Building, $1,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (41 U.S.C. 5) shall not apply to the funds made available under this paragraph.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—THIS CHAPTER

SEC. 501. (a) The aggregate amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for the lump-sum allowance for the Office of the Minority Leader of the House of

Representatives and the aggregate amount otherwise authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for the lump-sum allowance for the Office of the Majority Whip of the House of Representatives shall each be increased by $333,000.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2000 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SEC. 502. (a) Each office described under the heading ''HOUSE LEADERSHIP OFFICES'' in the Act making appropriations for the legislative branch for a fiscal year may transfer any amounts appropriated for the office under such heading among the various categories of allowances and expenses for the office under such heading.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to any amounts appropriated for official expenses.

(c) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 1999 and each succeeding fiscal year.

CHAPTER 6

POSTAL SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO THE POSTAL SERVICE FUND

For an additional amount for ''Payments to the Postal Service Fund'' for revenue forgone reimbursement pursuant to 39 U.S.C., 2401(d), $29,000,000.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

UNANTICIPATED NEEDS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under this heading in Public Law 101–130, the Fiscal Year 1990 Dire Emergency Supplemental to Meet the Needs of Natural Disasters of National Significance, $10,000,000 are rescinded.

CHAPTER 7

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS

Notwithstanding the 6th undesignated paragraph under the heading ''COMMUNITY PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT—COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANTS'' in title II of the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–276; 112 Stat. 2477) and the related provisions of the joint explanatory statement in the conference report to accompany such Act (Report 105–769, 105th Congress, 2d Session) referred to in such paragraph, of the amounts provided under such heading and made available for the Economic Development Initiative (EDI) for grants for targeted economic investments, $250,000 shall be for a grant to Project Restore of Los Angeles, California, for the Los Angeles City Civic Center Trust, to revitalize and redevelop the Civic Center neighborhood, and $100,000 shall be for a grant to the Southeast Rio Vista Family YMCA, for development of a child care center in the City of Huntington Park, California.

MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

Under this heading in Public Law 105–276, add the words, ''to remain available until September 30, 2000,'' after $81,910,000,''.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 2001. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 2002. (a) LOAN DEFICIENCY PAYMENTS FOR CLUB WHEAT PRODUCERS.—In making loan deficiency payments available under section 135 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7235) to producers of club wheat, the Secretary of Agriculture may not assess a premium adjustment on the amount that would otherwise be computed for club wheat under the section to reflect the premium that is paid for club wheat to ensure its availability to create a blended specialty product known as western white wheat.

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make a payment to each producer of club wheat that received a discounted loan deficiency payment under section 135 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7235) before that date as a result of the assessment of a premium adjustment against club wheat. The amount of the payment for a producer shall be equal to the difference between—

(1) the loan deficiency payment that would have been made to the producer in the absence of the premium adjustment; and

(2) the loan deficiency payment actually received by the producer.

(c) FUNDING SOURCE.—The Secretary shall use funds available to provide marketing assistance loans and loan deficiency payments under subtitle C of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7231 et seq.) to make the payments required by subsection (b).

TITLE III

TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS

SEC. 3001. The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(a) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended—

(a) in title III, under the heading ''Rural Community Advancement Program, (Including Transfer of Funds)'', by inserting ''1926d,'' after ''1926c,''; by inserting '', 306C, and 306D'' after ''381E(d)(2)'' the first time it appears in the paragraph; and by striking '', as provided in 7 U.S.C. 1926(a) and 7 U.S.C. 1926C'',

(b) in title VII, in section 718 by striking ''this Act'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''annual appropriations Acts'',

(c) in title VII, in section 747 by striking ''302'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''203'', and

(d) in title VII, in section 763(b)(3) by striking ''Public Law 94–265'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Public Law 104–297''.

SEC. 3002. Division B, title V, chapter 1 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277) is amended under the heading ''Department of Agriculture, Agriculture Research Service'' by inserting after ''$23,000,000,'' the following: ''to remain available until expended,''.

SEC. 3003. The Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(d) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended—

(a) in title II under the heading ''Burma'' by striking 'headings ''Economic Support Fund'' and' and inserting in lieu thereof 'headings ''Child Survival and Disease Programs Fund'', ''Economic Support Fund'' and',

(b) in title V in section 587 by striking ''199–339'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''99–399'',

(c) in title V in subsection 594(a) by striking ''subparagraph (C)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''subsection (c)'',

(d) in title V in subsection 594(b) by striking ''subparagraph (a)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''subsection (a)'', and

(e) in title V in subsection 594(c) by striking ''521 of the annual appropriations Act for Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''520 of this Act''.

SEC. 3004. Subsection 1706(b) of title XVII of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r–262r–2), as added by section 614 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1999, is amended by striking ''June 30'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''September 30''.

SEC. 3005. The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(e) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended—

(a) in the last proviso under the heading ''United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Administrative Provisions'' by striking ''section 104(c)(50)(B) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 1361–1407)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''section 104(c)(5)(B) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1361–1407)''.

(b) in section 354(a) by striking ''16 U.S.C. 544(a)(2))'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''16 U.S.C. 544b(a)(2))''.

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall take effect as if included in Public Law 105–277 on the date of its enactment.

SEC. 3006. The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(f) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended—

(a) in title I, under the heading ''Federal Unemployment Benefits and Allowances'', by striking ''during the current fiscal year'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''from October 1, 1998, through September 30, 1999'';

(b) in title II under the heading ''Office of the Secretary, General Departmental Management'' by striking ''$180,051,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$188,051,000'';

(c) in title II under the heading ''Children and Families Services Programs, (Including Rescissions)'' by striking ''notwithstanding section 640 (a)(6), of the funds made available for the Head Start Act, $337,500,000 shall be set aside for the Head Start Program for Families with Infants and Toddlers (Early Head Start): *Provided further*, That'';

(d) in title II under the heading ''Office of the Secretary, General Departmental Management'' by inserting after the first proviso the following: ''*Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading for carrying out title XX of the Public Health Service Act, $10,831,000 shall be for activities specified under section 2003(b)(2), of which $9,131,000 shall be for prevention service demonstration grants under section 510(b)(2) of title V of the Social Security Act, as amended, without application of the limitation of section 2010(c) of said title XX:'';

(e) in title III under the heading ''Special Education'' by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph the following: '': *Provided further*, That $1,500,000 shall be for the recipient of funds provided by Public Law 105–78 under section 687(b)(2)(G) of the Act to provide information on diagnosis, intervention, and teaching strategies for children with disabilities'';

(f) in title II under the heading ''Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund'' by striking ''$322,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$180,000'';

(g) in title III under the heading ''Education Reform'' by striking ''$491,000,000'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''$459,500,000'';

(h) in title III under the heading ''Vocational and Adult Education'' by striking ''$6,000,000'' the first time that it appears and

inserting in lieu thereof ''$14,000,000'', and by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph the following: '': *Provided further,* That of the amounts made available for the Perkins Act, $4,100,000 shall be for tribally controlled postsecondary vocational institutions under section 117'';

(i) in title III under the heading ''Higher Education'' by inserting after the first proviso the following: ''*Provided further,* That funds available for part A, subpart 2 of title VII of the Higher Education Act shall be available to fund awards for academic year 1999–2000 for fellowships under part A, subpart 1 of title VII of said Act, under the terms and conditions of part A, subpart 1:'';

(j) in title III under the heading ''Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement'' by inserting after the third proviso the following: ''*Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated under section 10601 of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, $1,000,000 shall be used to conduct a violence prevention demonstration program: *Provided further,* That of the funds appropriated under section 10601 of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, $50,000 shall be awarded to the Center for Educational Technologies to conduct a feasibility study and initial planning and design of an effective CD ROM product that would complement the book, We the People: The Citizen and the Constitution:'';

(k) in title III under the heading ''Reading Excellence'' by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph the following: '': *Provided,* That up to one percent of the amount appropriated shall be available October 1, 1998 for peer review of applications'';

(l) in title V in section 510(3) by inserting after ''Act'' the following: ''or subsequent Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Acts''; and

(m)(1) in title VIII in section 405 by striking subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''(e) OTHER REFERENCES TO TITLE VII OF THE STEWART B. MCKINNEY HOMELESS ASSISTANCE ACT.—The table of contents of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11301 et seq.) is amended—

''(1) by striking the items relating to title VII of such Act, except the item relating to the title heading and the items relating to subtitles B and C of such title; and

''(2) by striking the item relating to the title heading for title VII and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

''TITLE VII—EDUCATION AND TRAINING'.''.

(2) The amendments made by subsection (m)(1) of this section shall take effect as if included in Public Law 105–277 on the date of its enactment.

SEC. 3007. The last sentence of section 5595(b) of title 5, United States Code (as added by section 309(a)(2) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1999, Public Law 105–275) is amended by striking ''(a)(1)(G)'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(a)(1)(C)''.

SEC. 3008. The Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(g) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended: (a) in title I under the heading ''National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Operations and Research, (Highway Trust Fund)'' by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph '': *Provided further,* That notwithstanding other funds available in this Act for the National Advanced Driving Simulator Program, funds under this heading are available for obligation, as necessary, to continue this program through September 30, 1999''.

SEC. 3009. Division B, title II, chapter 5 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277) is amended under the heading ''Capitol Police Board, Security Enhancements'' by inserting before the period at the end of the paragraph '': *Provided further,* That for purposes of carrying out the plan or plans described under this heading and consistent with the approval of such plan or plans pursuant to this heading, the Capitol Police Board shall transfer the portion of the funds made available under this heading which are to be used for personnel and overtime increases for the United States Capitol Police to the heading ''Capitol Police Board, Capitol Police, Salaries'' under the Act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year involved, and shall allocate such portion between the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate in such amounts as may be approved by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate''.

SEC. 3010. Section 3027(d)(3) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (49 U.S.C. 5307 note: 112 Stat. 366) as added by section 360 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(g) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is re-designated as section 3027(c)(3).

SEC. 3011. The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 (as contained in division A, section 101(b) of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1999 (Public Law 105–277)) is amended—

(a) in title I, under the heading ''Legal Activities, Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities'', by inserting ''and shall remain available until September 30, 2000'' after ''Holocaust Assets in the United States'', and

(b) in title IV, under the heading ''Department of State, Administration of Foreign Affairs, Salaries and Expenses'', by inserting ''and shall remain available until September 30, 2000'' after ''Holocaust Assets in the United States''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BENTSEN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. Bentsen:

Page 36, after line 10, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3012. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to release from detention any criminal alien subject to mandatory detention pending removal from the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I am offering today, which the gentleman has reserved a point of order against, would prohibit the use of any funds in this act or any other act for the release of criminal aliens from detention centers run by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. This would only apply to criminal aliens subject to mandatory detention who are pending removal from the United States.

With the passage of the 1996 immigration reform law, Congress and the President placed a high priority on removing noncitizen criminals from the United States. This bipartisan reform law mandated detention of criminal aliens until their removal and provided the Immigration and Naturalization Service with two additional years to implement the law. It is worth noting that since 1996, Congress has doubled the funding for detention and deportation to $730 million.

In February of this year, reports surfaced that the INS planned to release criminal aliens, many of whom are being held on felony charges. Specifically, the INS issued a memorandum on January 8, 1999, which alerted field offices of a shortfall in detention space funding and offered guidelines for the release of criminal aliens who comprise the vast majority of the INS detainees awaiting deportation.

In response, the INS eastern region's regional director released a draft plan in early February to free 1,550 criminal aliens under a point system that would give priority to those with the least serious convictions. Among those eligible for release under the proposal were criminal aliens who had been convicted in U.S. courts for such crimes as drug trafficking, assault, burglary, counterfeiting and alien smuggling.

After much congressional criticism, INS Commissioner Meissner reversed the agency's plan. However, it is incomprehensible why such an idea was considered in the first place. Quite simply, it is imperative that the INS continue to detain and remove criminal aliens subject to the mandatory detention requirements of the 1996 immigration law. To do so effectively, it is important to disallow the use of all INS funding alternatives, including funds appropriated in previous budgets from being used for the release of criminal aliens, not just those contained in the bill before us today.

The amendment I am offering would thus codify the stated plans of Commissioner Meissner who said before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims on February 25, 1999, that INS will not now release any aliens subject to mandatory detention under section 303 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

□ 1715

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the INS has been woefully inadequate in dealing with this problem. I know

there are a lot of concerns about the IRAIRA law as it relates to certain resident aliens and people who were in the country legally, but this applies to people who enter the country illegally and who then commit either a felony or a misdemeanor and then are subject to deportation.

In my State of Texas, in the State of Florida, in California, in the eastern region of this country, this has been a serious problem. The INS has not been very good at getting back to us.

Earlier this year my colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, from the Houston area, wrote to Commissioner Meissner asking that she address this problem. She did not respond to us until today, when I received a letter from her, coincidentally. In that letter, actually, it was from her Director of Congressional Relations, in the letter they did state that they have reversed the policy.

It states that various options are being explored which will give the agency some relief, both in the short-term and long-term detention, including the possibility of seeking additional funding or the restoration of temporary period custody rule release authority; that is, they want to go back to releasing people who have been convicted of felonies. That is unacceptable to the constituents in my district. I think it would be unacceptable to most Members' constituents in their districts.

So while it is unfortunate that the point of order will probably be raised on this, the fact remains that this is the only game in town right now. If we are not going to get around to dealing with this until we take up the fiscal year 2000 appropriations bill, how do we know that the INS is not going to go back and change their policy once again?

I appreciate the chairman not wanting to load up his bill with a lot of amendments, but if this was the fiscal year 1999 bill, this would have been a straight limitation which I would have offered. At that time we did not know this was going to be a problem.

This does not add any new money. It does something that I think the Congress has already spoken on. I would hope the gentleman would not raise this point of order, and we could go ahead and have this adopted on a voice vote by the committee and move on.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized on his point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law, constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, and it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, ''No amendment to a general appropriations bill shall be in order if changing existing law.'' This amendment does not apply solely to the appropriation under consideration, and as much as I believe in what the gentleman is trying to do, and I think through the regular process we can do it, I must ask for a ruling of the Chair on this point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) wish to respond to the point of order?

Mr. BENTSEN. The only thing I will say is, I am disappointed that my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, would do this. We have an opportunity to address this today. There is no guarantee that the committee of jurisdiction would get around to it. It is unfortunate. This is a real problem, but so be it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) makes a point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

As stated at page 131 of House Practice, to avoid legislating a limitation must apply solely to the funds in the bill under consideration and may not be applied to funds appropriated in other acts.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) explicitly addresses funds in other acts. The provision therefore constitutes legislation, and the point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana:

At the end of title II (page 26, after line 2), insert the following new section:

SEC. 2003. (a) AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENTS.—Subject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to enter into agreements to make payments for the settlement of the claims arising from the deaths caused by the accident involving a United States Marine Corps EA–6B aircraft on February 3, 1998, near Cavalese, Italy.

(b) DEADLINE FOR EXERCISE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall exercise the authority under subsection (a) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of the Navy for operation and maintenance for fiscal year 1999, the Secretary shall make available $40,000,000 only for emergency and extraordinary expenses associated with the settlement of the claims arising from the accident described in subsection (a), unless the agreements made pursuant to the authority granted in subsection (a) provide for payments over a longer period.

(d) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount of the payment under this section in settlement of the claims arising from the death of any person associated with the accident described in subsection (a) may not exceed $2,000,000.

(e) TREATMENT OF PAYMENTS.—Any amount paid to a person under this section is intended to supplement any amount subsequently determined to be payable to the person under section 127 or chapter 163 of title 10, United States Code, or any other provision of law for administrative settlement of claims against the United States with respect to damages arising from the accident described in subsection (a).

(f) CONSTRUCTION.—The payment of an amount under this section may not be considered to constitute a statement of legal liability on the part of the United States or otherwise as evidence of any material fact in any judicial proceeding or investigation arising from the accident described in subsection (a).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, while I will not contest the point of order because this is legislating on an appropriation bill, I thought this issue was important enough to bring it before this body right now.

On February 3 of last year, near Cavalese, Italy, a Marine pilot inadvertently ran into a gondola on a ski lift and killed 20 people. It has been an international incident ever since.

While I agree and fully support the ruling of the court-martial that those pilots were not in error in this horrible tragedy, I do believe that we owe those people who died some monetary damages. We owe their families some monetary damages.

We have spent $20 million repairing the gondola and the ski lift and the other things that were damaged near Cavalese, Italy, but we have not done really very much to take care of the people who were really hurt by this horrible tragedy, the families of those people.

The Italian court system takes between 3 and 10 years to settle these kinds of claims. It seems to me relatively inhuman to make these people wait that long before we pay them the damages to which they are entitled. They are suffering a great deal right now.

I do not know what kind of message it sends to the world when we take care of the ski lift but we do not take care of the Human tragedy that was involved. It is my opinion that the Defense Department has about $68 million in unobligated funds from prior years from which to draw this money. We are talking about a maximum of around $1 to $2 million for each one of the families that were involved. I would just say to my colleagues, although I know there is going to be a point of order that is going to be sustained on this, that we ought to do something about this in the very near future.

I would urge the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Armed

Services, to do what they can to make sure reparations are dealt with in a very timely fashion. We do not want these people to suffer for another 3 to 10 years because this thing is being dragged out. Yell.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, the United States was at fault. There is no question about that. While the pilots may not have been at fault, those maps did not have the gondola on them, did not have the ski lift on them. The altimeter on the plane, there is some question about whether or not it was working. When they flew into that valley, even though there was an optical illusion, there were other factors that factored into this that caused this tragedy to occur.

I would just like to say before I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, the United States owes a responsibility to the people of Italy that were harmed by this terrible tragedy, and we ought to make restitution as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, for bringing this measure. I would like to inform the Members about this issue with the ski lift in Italy.

When the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) made a comment about the monies have been paid for the damage to the ski lift, we put monies aside, there was $20 million, but those monies have not been accessed. The ski lift has been replaced, the owner-operator has gone through the claims process in Italy, and it has not yet been adjudicated, so the $20 million has not been accessed. I wanted to clarify that point.

We have a Status of Forces agreement in Italy, and for the claims process, the Navy has jurisdiction. Right now when there is a claim, they are to go through the Italian government. Through the Status of Forces agreement, we, the United States, pay 75 percent and Italy pays 25 percent, but they are to go through the adjudicative procedures through the Italian government.

Right now, because we have that agreement in place, I will give advice to my colleagues, let us permit the adjudication to go through the Status of Forces agreement.

I would say to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), I applaud him and recognize his efforts, and the image that it shows around the world, but I would ask the gentleman to let us go through the adjudicative procedures that we have under our Status of Forces agreement in Italy.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by saying that the process the gentleman from Indiana just alluded to could take 3 to 10 years. I think that is too long. The other body passed this resolution that I am talking about, this amendment, yesterday. I think it was Senator ROBB that sponsored it. It passed, I think, without any opposition whatsoever.

Those people who are suffering, and their families who are suffering right now, should not have to wait for an adjudication process that is going to go on for 3 to 10 years. They suffered enough. We need to get on with it.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) continue to reserve his point of order?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill, and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, ''An amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order if changing existing law.'' The amendment gives affirmative direction in effect.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) makes a point of order under clause 2 of rule XXI that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) changes existing law. The amendment changes existing law by, among other things, waiving provisions of existing law and imposing new duties on the Secretary of Defense.

Accordingly, the point of order is sustained.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me say, as somebody who is a strong supporter of the amendment that the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TODD TIAHRT) brought to this Floor, that as we get ready to vote on final passage of this bill, we need to step back and ask ourselves what it is we are voting on.

We did not choose to further offset the defense spending with other savings from nondefense, but I think we need to look at what the committee has done. They have done a great job of saving over $1 billion from the social security trust fund, essentially, because that is where that money comes from if we do not offset it. We need to recognize that and praise them for that work.

Today we have seen the President order bombings in Kosovo. All of us realize that while the President has made that decision and ordered the military to engage, we in Congress will be asked later to find the money to pay for that, and that it will become increasingly difficult to do so without jeopardizing our national defense.

In the final analysis, Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge my colleagues, all of us who share a desire to save social security, to recognize the good job that the committee has done in finding offsets for the domestic spending. More than $1 billion has been offset. That means more than $1 billion has been saved for the social security trust fund. They have done that without the help of the President, without the help of the White House, without the help of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They deserve to be recognized for putting social security as a top priority in this bill.

Although I was a supporter of the Tiahrt amendment, I thought it was the right thing to do. I am also prepared and think the right thing for us to do today is to vote yes on final passage, and recognize that we have begun a very arduous task of saying that we are going to make sure that we offset spending, make sure that we save social security by offsetting those requests for additional spending, and recognizing that we have to preserve that trust fund.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his good work, and I would urge all my colleagues to vote yes on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. I simply want to say, in light of the comments by the previous speaker, that repeating a misstatement of fact does not make it a fact, no matter how many times that misstatement is repeated.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do so to compliment the Chairman for having presided in this Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union in a very professional and magnificent fashion.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read the final two lines of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the ''1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act''.

□ 1730

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. PEASE, 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. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 125, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 211, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—220

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bereuter
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Moran (KS)
Morella
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Upton
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—211

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Sisisky
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—3

Myrick
Slaughter
Stupak

□ 1750

Messrs. HERGER, RADANOVICH, RYUN of Kansas, SENSENBRENNER, GUTIERREZ, ROGAN, BARTON of Texas, MCINNIS, MANZULLO, GRAHAM, POMEROY and MINGE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

Mr. JOHN and Mr. REYES changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO PRESIDENT'S EXPORT COUNCIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order Number 12131, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the President's Export Council:

Mr. EWING of Illinois,

Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and

Mr. PICKERING of Mississippi.

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR MEMBERS OF U.S. ARMED FORCES ENGAGED IN MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 130) expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the members of the United States Armed Forces who are engaged in military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House, with the previous question ordered to its adoption without intervening motion except for 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on International Relations and the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services or their designees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 130

Whereas the President has authorized United States participation in NATO military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;

Whereas up to 22,000 members of the Armed Forces are presently involved in operations in and around the Balkans region with the active participation of NATO and other coalition forces; and

Whereas the House of Representatives and the American people have the greatest pride in the members of the Armed Forces and strongly support them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives supports the members of the United States Armed Forces who are engaged in military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and recognizes their professionalism, dedication, patriotism, and courage.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE).

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

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. While I have deep reservations about the direction of our policy in the Balkans and the wisdom of intervening on the ground in Kosovo, I have no reservations whatsoever about the patriotism, dedication, professionalism and courage of the men

and women who serve this country in uniform.

Indeed, since 1992, when American pilots began to conduct no-fly-zone operations over Bosnia, and sailors began to enforce a maritime exclusion zone around the former Yugoslavia, hundreds of thousands of our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines have served with distinction in operations in and around the Balkans. Their record of service is a source of pride to all of us. These young people truly deserve and represent the best America has to offer.

The operations now underway over Yugoslavia represents a new chapter. Though these attacks have been meticulously planned and undoubtedly are being conducted with consummate skill, they are perhaps more dangerous than any previous operation in the Balkans.

□ 1800

The President has rightly spoken of the risks to our personnel, for they are real and considerable. What we are witnessing in the skies over Serbia is unquestionably a war. Now, more than ever, our armed forces in and around the Balkans need and deserve our support.

They also deserve the backing of a sound policy. Even if the air campaign now underway is successful, it will merely be the opening move in Kosovo. The next step is the deployment of NATO and United States ground troops in the midst of a civil war where the Kosovars are committed to independence and when the Serbs are determined to preserve what they regard as their historic homeland.

Thus, there is neither an end date nor an achievable end-state in Kosovo. This is an open-ended mission where success is impossible to define, as is the mission of our troops.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and send a clear message to our men and women of the strong support we have for them as they place their lives in danger in the skies over Yugoslavia.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, if there is ever an issue that brings this Congress together, it is a commendation for the men and women who fight for this country and who serve in its armed forces. And if there is ever a message to the other countries in this world that democracy, with all its debates, divisions and sometimes heated arguments, that it is moments like this when we do come together to support the men and women that carry out the foreign policy of the United States when it requires military action.

It would be unthinking not to have reservations about a policy that uses force and puts our people in harm's way. I think every Member who is responsible worries about the consequences of that action. But what is clear is if we do not continue on the policy that President Clinton has initiated, we would find more death and destruction in Kosovo.

Today, as we are on this floor, there are a quarter of a million refugees. There are thousands already dead. Do we wait to respond until there are tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands dead? Do we wait until the quarter million refugees become a million or a million and a half refugees?

I say we cannot do that. And so I am privileged to be here and join with my colleagues to commend the armed forces for their role in this, their heroism, their technical proficiency. And I commend the President for his leadership in solving the problems and fighting to stop the killing, which may not solve all problems on earth but will certainly give the people of Kosovo an additional chance for life.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

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

I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution, and I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) for taking the initiative of introducing this resolution.

Earlier today we received reports, and the President has confirmed those reports, that operation Noble Anvil, a military air operation, is now underway over Serbia.

This is the time to put aside all of our differences and any doubts that we may entertain about our policy and it is time to unite behind brave men and women who are now involved in a very serious and risky military mission in defense of our national interests. These include bringing stability to a strategically important part of Europe, preventing further human suffering, and maintaining the credibility of the North Atlantic Alliance.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to emphasize that while I fully support the NATO air campaign to end Milosevic's brutal attacks upon the Albanian majority of Kosovo, this is a decision that many of us have come to with great reluctance. I fervently wish that our diplomacy that has been underway for more than a year to end the tragic and needless bloodshed in Kosovo had worked. Regrettably, as we saw earlier in this decade in Bosnia, Milosevic only heeds the language of military might.

With this military operation underway, we should do everything that we can to ensure that our pilots and those who support them are successful and that they return safely and that their time in harm's way be kept as short as possible. They represent the finest aspects of our Nation: determination, courage, and steadfastness under the most difficult of conditions.

Although our pilots are aware of the dangers they now face as they carry out their missions over Serbia, the most demoralizing thing for our military personnel is not knowledge of the risks posed by the enemy they are facing but knowledge of any dissent on the home front about the nature of their mission.

So I urge my colleagues, let us today by this resolution indicate that we in the Congress are united in our prayers to them and to their families for a safe, swift, and successful end to this air operation. It is important that we recognize that this is not a unilateral military action by our Nation but a military operation authorized by the 19 nations represented by the North Atlantic Council and ordered by the Secretary General of NATO, Javier Solana, and while our armed forces are taking the lead in this first wave of attacks, they will be joined by armed forces of other NATO allies as this operation progresses. We extend our prayers and our support to those personnel and to their families.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to join in wishing our airmen and women Godspeed.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution that is before us, a resolution that supports the members of the United States armed forces who are engaged in military operations in Yugoslavia. They are not by themselves. This is part of a NATO force. Nineteen nations have banded together to urge and cause Milosevic of Yugoslavia to come to the table and do what is right for international peace. Fourteen of the 19 nations are operating today in one way or another in supporting this effort.

I support our troops engaged in this. I support those brave airmen and those who support them on the ground. On a more personal note, I am privileged to represent Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri, which sent several B–2s as part of this mission. I am told by sources in the Pentagon that they did well and that they are returning back to Whiteman Air Force Base unscathed.

This is an important measure. This is important not only for us in this House of Representatives to support and recognize the professionalism and dedication and patriotism of those airmen and those involved in this operation, but I support what we are doing there.

The Balkans are a tinderbox. World War I started there. The United States is a leader in NATO, and NATO has as its goal and task to bring and keep peace and stability in Europe. There is a great deal at stake: the stability of Europe, the possibility of a wider war, refugees in the hundreds of thousands, eventual involvement not only of NATO but of other allies, such as Greece and Turkey, if violence in Kosovo spreads to the surrounding countries.

There are no easy choices in this, but I support the President's decision of

this very, very difficult and dangerous mission. And though it is difficult and though it is dangerous, it is the only alternative open to us.

I applaud those in uniform, and I hope that the people in America, all across the land, will understand and thank those for their dedication, their professionalism, their patriotism, for they are doing a great deal in the effort to bring peace to a very unhappy part of the world.

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

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting there writing my note and not ready to speak, but I will do it off the cuff.

I am vehemently opposed to us going into Kosovo, and I will explain why. But making that statement, now that we are engaged in Kosovo, I will do everything in my power to support the President. I will also tell my colleagues why.

The President did not give us that courtesy when I was fighting in Vietnam. He continued protesting in countries that killed many of my friends. I myself was shot down by a Russian SAM. Now, that may not bother my colleagues, but it did bother me that the President was protesting in Russia.

We need to get behind every one of our men and women. I do not care about my colleagues here, and I do not care about them over here, and I do not care about my Senate colleagues. I care about those kids we are asking to send in harm's way. And let me tell my colleagues why I am opposed to this.

First of all, a majority of the Russian military feel that they need to overthrow the Russian Government. These are the hard-liners that support Milosevic. Milosevic is terrible, but so is Tudjman and so is Izetbegovic. All three of them need to go. And I predict that within this year we are going to see a major coup in Russia because of what we are doing. If I was the head of North Korea, I would come tomorrow if we get tied in Kosovo. If I was Saddam Hussein, I would come tomorrow.

We are in 52 wars, Mr. Speaker, in this world. Some of them far more damaging than Kosovo. I am very, very concerned of what is going to happen over there as far as past foreign policy. I look at Somalia, to where the President changed the policy of humanitarian to going after Hadeed and then he drew down our forces, and after our military said we cannot do that because this makes us vulnerable. He did it anyway. And then they asked for armor because they could not get in. Seventeen hours, I watched it last night on television, that it took us to get to our troops; and we lost 22 rangers.

People ask me, ''What is it like to work with somebody you cannot trust?'' That is an important question. I do not trust this President to get us out of Kosovo. I do not trust him to get us out of Yugoslavia, no more than I expect him to get us out of Haiti, because we are still there spending $20 million a year building roads and bridges, which is coming out of defense.

So, yes, Mr. Speaker, I am dead set against this. But you also have my pledge to do everything I can to help the President to get our kids back.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, Yugoslav President Milosevic's continuous failure to embrace peace and his brutal actions against ethnic Albanians in Kosovo have precipitated today's military strikes. As our armed forces seek to bring a measure of justice to a troubled region, I want to join my colleagues in expressing strong support for the brave men and women of the U.S. military.

I am saddened that Mr. Milosevic rejected appeals for peace. We rightly consider the use of force only with the greatest reluctance. But our hand has been forced by his atrocities, mass murder of civilians and forcing whole communities from their homes. If left unchecked, he will continue his crimes in Kosovo.

Sadly, history has shown us what genocide looks like. Slaughtering ethnic Albanians, many of them defenseless citizens and civilians, forcing hundreds of thousands of Albanians to flee their homes as refugees, point to the grave humanitarian nature of the situation in Kosovo. Worse, Milosevic's aggression in Kosovo could jeopardize stability in the region by spreading to neighboring countries such as Macedonia or Albania. If the U.S. does not act now, the crisis in Kosovo will only grow worse.

The situation in Kosovo is serious and the challenges our troops face are great. I know that our armed forces are well-trained and that they will once again make us proud. Our prayers are with them and with their families as they work to counter aggression and to foster peace.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), a member of our Committee on International Relations.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution and I support our troops. And that is what this resolution is about. But a greater support for us would be to insist that before we send our troops into action, as they are today, that there be a reasonable and understood long-term game plan in place prior to sending these young people, our young defenders, off to fight so far from home and in a cause that has little to do with our national security.

□ 1815

Yes, we support our troops, but let us all together also send this message to the people of the world. We are not going to send our troops all over the world and garrison the rest of this planet for the stability of the rest of the world. Let Europeans, for example, provide the troops necessary for the stability that they need in their own backyard. Yes, there is a case that there is Serbian genocide that is taking place. The Serbs are committing genocide against these Kosovars as they did against the Bosnians in their attacks against the Slovenians and the Croatians under the dictatorship of Milosevic and it is intolerable. We recognize the Kosovars and their right for self-determination and independence. Yet we do not have the courage to lay the diplomatic foundation for a long-term solution before we order our troops into harm's way. Something is terribly wrong here. We should not be the policeman of the world. Our troops, they deserve to be applauded which we are doing, but we should not accede and tell the world that they have a blank check on the use of our troops to create their stability for them. Four years ago and $10 billion ago, we were told that sending our troops to Bosnia would be a 1-year operation and $2 billion in cost. They are still there. This vote tonight is done to applaud our troops, but it is not a blank check. It is a message of support for our troops.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER).

Mrs. TAUSCHER. I thank the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution that expresses our support for the troops in the Balkans. We have the finest fighting men and women in the world. Their spirit, commitment and dedication is unrivaled.

In December, I visited our troops keeping the peace in Bosnia and Macedonia. I was impressed by the work that they have done to help the people of Bosnia and Macedonia transition to a peaceful society and by the pride that they take in their work.

Our men and women in the military are now confronting another great challenge. They have again answered their country's call to service. At this time of great courage and sacrifice, our best thoughts and prayers are with them. The President made the right decision to initiate air strikes against Yugoslavia. Slobodan Milosevic has continually refused efforts to reach a peaceful settlement in Kosovo. It is now time to display the resolve of the international community.

Mr. Speaker, let us pass this resolution and show our sailors, soldiers, airmen and marines that they have the support and appreciation of a grateful Nation.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Jacksonville, FL (Mrs. FOWLER).

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, this is a sobering moment. American military pilots and air crews are now in harm's way. I had previously expressed my strong reservations about the President's plan to influence events in Serbia. Now, however, our troops are engaged in a military conflict. As always, they are performing their job with the utmost professionalism and dedication and it is incumbent upon us to demonstrate our fullest support for them. I join my colleagues in doing so here and am praying, as I know we all are, for their safe return.

I would hope that every Member of this House will work together to ensure that our military personnel in the Balkans have every resource they need to perform their assigned mission as effectively as possible and are able to return home soon. I hope we are successful in this effort and that Mr. Milosevic will soon sign a peace agreement.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this most timely and appropriate resolution.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank the ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. Our young men and women in the Armed Forces are carrying out their duties with courage and professionalism, and they deserve our praise and our complete support.

In my view, however, it is not enough to support our military in carrying out the mission given to them. I rise, as well, Mr. Speaker, to support the very mission itself. The mission is to save lives, to stabilize a region, to save lives that certainly would be lost if we again delayed taking this decisive action. The reports about what Serbian forces were doing in Kosovo in the last few days are clearly horrendous, the separation of men from women and children, the reported mass execution of the former and desperate flight of the latter.

The mission is also asserting U.S. leadership when Europe needs that leadership. Our allies are with us and they need us. Like it or not, Europe cannot and does not do it alone. It is in our national interest to avoid even the perception of a vacuum in our leadership capabilities. That could lead to challenges which we cannot foresee now, which we cannot predict, but clearly which would likely put our military men and women at even greater risk if allowed to happen.

Mr. Speaker, everyone says that we cannot be the world's policeman and I agree. But when there is a need for action and when that action can so clearly be effective and when the military can use its resources to minimize the risks involved, then we should act. Tyrants around the world cannot and must not have the false impression of knowing that we will not go after them because we cannot go after everyone. The fact that we could respond should give them pause.

Mr. Speaker, I have been one on this floor who in years past have said in Bosnia that we should have acted. In my opinion had we in Europe acted sooner, thousands, yes, tens of thousands of lives may have been saved.

I support the troops. I support the mission.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and a member of our committee.

Mr. LEACH. I thank my dear colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives considered several resolutions on the Balkans. This gentleman voted to oppose intervention. Last night, I explained my concerns relating to the lack of the end game as well as the lack of relevance in my judgment of use of air power in a part of the world which has heavily engaged for much of this century in guerilla warfare.

This resolution is poignantly appropriate because it respects and reflects respect for our troops. But it should be understood by this body that the difficulties that our troops are in are much greater today and will be much greater tomorrow than they were yesterday, not simply because engagement is active today but we are changing the nature of our involvement. This is a bench mark change. We have moved from a peacekeeping role to a peace-enforcing role. That means we have moved from the role of being part of a NATO force acting as a police function to part of a NATO force choosing sides in certain civil war types of setting.

This means that our troops will now become more targets than simply intermediaries. Therefore, it is extraordinarily important that all of us recognize that there is reason to reflect great respect for those troops that are being put in harm's way. But to the degree that foreign policy should be considered morality in action, we should also be clear to recognize that means have to be part of the goals. To the great credit of the President, the goals of the United States in this intervention are quite admirable. The question that remains, however, is whether the means to achieve those goals will escalate the conflict or cause diminution of circumstance.

Mr. Speaker, let me just conclude by saying that I think this evening it is very important that this Congress move forth with this kind of resolution, and I strongly endorse it. But I also think that it be very important that we recognize that a change in policy has occurred of stellar significance and that it is our obligation to continue to review and appraise policies as they develop and to commit ourselves to doing the best we can to advance approaches that deescalate rather than escalate conflict in the Balkans.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, tonight this House, Democrats and Republicans, unite in support of the men and women of our armed forces and those of our NATO allies who are now engaged in one of the most challenging and dangerous missions of recent times. The dangers of this action are indeed great. But the dangers of inaction are even greater. The decision to act was perhaps the most difficult foreign policy decision our President has confronted. The moral leadership in the free world that we have exhibited through the years is being indeed tested by President Milosevic. With thousands of people fleeing Kosovo and with thousands of lives hanging in the balance, the United States has chosen to stand up against aggression and genocide. Our action is consistent with our moral responsibility, it is consistent with our commitment to our NATO allies, and it is consistent with our efforts to secure the peace and stability of Europe where two world wars have begun.

May our prayers tonight be for the safety of our soldiers, our sailors and our airmen, and may God bless America.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee as well as our leadership for bringing a resolution to the floor that is one that I can support. It is supporting of the troops but it does not go that one step further to rubber-stamp a foreign policy that is very questionable, so I appreciate that very much.

But in another sense, I think it is awful strange that every time we do find our troops in harm's way that we need to come to the House floor to reassure ourselves that we support the troops. I have never been challenged, and I take controversial votes on occasion, and I have never seen another Member challenge anybody as being unpatriotic and not supportive of our troops. So it sort of bewilders me a little bit that we always have to say, ''We support the troops.'' I think that should go without saying.

Nevertheless, we do have this resolution on the floor, and I will support it. But I just wonder why that occurs, that we feel compelled to do so. I think sometimes it is because we have not met up to our responsibilities, because we have allowed our troops to be placed in harm's way, and usually in an improper manner. We have not done this properly according to the Constitution. The President did not get permission from the House and the Senate. We may have a little bit of a guilt feeling about having these troops placed in

harm's way without the proper permission, and, therefore, we have to reassure ourselves that we are taking care of the troops.

Now, if we really want to support our troops, I think we would defend the sovereignty of this country, we should provide for a strong national defense and we certainly should avoid putting our troops in harm's way. The real question that comes up is by putting the troops in this region right now, we are invading the sovereignty of a nation which is very questionable. This is not done very often. Yet Serbia is a sovereign nation. They are involved in a civil war, and there are bad guys on both sides. For us here in the Congress to decide who the good guys and who the bad guys are is not possible, nor is it our job.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am a man of peace, not of war. I am a believer in the philosophy and the discipline of nonviolence. I am a disciple of the teachings of Gandhi, Thoreau and Martin Luther King, Jr. But there comes a time when force and military might become necessary to put an end to madness. It was Gandhi who said, ''Noncooperation with evil is as much a moral obligation as is cooperation with good.'' Mr. Speaker, we cannot sit idly by while thousands of people are murdered in Kosovo.

Today, President Clinton took bold, forceful, and decisive action to stop the slaughter of innocents in Kosovo. We have a moral obligation, a mission and a mandate to prevent a modern day holocaust. I am hopeful that our military action will be swift and sudden, that it will be compelling, and that it will persuade the Serbs that peace is the more excellent path.

Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers today are with our men and women in uniform. May they return home to their friends and families safe, sound and secure in knowing that, through their actions, they have saved the lives of countless men, women and children.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), a member of our committee.

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

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to take long. To me it is very simple.

I absolutely support the members of the armed forces, I support our President, I support the mission. I do not think there is a single person around here who does not see this as one of the most difficult decisions we can make. But make it we must, and we may not be divided. We must not be divided.

Mr. Speaker, I support this particular House Resolution 130 wholeheartedly.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL).

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for this opportunity to say just a couple of words. As my colleagues know, it is tough when a leader has to lead, and I think we are in that position. We are the only superpower, and we got a lot of responsibility to go with it. None of us who have ever been in harm's way wants to see somebody in harm's way, but, as my colleagues know, some of them have had experiences, and I respect everybody that has had experiences in life; some of them I have had. But I had the opportunity to walk on the grounds of Dachau and Bergen-Belsen and so on and look at what took place there and before they became shrines and before they became memorials, and I said in my heart: This is so wrong. Pray Lord, it will never happen again.

So, Mr. Speaker, as I see what is going on over there these last many months, people talking to us about it, we do not really have a choice. If we are the Nation that I believe us to be, then we must stand up and do something even though as difficult as it may be.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support our troops, I support our President's decision, and I know it is hard, but I hope that they return safely and the mission is over soon.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and I would like to express in the strongest terms possible my sentiments of this resolution tonight in the House of Representatives, that it is a heartfelt, gut wrenching resolution from every Member of the House of Representatives to everyone in the world about the United States commitment to this effort now underway and that it is not an act of war, it is an act of peace, a gesture of justice, and we appeal to the leaders of the world that the United States is carrying out the commitment that we had at the end of World War II that this will never happen again. The seeds of despair, the crime of genocide, will be stopped.

This, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a gesture on our part to the parents, the wives, the children of the men and women in harm's way in this air strike. We, as Members of the House, come together to share their anguish. This resolution is a statement to Mr. Milosevic and people like him around the world that we are resolute in our relentless determination to end cruel injustice and genocide.

Mr. Speaker, we are here tonight to express in the strongest way possible that we, with the unity of the full House and this country, that our support for our troops and this mission is unequivocal.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the resolution, I support our armed forces, our brave men and women, and I support the President in his courageous decision.

This morning I showed a picture that I wanted to in advance and say it again. I apologize to my colleagues, the American people, if they are offended by this picture, but I think it has to be shown because this to me tells us why we are in Kosovo.

This is the picture of one of the victims, a dead Albanian child. Let me read for my colleagues what it says. It says his mother will never have to see him this way, they killed her too. Every night, while most of our children sleep in the comfort of a warm bed, Albanian homes in a place called Kosovo are being raided, and innocent people are being massacred, many of them children, all in the name of ethnic cleansing.

That is what is going on. That is why we, as leaders of the world, have to be in Kosovo, to stop genocide on the continent of Europe. That is why NATO has to be there, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which is concerned about North America and Europe, to stop genocide. It is in U.S. national interests to stop genocide and in the U.S. national interest to stop a wider war because, if we did nothing, surely the war would expand and possibly engulf NATO allies such as Turkey and Greece and Hungary and other countries such as Albania and Macedonia and Bulgaria.

So once again, as the leaders of the free world, we are doing the right thing.

Mr. Milosevic has broken every agreement that he has accepted. He signed an agreement in October, and he violated it. Thousands and thousands of people have been displaced from their homes. There are a quarter of a million refugees, 100,000 in the past 2 weeks alone. People are being slaughtered. Innocent civilians, unarmed civilians, men, women and children lined up and shot into a pit. This has to stop.

I am proud of our Armed Forces. Support the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, on March 11, as a freshman Member of this body, I witnessed one of the most profound debates on the issue as to whether or not we should allow the President to move ahead on his plan to attack Yugoslavia. I was on the losing side of that debate. I believed that the decision was wrong; I believe that it is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I am still convinced that the decision is a mistake, and I could not in good conscience say otherwise. Now, however, the trigger has

been pulled and we cannot put the bullet back into the chamber.

Our only course of action is to, in fact, pray for the safe return of our Armed Forces now engaged and pray also that we do not use this as a criteria for future involvement of a similar nature because I can assure my colleagues that if, in fact, everything I have heard tonight as to the reasons why we are here, why we are doing what we are doing in Yugoslavia, if that is what we are going to use for interaction, if that is what we are going to use as a reason to put our forces in harm's way, I have a list of countries about, oh, as long as my arm that I can get for my colleagues that fit everyone of those criteria, and I hope and pray that we do not go there.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the ranking member for yielding this time to me, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in strong support of the resolution. I speak as someone who has some grave doubts about the underlying policy but no doubt at all about my admiration and respect for the men and women in uniform who represent us so ably tonight. Our hearts and our prayers are with them, and our hearts are also with those who sit at home with their hearts in their throats waiting for the phone to ring with news about what has happened to their loved ones. It is our prayer that when that phone rings in houses and apartments all over America and around the world that the news will be good and the voice will be the voice of their father, or their mother, or their brother, or their sister, or their son and their daughter saying:

I am safe, I am well, and I am coming home soon.

Mr. Speaker, I would also hope that Members would do more than just come to the floor on days like this when we commend the efforts of our troops, but they would also come to the floor on days when we decide how much to pay our troops, come to the floor and support our efforts when we decide the quality of life for their families in bases around the world, would come to the floor and support the efforts that will give them the safest planes and the most accurate missiles and the most sure defense systems as well. Honoring our troops is not simply something we should do in times of grave national crisis; it is something that we should do every week and every day and every month with every dollar that we commit to their well-being and their safety.

I am pleased to join with colleagues from all around the country on both sides of the aisle in sending our prayer of support, but adding an admonition that we stand by our people not just tonight, but in the weeks and months to come.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support our troops. I support air and logistics support, not ground troops. And I believe we better be very careful before we commit ground troops into this region. Milosevic definitely must be challenged, and I would like to say to this body that there will not be a long-term solution of lasting peace without dealing with the issue of independence that was recommended to this body in 1986.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quote the intelligence report:

Without independence for Kosovo, there will be revolution and bloodshed, and that bloodshed will be American as well if it is allowed to escalate.

I support our troops; I am sure they will do a great job; and I support the efforts of our Congress in working with this issue and dealing with a tough technical subject.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for yielding the time and my friend from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for sharing his time with me.

Mr. Speaker, tens of thousands of Albanian Kosovars are trudging through the mud and the snow in a desperate trek to safety, and behind them the troops of Slobodan Milosevic are shelling their villages, are slaughtering their livestock and are setting their homes a flame. In burning the homes of innocent people in Kosovo, Milosevic is also igniting a much broader conflict. It is one that threatens to spread throughout the Balkans and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, that is why America and NATO allies are acting now to put a stop to this human catastrophe, to douse the flames of war before they spread and to demonstrate NATO's resolve for peace in Kosovo. Bombing the forces of Milosevic entails significant risk, but the risk of doing nothing is even greater. We learned that lesson in Bosnia where western inaction allowed things to generate into terrible atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, over the past year we have worked very hard to facilitate a just settlement for the people of Kosovo and Yugoslavia, but Milosevic has refused to compromise, he has ignored our overtures for peace, and he has broken his promises. Even as we speak, he intensifies his campaign of violence and intimidation and ethnic cleansing. Just since Friday his troops have forced 25,000 families, Albanian Kosovars, from their homes.

□ 1845

We have all seen the pictures, old people and children struggling down a dirt road clutching the few possessions that they carry. Some have not been so lucky. Many Albanian Kosovars have been executed by Serbian forces merely because of their ethnic heritage.

This slaughter cannot, must not continue. Our forces will strike hard and have struck hard to deter his aggression, eliminate his offensive military capabilities and show him decisively that the only sensible choice is the path to peace.

Mr. Speaker, twice this century and throughout the Cold War American soldiers have fought bravely to protect freedom and democracy in Europe. We gather in this chamber tonight to express our pride and our support for them as they engage in this important mission once again. Our prayers are with them as they risk their lives so that others might live in safety and in freedom.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today is a tragic day. It will undoubtedly be the beginning of a tragic scenario. I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) asked an interesting question. Why is it he said, that we repeatedly are up here on the House Floor under the compulsion to express our support for our men and women in the armed services? I think it probably has something to do with we have had too many military deployments recently which were based on very questionable premises, ill-informed, ineptly handled and for which there was no exit strategy, and here we are again facing the same kind of deployment problems.

In Kosovo we are trying to coerce a peace agreement between two sides which do not agree with the objectives of that peace agreement. As a result of the American and NATO air strike today, the Serbians are now going to be more supportive for Milosevic.

Now, certainly America's objectives in Kosovo are honorable and humane. There is no doubt about that, but I believe that contrary to what is expected, with this armed action against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia we are actually going to see a further destabilization in the Balkans. A fragile country, the Republic of Macedonia, or the Former Yugoslavian Republic of Macedonia, if you prefer, will be subjected to further destabilization. I also believe we are going to accelerate the kind of violence by Serbian forces in the next few days against the Albanian ethnics in Kosovo. That is almost inevitable.

Bombing will not do what we hope it will do. Bombing or air power never wins wars: it never settles things on the ground. It takes ground troops. So we will go through this air strike phase against missile sites and air defense systems, then we will accelerate the air attacks against strategic targets,

and, I predict, unfortunately that within 2 months, probably in a far shorter time than that, we will be involved with ground troops in Kosovo and there will be Americans among them.

We do need to support our troops, by all means, because they are now going to be there for a very long time as ground troops in a hostile environment. There is no exit strategy prepared or easily possible from this unhappy quagmire.

I also think we have to decide when it is indeed in our vital national interest to be involved in humanitarian efforts that we want to support. Why not in the civil and ethnic or racial conflicts in the Caucasus? Why not in Central Asia? Why not in Rwanda or Congo or Eritrea and Ethiopia? I ask those questions of my colleagues, but I do support the resolution and the men and women of our armed forces and I know we all do.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps my colleague for whom I have the greatest esteem I can answer most immediately, we do not have a NATO treaty with Rwanda. We do not have a NATO treaty with Eritrea and with Ethiopia.

I stand to support our military this evening. I stand to support them not only this evening but in their being ready in the future. For those of us that have stood here and asked for deployment, we have a responsibility to put our money where our mouth is.

All of us pray for the safe return of our troops. These brave Americans are keeping our commitment to our allies in NATO. They are discharging a great humanitarian purpose.

A week ago, I saw a report on television where a 12-year-old boy had the responsibility of taking care of six of his siblings because his mother and father had been slaughtered. Our troops tonight are standing with those children to give them a chance for freedom. The commander in chief of this country is standing with those children this evening and our 18 allies in NATO are standing with them, too. Support our troops.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House.

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

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to answer my distinguished friend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS). We have no NATO agreement with Kosovo, with Yugoslavia or Macedonia either.

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, certainly tonight is a grave time for this country. It is a time that any time our armed services, our young men and women, confront an enemy in service of this country is a time that we must focus on and we must pray for their strength and safety, and we are there.

We can debate the reasons why we are there and we can talk about if it is good or it is not good. We can talk about the problems that we have seen in that area, namely Kosovo, but we are there. I would like to take this opportunity to offer my personal appreciation and strong support for our men and women. They are in the skies over Kosovo and Serbia as we speak. They are risking their lives for certainly the ideal of democracy and safety and decency, and our hearts and our prayers certainly go with them.

We know how dangerous their mission is, and we strongly urge all Members to give their whole-hearted support to this resolution.

I would like to commend those brave young men and women for their selfless sense of honor and duty to their country. Each is a modern hero, an example of why America is truly a great Nation, and we wish them godspeed in their mission and certainly a safe return. The hearts of all Americans, and prayers, are with them.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support for our brave men and women of our armed forces which are now involved in the military operations against Serbian military targets in the former Yugoslavia.

The military action we have undertaken has three objectives: First, to demonstrate the seriousness of NATO's opposition to aggression and its support for peace.

Second, to deter President Milosevic from continuing and escalating his attacks on helpless civilians by seriously punishing such actions.

Thirdly, to damage Serbia's capacity to wage war against Kosova in the future by diminishing its future capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, as we have seen numerous times in the past, the only language that Mr. Milosevic understands is that of force. Therefore, I believe it is imperative that he be assured of our firm resolve to continue military action until Serbian forces halt their campaign of murder and repression and comply with the demands of the international community.

Mr. Speaker, I believe military intervention is the right course of action and we must remember that these actions carry with them considerable risk. And so we must remember those young men and women of our armed forces and pray for their safe and speedy return.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution supporting our armed forces engaged today in military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Like my colleagues, my thoughts and prayers are with these men and women for their safe and swift return.

However, I am very distressed that again Congress was not consulted until the bombers were virtually on their way. Today's action reinforces the continued circumvention of the War Powers Act. Although I deplore the genocide and ethnic cleansing that is being waged by the Serbs against ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, I am very concerned that we are being drawn into a situation that will require ground troops.

The situation in Bosnia has continued for many years and while things may have improved there, no exit strategy is in sight. This action in regards to Kosovo appears to be headed in exactly the same direction and with much higher risks. It is imperative that congressional approval be sought by the administration before this action escalates.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, like everyone in this House tonight I rise in support of this resolution and join in offering my thoughts and prayers to the young men and women in American uniform and to all those military personnel from the other 18 NATO nations who are committed to restoring the peace in Kosovo.

Once again, they are called upon to carry out a dangerous military mission to bring peace and stability to Europe. I believe this is the right policy at the right time and for the right reason.

The people of Kosovo are good and decent people who do not deserve to be murdered and forced from their homes by Milosevic's army. I am proud of our men and women in the military who will carry out their duties professionally, honorably and courageously. May they all return home to their families safely.

If we have learned anything from the 2nd World War, it is that the United States of America cannot stand idly by while atrocities and genocidal practices are being committed against defenseless civilians.

The action taken today is not unilateral. All 19 members of NATO agreed that the time has come to stop Milosevic's campaign of terror in Kosovo in order to prevent further tragedy and to stabilize the greater Balkan region.

In this matter, the danger of inaction far outweighs the risk of action. If we can learn any lesson from both World War I and World War II, it is that the U.S. can and must take a leadership role to stop tyranny and atrocities that threaten innocent people and the free world.

But ultimately, it is not NATO that is acting today, but individual men and women in the uniforms of the United States Armed Forces, as well those of our allies. These soldiers sailors and airmen are in harm's way, and we must support them to the fullest.

We should not delude ourselves in thinking that air strikes and other military actions in the Balkans will be as safe as the actions we have taken recently in Iraq. The situation in Kosovo is far more complex, and our actions there may result in casualties and even loss of life.

Let us hope the military action is successful and those men and women can return home soon.

Mr. LATOURETTE. The Chair announces that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE) has 1 minute remaining and the right to close. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) has 4½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) has 1 minute remaining.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and a member of our committee.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, some years ago we had a Member of Congress named Ben Blaz. He was from Guam, and he was a military man. He was a general in the Marine Corps, and he told me, he said, there is nothing worse for an infantryman to be climbing up a hill and look back over his shoulder and seeing that nobody is there.

Well, we want to tell our fighting forces in Kosovo and in Yugoslavia tonight that we are there. We are constantly reminded of the heavy, heavy price that freedom extracts from us. The brave men and women that are willing to risk their lives in a far away land to resist genocide are living proof that patriotism and valor are still the defining characteristics of our fighting people.

The finest speech I have ever heard in 25 years in Congress was delivered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) last week over there on this issue. He reminded us that when the Holocaust occurred we all said never again, never again.

Well, again is happening right now. It is happening in Kosovo, where thousands of people are massacred and other thousands of people, elderly and infants, are roaming the snowy mountains because they have been dispossessed. It is happening again.

I do not know how we turn our back on that and walk away if it is within our power to stabilize the situation and stop the killing.

So that is what this is about. We can debate the policy again and again and again, but we are there and the genocide is there and we do have a national interest in halting the killing. We have a human interest in halting the killing. So I want to express my pride, I want to express my prayers for the fighting men and women who are in the front lines paying the price, halting the genocide and doing the Lord's work.

□ 1900

I am proud of our military. Diplomats are fine, lawyers are great, but in the last analysis, it is the soldier that pays for freedom, and we ought to be thanking God on our knees that we have such men.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) for his very excellent words in support of this resolution.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the final minute of my time.

This clearly is a good resolution that deserves all of our support, Mr. Speaker. We all support our fighting forces at this time of their need. This military action is the right thing to do for at least three reasons:

First, we need to stop this brutal dictator, Milosevic, from plunging Europe into an even deeper cycle of unrest and instability and violence; secondly, we need to prevent a humanitarian crisis from deepening, affecting the innocent civilians in Kosovo; and thirdly, we need to act to support our national credibility and NATO's credibility in this measure.

We all support the resolution, compliment our fighting men and women, and wish them God speed.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are here discussing a resolution to commend the American military forces. This is as it should be. We have also discussed and heard words explaining why we are leading the NATO forces in doing what we are doing, for humanitarian purposes, for purposes of keeping NATO strong, for purposes of keeping the Balkans from erupting onto a wider war or conflict.

Let us talk about the troops for a minute. Let us talk about those young men and those young women who day in and day out wear the uniform of our country. Let us think of them not just tonight, let us think of them at other times, not just our committee but all of us, regardless of the committee on which we serve.

They are the cream of the crop. They are the seed corn of the future of American democracy, the young men, young women who raise their right hand and swear to uphold the Constitution and do their duty. That is the bottom line of young America. I am so proud of them.

Here they are being called upon to fulfill a very dangerous mission, yes. They are those in the air forces of our country, the Air Force, Marines, Navy. But I am sure that all men and women in the military are in our thoughts and prayers tonight.

As fewer and fewer people wear the uniform, fewer and fewer sons and daughters and grandsons and nephews and nieces, there seems to be a growing gap between American civilians and between those who defend our freedoms.

Let us not just think of those in our United States forces this evening, let us think of them at other times. Let us think of them at the times we debate the budget, when we discuss what we should do for their pay, for their barracks, for their families, for their housing, for their housing allowances. We want to do better for them than we have in the past.

In a democracy, it is often difficult to show appreciation for those in the military. Rudyard Kipling, the poet laureate of Great Britain many years ago, penned a poem entitled ''Tommy,'' reflecting the fact that the soldier, the Redcoat, was out of sight, out of mind, until there was trouble at hand.

He penned and wrote, ''It is Tommy this and Tommy that, and throw him out, the brute, but it is 'Savior of our country' when the guns begin to shoot.''

Let us keep the young people of our forces, whether they be in Fort Leonard Wood, Whiteman Air Force Base, any post or base throughout this world, in our thoughts, in our minds, in our prayers, and in our votes on this floor when it comes to supporting them, not just tonight by this vote, but by votes and debate and help in the days ahead.

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

Mr. Speaker, the mission of our Committee on Armed Services is to properly provide for our military people. The chairman of our Subcommittee on Military Procurement is the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER).

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, in a couple of minutes we are going to tell these wonderful people who protect America, our uniformed service personnel, how much we respect them. We are going to tell them that with this vote. But in the next several weeks, we are going to have a chance to show them how much we support them and how much we respect them.

I hope every Member here will vote to close that 13½ percent pay gap that exists between them and the private sector, and help to get those 10,000 service personnel off food stamps. I hope every Member here will vote for a defense budget and for supplemental budgets to pay for that $1.7 billion worth of ammo that we are short in the Army, and to pay for the equipment that our personnel need, and to pay for

some of the spare parts we need to get those planes off the ground that right now are grounded.

These are our finest citizens, and I hope in the next several weeks we are going to show that and demonstrate that in the best way we know how. That is when we vote to support them.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am troubled by events taking place far away in the Balkans today. The brutal aggression and ''ethnic cleansing'' that have been long perpetrated by Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic must come to an end. Today, the military forces of NATO, led by the United States, struck at the heart and means of this miscreant aggression.

Too many lives in past conflicts have been lost because of inaction. Imagine how different the world might have been had the world stood up sooner to an Adolf Hitler or a Heideiki Tojo. We are once again at one of those historical crossroads. It is necessary and proper that the United States and our NATO Allies force the hand of Milosevic toward the end of just governance and human decency. The Serbian military's brutality in the name of a 610-year-old vindication is childish and historically indefensible. Today, with God's help, we aim to set things right.

In bi-partisan fashion, I stand in strong support of our President's decision and applaud his courage. I stand in strong support to our brave troops, our gallant allies and all their faithful families as we begin to embark on this endeavor to stop the senseless violence. Let's hope that President Milosevic will get the message and return to the table of peace.

Mr. ORITZ. I rise today in support of the resolution before us, in support of our young men and women in uniform serving in the European theater, and in support of NATO's decision to use force to try and change dictator Slobodan Milosevic's mind about continuing his holocaust in Kosovo.

As the Ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Readiness Committee, I have been in the Bosnia/Southeastern European theater several times over the past few months and have spent significant time talking to our troops over there.

In Bosnia, when we sent troops to keep the peace there, we were not quite sure how that would turn out, but we knew that doing nothing was unacceptable. The soldiers I have talked to in Bosnia have told me that they know their mission is successful because the fighting has stopped and they now see children playing in the street.

The United States has a large responsibility in this world. The lessons of WWII taught us that unchecked aggression and man's inhumanity to others will not simply stop. Someone must step in to stop them. That is one of the fundamental reasons NATO was created, to stop unchecked aggression by dictators.

Generally, people across the country cannot find Kosovo on a map and do not yet understand why slaughter after slaughter in a place far, far away can invoke the military might of the United States. That is unfortunate. The truth of the matter is that the effects of this unchecked aggression have already begun to spill over the borders of Kosovo and Bosnia into Italy, Hungary, Greece and Turkey. These are NATO allies and we have a responsibility to them.

Our troops are presently engaged in a hostile action, and the House of Representatives, and the entire Congress, owes them our respect and our support.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the NATO Air strikes aimed at preventing any further loss of lives in the embattled Serbian province of Kosovo. It is clear that all reasonable diplomatic avenues had been exhausted and military action was inevitable. The United States and NATO have an obligation to uphold the basic standards of human rights and hold Serbia and its leadership to the October 1998 agreement which they made and which they have blatantly disregarded. Furthermore, seizing upon the withdrawal of the OSCE monitors as an opportunity to unleash another round of assaults on the civilian population of the Kosovo region is unacceptable.

Leaders of the ethnic Albanian majority Kosovars will settle for autonomy today, but plainly want complete independence for their region. The Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic continues to adamantly stand opposed today to Kosovo's pleas, even autonomy for Kosovo, which he rejected after years of such status in the late 1980's. Serbia's Milosevic's ethnic cleansing crusade has claimed the lives of thousands of innocent civilians since the renewed military action in 1998. This Serbian aggression can not be overlooked. The actions carried out by the Milosevic regime certainly has the potential to undermine the Bosnian Peace Accords and spill over into neighboring countries, such as Macedonia, Albania, Turkey and Greece. I will remind my colleagues that this small trouble spot on the map in Eastern Europe was the spark for past World Wars.

After months of peace talks and violations of cease-fire agreements, Milosevic continues to launch attacks and mass genocide against the Kosovars in Serbia. As a result, by October 1998, up to 275,000 civilians had fled their homes. Some have immigrated to the Yugoslav republic of Montenegro; others crossed the border into Albania or Macedonia, but most stayed in Kosovo and have been subject to genocide by Milosevic's Serb troops. The latest outbreak of fighting has created a new refugee crisis, with about 60,000 people a new fleeing their homes in the last couple of weeks.

Ironically, as the integration of Central Europe into NATO occurs, the United States can not sit back and allow this type of conduct. This flies into the fact of NATO's agreements and purpose. Such events, if unaddressed, will seriously undermine NATO's credibility and role within Europe. Mass genocide must not be tolerated. For moral reasons independent of our pre announced alliances much less in the face of it. NATO was not formed and maintained for parade purposes. When it is necessary and needed member nations must act to fulfill its mission. The irony of this crisis is two-fold. Nobody likes to send anyone into a situation with the possible loss of their lives. But right now innocent lives such as the elderly, women and children are being lost at the hands of Slobodan Milosevic's Serbian forces.

I support our troops and this justified and necessary mission in attempt to end the genocide and protect the basic human rights for the Kosovars and Serbian compliance with the basic cease fire agreements that they have pledged to agree to in October of 1998.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, last week, I voted against the resolution authorizing the deployment of United States military troops to Kosovo. Although the House ultimately approved the resolution, my concern that we are entering into this operation without a well-defined mission, and, more importantly, a strategy to remove our troops remains.

Despite the many different opinions on this situation, it is now time for every American to stand unified behind our men and women in uniform.

We must not, however, yield to the emotion of the moment. To protect our sons and daughters it is vital that the President, and the Congress, together, continue to act prudently to not only preserve the lives of innocent Kosovars but our young men and women abroad.

I only ask that we, as one nation, offer our thoughts and prayers for the families, and the safe return of these brave young Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie	Burr	Dickey
Ackerman	Burton	Dicks
Aderholt	Buyer	Dingell
Allen	Callahan	Dixon
Andrews	Camp	Doggett
Archer	Campbell	Dooley
Armey	Canady	Doolittle
Bachus	Cannon	Doyle
Baird	Capps	Dreier
Baker	Capuano	Duncan
Baldacci	Cardin	Dunn
Baldwin	Carson	Edwards
Ballenger	Castle	Ehlers
Barcia	Chabot	Ehrlich
Barr	Chambliss	Emerson
Barrett (NE)	Chenoweth	Engel
Barrett (WI)	Clay	Eshoo
Bartlett	Clayton	Etheridge
Barton	Clement	Evans
Bass	Clyburn	Everett
Bateman	Coble	Ewing
Becerra	Coburn	Farr
Bentsen	Collins	Fattah
Bereuter	Combest	Filner
Berkley	Condit	Fletcher
Berman	Conyers	Foley
Berry	Cook	Forbes
Biggert	Cooksey	Ford
Bilbray	Costello	Fossella
Bilirakis	Cox	Fowler
Bishop	Coyne	Frank (MA)
Blagojevich	Cramer	Franks (NJ)
Bliley	Crane	Frost
Blumenauer	Crowley	Gallegly
Blunt	Cubin	Ganske
Boehlert	Cummings	Gejdenson
Boehner	Cunningham	Gekas
Bonilla	Danner	Gephardt
Bonior	Davis (FL)	Gibbons
Bono	Davis (IL)	Gilchrest
Borski	Davis (VA)	Gillmor
Boswell	Deal	Gilman
Boucher	DeFazio	Gonzalez
Boyd	DeGette	Goode
Brady (PA)	Delahunt	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Goodling
Brown (CA)	DeLay	Gordon
Brown (FL)	DeMint	Goss
Brown (OH)	Deutsch	Graham
Bryant	Diaz-Balart	Granger

Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Lee

NOT VOTING—9

Calvert
English
Frelinghuysen
Myrick
Nussle
Pickering
Slaughter
Stupak
Weller

□ 1924

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 71, I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the following rollcall vote: Rollcall vote No. 71, H. Res. 130. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 130, the resolution just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1150

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1150.

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

There was no objection.

INTERIM FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 643) to authorize the Airport Improvement Program for 2 months, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) briefly to explain the bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple extension. We are taking the Senate's bill to extend the Airport Improvement Program for 2 months so that we can then deal with the major legislation in April or May. That is all this is.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation.

On March 31, 1999, funding for the FAA Airport Improvement Program will be cut off. Last year, we attempted to pass a comprehensive long-term bill that would have extended AIP and FAA funding.

However, due to a breakdown in conference negotiations, only a short-term 6-month extension for the AIP was passed as part of the Omnibus appropriations bill.

In February of this year, the House passed H.R. 99, a six-month bill to extend AIP and fund FAA's operations and facilities and equipment programs through the end of FY 99.

H.R. 99 was passed so that AIP funding would not run out while we attempted to pass our long-term aviation reauthorization bill, AIR–21.

H.R. 99 was passed out of the House and sent to the Senate on February 3, two months prior to the expiration of AIP funding on March 31st.

In the shadow of this imminent deadline, last week the Senate passed a two-month extension bill that would fund AIP only through May 31st of this year.

The Senate bill also includes technical changes for the Military Airport Program and the small airport fund within AIP to allow them to work under the limited extension.

In addition, the Senate bill extends the War risk Insurance program for two additional months. Its funding is also set to expire on March 31st. This is an important issue, especially in light of current events.

The House passed H.R. 98 in February, which extended the War Risk Insurance Program through 2004. If the Senate should pass H.R. 98, it is our intention that that bill extension for 5 years should take precedence over this two-month provision.

Finally, the Senate bill allows the FAA to consider a PFC application from Metropolitan Washington Airport Authority up to a limit of $30 million. Under current law, FAA is not allowed to consider a PFC application from MWAA.

Although this bill only extends the programs for two months instead of the House-passed six month bill, it is important that this bill pass so that funding for AIP does not lapse.

I urge you all to support this bill so that this short term measure is in place and funding for your local airports will remain in effect while we attempt to pass a long-term FAA reauthorization bill.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the other body did not act as responsibly and as promptly as this committee and this body did, but I do support this 2-month extension.

Further reserving the right to object, I want to observe with sadness the death of a good friend to airports, to this committee, and to the Congress, Ellis Ohnstad, the long-time employee of the FAA Airports Office, a constant source of good humor and solid information and support for our committee. We will miss him dearly.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support passage of S. 643. S. 643 provides for a 2-month extension of the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) and authorization for other Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) programs through the end of the fiscal year 1999.

In February, the House passed H.R. 99 which extended the AIP until the end of fiscal year 1999. The other body was unwilling to agree to a 6-month extension and sent to the House a 2-month extension. The House approach is still the preferable one, but with AIP due to lapse on March 31, a 2-month extension is better than letting the program expire.

It is disturbing to me that the other body continues to play political games with AIP. AIP funds critical safety, security, and capacity projects at airports throughout this country. The stop-go-stop approach taken by the other body to this issue has caused administrative inefficiencies at the FAA and, more importantly, doubt for airports in moving forward on projects. I am particularly concerned about northern states where the lack of commitment to a full-year program threatens the construction season.

It is my hope that another extension will not be needed since the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee on March 18th passed H.R. 1000, the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century, known as AIR–21. With leadership support and assistance, we should be able to move this bill forward for floor consideration shortly.

H.R. 1000 meets four pressing challenges facing the aviation system: Capacity at our nation's airports; accelerating the modernization of the air traffic control system; promoting competition in the airline industry; and increasing safety in the aviation system.

We have tremendous needs especially in the airport system: renovating existing runways and taxiways; helping communities cope with noise problems; increasing capacity through projects like San Francisco's $1 billion runway project; and meeting airport requirements so the smaller airports can take advantage of technological breakthroughs like GPS/WAAS. AIR–21 meets these airport and other challenges and I look forward to working with Members of the House on its passage.

In the short-term, this extension is needed and I ask all Members to support S. 643.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 643

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Interim Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AIRPORT IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 48103 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking from ''$1,205,000,000'' through the period and inserting ''$1,607,000,000 for the 8-month period beginning October 1, 1998.''.

(b) OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY.—Section 47104(c) of such title is amended by striking ''March'' and inserting ''May''.

(c) LIQUIDATION-OF-CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION.—The Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999 is amended by striking the last proviso under the heading ''Grants-in-Aid for Airports, (Liquidation of Contract Authorization), (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)'' and inserting ''*Provided further,* That not more than $1,300,000,000 of funds limited under this heading may be obligated before the enactment of a law extending contract authorization for the Grants-in-Aid for Airports Program beyond May 31, 1999.''.

SEC. 3. AIRWAY FACILITIES IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM.

Section 48101(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

''(3) $2,131,000,000 for fiscal year 1999.''.

SEC. 4. FAA OPERATIONS.

Section 106(k) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking from ''$5,158,000,000'' through the period and inserting ''$5,632,000,000 for fiscal year 1999.''.

SEC. 5. REMOVAL OF THE CAP ON DISCRETIONARY FUND.

Section 47115(g) is amended by striking paragraph (4).

SEC. 6. EXTENSION OF AVIATION INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 44310 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''March'' and inserting ''May''.

SEC. 7. MILITARY AIRPORT PROGRAM.

Section 124 of the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996 is amended by striking subsection (d).

SEC. 8. DISCRETIONARY FUND DEFINITION.

(a) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 47115.—Section 47115 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking ''25'' in subsection (a) and inserting ''12.5''; and

(2) by striking the second sentence in subsection (b).

(b) AMENDMENT OF SECTION 47116.—Section 47116 of such title is amended—

(1) by striking ''75'' in subsection (a) and inserting ''87.5'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) in subsection (b) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and inserting before subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, the following:

''(1) one-seventh for grants for projects at small hub airports (as defined in section 41731 of this title); and

''(2) the remaining amounts based on the following:''.

SEC. 9. RELEASE OF 10 PERCENT OF MWAA FUNDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding sections 49106(c)(6)(C) and 49108 of title 49, United States Code, the Secretary of Transportation may approve an application of the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (an application that is pending at the Department of Transportation on March 17, 1999) for expenditure or obligation of up to $30,000,000 of the amount that otherwise would have been available to the Authority for passenger facility fee/airport development project grants under subchapter I of chapter 471 of such title.

(b) LIMITATION.—The Authority may not execute contracts, for applications approved under subsection (a), that obligate or expend amounts totalling more than the amount for which the Secretary may approve applications under that subsection, except to the extent that funding for amounts in excess of that amount are from other authority or sources.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1930

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 643.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 37

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JOHN PORTER) from House Joint Resolution 37, the Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment.

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

There was no objection.

EXTENDING SELECT COMMITTEE ON U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY AND MILITARY/COMMERCIAL CONCERNS WITH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 129) extending the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns With the People's Republic of China, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 129

Resolved,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

Section 2(f)(1) of House Resolution 5, One Hundred Sixth Congress, agreed to January 6, 1999, is amended by striking ''April 1, 1999'' and inserting ''April 30, 1999 (or, if earlier, the date on which the Select Committee completes its activities)''.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

MRS. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my special order up at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

OUT OF THE MOUTHS OF BABES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. ROUKEMA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of our colleagues and our people in the country to the outstanding anti-smoking program that the faculty at the Byrd Elementary School in Glen Rock, New Jersey, is providing for their students in cooperation with the New Jersey Breathes organization.

The highlight of the program was a school-wide assembly that I had the privilege of attending on Monday, March 22d, and during that assembly a 5th grade student, Katherine Sommer, was honored as the winner of a composition contest conducted as part of the anti-smoking effort.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read this winning essay so that my colleagues, their children and their grandchildren can benefit from the direct and lucid way that Katherine Sommer expressed her wisdom on the issue of smoking and young people. My reaction was, ''out of the mouths of babes''.

Here is her essay. It was entitled ''Don't Smoke''. Katherine Sommer began this way:

> Things can happen. Some things can't be helped. Some things can. Some people die of old age, heart attacks, and many other things, but a lot of people die a long, horrible death. They die of smoking. It could happen to you if you make one bad decision. Think of it this way. If you choose to smoke, you will be doing something really stupid. You could get very sick or even die. That wouldn't be worth it, would it? The worst part is it would be all your own fault!

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my colleagues that Katherine Sommer was speaking to her classmates.

> Some teenagers and young children start smoking for some really silly reasons. Some kids may want to join a popular group at school, and think smoking will make them look older. Some girls think smoking will make them look cool and boys will like them even more. What they do not know is if what happened on the inside of your body happened on the outside, you would look really ugly.
>
> If you think that most kids smoke, you're wrong. The average kid doesn't smoke. And if you're anywhere near average, you won't either. You could really hurt yourself. You could get lung cancer, throat cancer, gum cancer or lip cancer. These are only some of the horrible diseases that you can get from smoking. And think, you could die just from trying to be cool.
>
> Another reason you may start smoking is that a family member or really good friend may already smoke. You might think that it's harmless. You may think, I'll try one smoke, and if I don't like it I won't have any more. Well, it's not that easy. Smoking is addictive. That means that once you start something, you can't stop. Once you try it, it could be too late.
>
> I do not intend to smoke. You shouldn't either. Don't let anything interfere with your dreams. Just don't try smoking. It's not healthy.

That was Katherine Sommer, 5th grade, winning essay in Glen Rock, New Jersey. Again I want to say to my colleagues, out of the mouths of babes, a message for the ages.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUMENAUER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ENGLISH addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FILNER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SESSIONS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GOVERNMENT PENSION OFFSET REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JEFFERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to provide this statement regarding the Government Pension Offset Reform legislation that I introduced today.

Pension offset reform is an important issue to me. It is an important issue for my constituents in Louisiana and it is an important issue for many State and local government employees across the Nation.

As many of my colleagues are aware, State and local government employees were excluded from Social Security coverage when the Social Security system was first established in 1935. These employees were later given the option to enroll in the Social Security System, and in the 1960s and the 1970s many public employees opted to join in.

Some local governments chose to remain out of the system. Their employees and spouses planned for their retirement according to the rules in effect. It is estimated that about 4.9 million State and local government employees are not covered by Social Security. Seven States, California, Colorado, Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Ohio and Texas, account for over 75 percent of the noncovered payroll.

Many of the State and local government employees that are covered by government pensions are or will be unfairly affected by the pension offset. As Members may be aware, the pension offset was originally enacted in response to the perceived abuses to the Social Security system resulting from the Goldfarb decision.

The Social Security system provides that if a spouse who worked and paid into the Social Security system died, the benefits were to be paid to the surviving spouse as a survivor benefit. Men were required to prove dependency on their spouses before they became eligible for Social Security benefits. There was no such requirement for women.

The Goldfarb decision eliminated the different treatment of men and women. The Court instead required Social Security to treat men and women equally by paying benefits to either spouse without regard to dependency.

Many of the men who would benefit from the Goldfarb decision were also receiving large government pensions. It was believed that these retirees would bankrupt the system, receiving large government and private pensions in addition to survivor benefits.

To combat this perceived problem, pension offset legislation was enacted in 1977. The legislation provided for a dollar-for-dollar reduction of Social Security benefits to spouses or retiring spouses who received earned benefits from a Federal, State or local retirement system. The pension offset provisions can affect any retiree who receives a civil service pension and Social Security, but primarily affects widows or widowers eligible for survivor benefits.

In 1983, the pension offset was reduced to two-thirds of the public employer survivor benefit. It was believed that one-third of the pension was equivalent to the pension available in the private sector.

The pension offset, aimed at high-paid government employees, also applies to public service employees who

generally receive lower pension benefits. These public service employees include secretaries, school cafeteria workers, teachers' aids, and others who receive low wages as government employees. The pension offset as applied to this group is punitive, unfairly harsh and bad policy.

Government pensions were tailored to reduce benefits that were equal to many combined private pension-Social Security policies in the private sector for upper level government workers. However, this was not true for lower income workers, such as employees who work as secretaries, school cafeteria workers, teachers' aids, and others who generally receive lower pension benefits.

To illustrate the harsh impact of the pension offset, consider a widow who retired from the Federal Government and receives a civil service annuity of $550 monthly. The full widow's benefit is $385. The current pension offset law reduces the widow's benefit to $19 a month. Two-thirds of the $550 civil service annuity is $367, which is then subtracted from the $385 widow's benefit, leaving only $19. The retired worker receives $569, $550 plus $19, per month.

Proponents of the pension offset claim that the offset is justified because survivor benefits were intended to be in lieu of pensions. However, were this logic followed across the board, then people with private pension benefits would be subject to the offset as well. But this is not the case.

While Social Security benefits of spouses or surviving spouses earning government pensions are reduced by $2 for every $3 earned, Social Security benefits of spouses and surviving spouses earning private pensions are not subject to the offset at all. If retirees on private pensions do not have Social Security benefits subject to offset, why should retirees who work in the public service system?

Mr. Speaker, the pension offset has created a problem that cries out for reform. It will cause tens of thousands of retired government employees, including many former paraprofessionals, custodians or lunch room workers, to live their retirement years at or near the poverty level.

My office has received numerous calls, all from widows who are just getting by and desperately need some relief from the pension offset. During the 105th Congress I introduced the Government Pension Offset Repeal bill, H.R. 273. Thanks to the grassroots support for it, it received 183 votes. Today we introduced this bill with 119 cosponsors already, and I look forward with my colleagues to gaining passage of this important reform legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BOEHLERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

U.S. MILITARY ACTION TAKING PLACE IN SERBIA IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, U.S. military forces are now bombing a foreign nation halfway around the world. This cannot be a proud moment for America. The reason given for doing so is that Serbian leaders have not done what we have told them to do.

Serbia has not invaded another country but is involved in a nasty civil war, with both sides contributing to the violence. There is no American security interest involved in Serbia. Serbia has not threatened us nor used any force against any American citizen.

□ 1945

As bad as the violence is toward the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, our ability to police and stop all ethnic fighting around the world is quite limited and the efforts are not permitted under constitutional law. We do not even pretend to solve the problems of sub-Saharan Africa, Tibet, East Timor, Kurdistan, and many other places around the world where endless tragic circumstances prevail.

Our responsibility as U.S. Members of Congress is to preserve liberty here at home and uphold the rule of law. Meddling in the internal and dangerous affairs of a nation involved in civil war is illegal and dangerous. Congress has not given the President authority to wage war.

The House resolution regarding Kosovo was narrowly, reluctantly, and conditionally passed. It was a nonbinding resolution and had no effect of law. Even if it did, the resolution dealt with sending troops as a peacekeeping force to Kosovo only if a peace agreement was signed. There was no mention of endorsing an act of war against Serbia. Besides, the resolution was not the proper procedure for granting war powers to a president.

The Senate resolution, now claimed to be congressional consent for the President to wage war, is not much better. It, too, was a sense of Congress resolution without the force of law. It implies the President can defer to NATO for authority to pursue a war effort.

Only Congress can decide the issue of war. Congress cannot transfer the constitutional war power to the President or to NATO or to the United Nations. The Senate resolution, however, specifically limits the use of force to air operations and missile strikes, but no war has ever been won with air power alone. The Milosevic problem will actually get worse with our attacks, and ground troops will likely follow.

It has been argued we are needed to stop the spread of war throughout the Balkans. Our presence will do the opposite, but it will certainly help the military-industrial complex. Peaceful and cooperative relations with Russia, a desired goal, has now ended; and we have provoked the Russians into now becoming a much more active ally of Serbia.

U.S. and NATO policy against Serbia will certainly encourage the Kurds. Every argument for Kosovo's independence can be used by the Kurds for their long-sought-after independence. This surely will drive the Turks away from NATO.

Our determination to be involved in the dangerous civil war may well prompt a stronger Greek alliance with their friends in Serbia, further splitting NATO and offending the Turks, who are naturally inclined to be sympathetic to the Albanian Muslims. No good can come of our involvement in this Serbian civil war, no matter how glowing and humanitarian the terms used by our leaders.

Sympathy and compassion for the suffering and voluntary support for the oppressed is commendable. The use of force and acts of war to pick and choose between two sides fighting for hundreds of years cannot achieve peace. It can only spread the misery and suffering, weaken our defenses and undermine our national sovereignty.

Only when those who champion our war effort in Serbia are willing to volunteer for the front lines and offer their own lives for the cause will they gain credibility. Promoters of war never personalize it. It is always some other person or some other parent's child's life who will be sacrificed, not their own.

With new talk of reinstituting the military draft since many disillusioned military personnel are disgusted with the morale of our armed forces, all Americans should pay close attention as our leaders foolishly and carelessly rush our troops into a no-win war of which we should have no part.

TRIBUTE TO DOROTHY IRENE HEIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, in light of this being Women's History Month, the Congresswoman from California (Ms. LEE) will be on the floor later this evening on a special order on women of color.

Because of a prior commitment, I will not be here at that time. But I would like to use a few minutes to offer a few words concerning a great woman of color of this century, Dorothy Irene Height, President and CEO Emeritus of the National Council of Negro Women.

Dorothy Height has spent half a century of ground-breaking service to her country to African American women. She is one of the great civil rights and women's rights leaders of our time. And I emphasize both of those great missions in speaking about Dr. Height.

Today is Dr. Dorothy Irene Height's 87th birthday. Mentored by her predecessor, the great Mary McLeod Bethune, Dorothy Height has spent a lifetime mentoring black women.

Today was no leisure day for Dorothy Height. As the day began, she was here in this House protesting the majority's census proposal that knowingly undercounts children and people of color. Dorothy Height has spent a lifetime keeping on top of issues of the day like the census.

There are so many landmarks in her extraordinary career, I will not attempt to list them. Let me name a few of the great ones. She is the first national female civil rights leader of the modern era. That was clear when 10 civil right leaders got together in 1963 and decided that there would be the first mass march on Washington for civil rights of the 20th century.

There were 10 leaders. Only one of them was a woman. My colleagues can imagine who the others were, leaders like the heads of the NAACP and Urban League. And there was that one great woman, Dorothy Height, the President of the National Council of Negro Women.

To cite another landmark, when women's rights burst on the scene, Mr. Speaker, Dorothy Height was one of the first leaders to understand that there must be no cleavage between women's rights and African American rights, between race and sex.

Inevitably there was some confusion about how blacks were to see this great new movement of half of the population. It took real leadership to come forward and clear up this confusion. Dorothy Height was among the foremost who forged unity. She even helped to make good feminists out of black men, who have ever since been in the forefront of women's rights.

All the while she has been carrying the great domestic issues of our time, Dorothy Height has carried an international portfolio. She indeed is recognized today as a world leader on matters of women of color.

I come to the floor this evening to salute Dorothy Irene Height, who has made the National Council of Negro Women one of America's great coalitions. Black women's groups of every variety are united under the umbrella of the Council. Together they work to improve the lives of African American women.

In celebrating women of color this evening, we would do well to begin with the life and times and work of Dorothy Irene Height.

U.S. IS EMBARKING ON VERY DANGEROUS AND WRONG COURSE IN KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, last August we bombed Afghanistan and Sudan, in bombing raids that most Americans have already forgotten. We rushed into that bombing without informing even the full Joint Chiefs of Staff and without congressional approval, and later found we had even bombed a medicine factory.

Last December we started bombing Iraq, once again bombing people that our own leaders tell us are not our enemies. Many press reports since then have confirmed that the White House rigged the UNSCOM report in a lame attempt to justify the Iraqi bombing.

Now we are going to drop bombs on Kosovo. We are spending billions and billions of hard-earned tax dollars in all these bombing campaigns. Yesterday I had a group of people in my office requesting $100 million more for Alzheimer's research. I told those people to just try to get the President to stop bombing for part of one day.

We are dropping bombs and making enemies out of people who want to be our friends. And we are doing all this in places where there is absolutely no threat to our national security and no vital U.S. interest at stake.

The Christian Science Monitor said a few weeks ago that there are wars or military conflicts going on right now in 46 different places around the world. Many of these situations are just as bad or worse than Kosovo right now. There have been 2,000 people killed in Kosovo in the last year. As bad as this is, columnist Charles Krauthammer pointed out on television Sunday that more people were killed recently in Ethiopia in just one day.

If we intervene in every place where there are human rights violations, we will have to go into even more places than the 46 where the Christian Science Monitor found military conflicts. We seem to be following a CNN foreign policy, going heavily into whatever situation is being emphasized on the national news at the moment.

We should try to be friends with all nations. But we do not have the resources to become the world's policeman, and we will make more enemies than friends if we become the world's bully.

And we cannot hide behind NATO. Everyone knows that this bombing in Kosovo would not be done if the U.S. did not insist on it. NATO was set up as a defensive organization. Now it is being turned into an offensive one, attacking a non-member nation that has not threatened us or any other country.

We are intervening in a civil war. It is as if one of our own States was attempting to secede and our military attempted to keep it in and some other country started bombing us. The Kosovo bombings have been attempted to be justified on the basis that the fighting will spread. This is ridiculous. Milosevic may be a tyrant, but he is not attempting to nor does he have the resources to spread worldwide. It is ridiculous to try to equate this situation to when we were fighting world communism. There is no similarity to Russia under Khruschev or China under Mao Tse-Tung.

Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger wrote a few days ago that U.S. intervention in Kosovo is a mistake. He said, ''The proposed deployment in Kosovo does not deal with any threat to U.S. security as this concept has been traditionally conceived.'' He pointed out that ''ethnic conflict has been endemic in the Balkans for centuries.''

David Broder wrote in the Washington Post last week, ''Sending in the military to impose a peace on people who have not settled ancient quarrels has to be the last resort, not the standard way of doing business.''

This is a religious or ethnic conflict that we cannot resolve unless we stay for a very long time at a cost of many, many billions. The President promised we would be out of Bosnia by the end of 1996. This is now March of 1999, and we are still there. I was told by another Member of the House recently that we have now spent $20 billion in Bosnia.

We are about to get into a very dangerous situation. This is an European problem. It is not something that we should risk American lives over. Young Americans may be killed. We should not be so eager or willing to send our troops into this situation. We cannot afford to spend all these billions just to show that the President is a great world statesman or to make sure that he goes down in history as a great world leader.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Thomas Friedman wrote recently in the New York Times these words:

> Stop. Before we dive into sending American troops to sort out the Serbian-Albanian civil war in Kosovo, could we talk about this for a second? If ever there was a time for an honest reassessment of U.S. policy towards Bosnia and Kosovo, it is now. And what that reassessment would conclude is that we should redo the Dayton Accords, otherwise we are going to end up with U.S. troops in Bosnia and Kosovo forever, without solving either problem.

Mr. Friedman is right. We are embarking on a very dangerous and very wrong course.

HONORING WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH AND WOMEN OF COLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to participate in the celebration of Women's History Month and women of color. I applaud my distinguished colleague from California (Ms. LEE) who will later on this evening be conducting an hour discussion on this celebration.

For more than 10 years, the month of March has been dedicated to the celebration of women in American history. This month affords us the opportunity to appreciate the accomplishments of women and the role they have played

in history, American women and women of color who throughout history have proudly served in shaping the spirit of our Nation and shaping our lives, individually and collectively.

Today, empowered by this great legacy, American women serve in every aspect of American life, from social services to space exploration. The opportunities for American women are growing, and their efforts as mothers and volunteers, corporate executives and Members of Congress, law enforcement officers and administrators, construction workers and soldiers, educators and scientists, enrich all of us and make our country great.

□ 2000

Women continue to strengthen our Nation's social fabric as leaders in the home, the community, the workplace, and the government.

The challenges facing women in the next century are many. They are increasingly called upon to serve as caregivers to children and elderly relatives and must bear the weight of providing economically for their families. However, through their endeavors, women are producing a heightened national consciousness to meet the needs of our people.

As we honor the courageous legacy of our Nation's women of color and celebrate the diversity of their backgrounds, talents and contributions, I reflect upon one great woman that has placed her stamp on public service and who played an important role in my life, the Honorable Lena K. Lee, former Maryland House of Delegates member.

A coal miner's daughter, Delegate Lee earned her prominence in Maryland through her indomitable intellect, compassion and character. Ms. Lee was the third woman to receive a law degree from the University of Maryland Law School, a founder of the Maryland Legislative Black Caucus, and a member of the Maryland Women's Hall of Fame.

Teacher, principal, union leader, lawyer and legislator, Delegate Lee created a new vision of what African-American women could hope to achieve in Maryland and across this Nation. However, her impact would be much broader. She has touched the lives of many. Her leadership and noteworthy contributions in the fields of education, law and politics are well known in our State.

In the summer of 1982, I received a call from this woman known only to me by reputation. She praised my work in assisting young African-American law graduates in their efforts to pass the bar exam, as well as my community involvement. I had been working in my small law practice wondering how my career would proceed when this renaissance woman and legend in our community was calling to compliment me. As the one that influenced my decision to begin a political career in the Maryland House of Delegates, Lena K. Lee was my teacher in public life.

''Mentor'' is defined as a wise and trusted guide. I can proudly say that Lena K. Lee is a mentor. I have served the citizens of the 44th District in Maryland as a member of the House of Delegates and then as Speaker Pro Tem of the Maryland General Assembly and now I stand on the floor of the United States Congress today as a Member of this body.

She exemplifies the very idea that no matter what your background or circumstances, one can achieve great success. However, upon arrival, she believes that one is a public servant, with a first and fundamental responsibility to those who are unknown, unseen, unappreciated and unapplauded. Her life is a model of the old adage that ''to whom much is given, much is required.''

She is a champion of justice and dynamic legislator that was instrumental in getting Morgan State College changed to Morgan State University and saving the Orchard Street Church, a site of the underground railroad, from destruction. When we needed a black caucus and a women's caucus in the Maryland legislature, a new Provident Hospital or any other improvement in our community, it was her unselfish public service that was at the creation. Whether the cause was the health of Maryland prisoners or rebuilding of Orchard Street Church or Morgan State's university status, it was public service that was at the forefront of her agenda.

Martin Luther King Sr. said, ''You cannot lead where you do not go and you cannot teach what you do not know.'' She may not have known her influence on other people's lives but Delegate Lee has led and taught a countless number of Baltimoreans how to stand and fight for justice. And so tonight I publicly thank her for all that she has done not only to touch my life but to touch the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BASS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BUDGET BLUEPRINT KEEPS FAITH WITH ALL GENERATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln said, ''You may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time; but you can't fool all of the people all the time.'' That observation is still true today. As complicated as our Federal budget is, most Americans know that the budget is not truly balanced until we take all of those extra Social Security taxes and no longer use them to make the deficit look smaller. The Republican budget which we will announce tomorrow and debate on this floor stops the practice of cooking the books with Social Security money and it does a lot more. I would like to present some of the highlights:

First, our budget blueprint ensures that every penny of Social Security taxes will be spent only for Social Security. For years, the conventional wisdom in Washington was that Social Security money in excess of current benefit payments could be used to finance deficit spending. So, while the baby boomers inched closer to retirement, folks in Washington were spending dollars borrowed from Social Security on other programs. And, worse, they were still running up big deficits, even counting Social Security money.

This has to stop. Under the Republican budget plan, it would. The President has promised to reserve 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security. This means that for a time, Social Security money would be spent on things other than Social Security. For example, the President's 30 new programs. In contrast, the Republican budget seals away every bit of the Social Security surplus.

Second, our budget blueprint keeps faith with the spending caps set in the Balanced Budget Agreement of 1997. When I came to Congress, forecasters were predicting $200 billion deficits growing to $600 billion by the year 2009. Now, strong economic growth and spending discipline mandated by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 are projected to create ever-increasing surpluses, at least under the old way of keeping the books. But this is no time to let up. We must protect those surpluses by restraining the growth of Washington spending. The administration has been talking lately about a new virtuous cycle of surpluses and declining interest rates. There is no quicker way to return to a vicious cycle of deficit spending and higher interest rates than to abandon the hard-won spending caps from 1997. The Republican budget maintains our commitment to fiscal restraint.

Third, our budget blueprint begins the process of actually paying down the debt we are passing on to our children. Everyone would agree that we have a moral obligation to take care of our children. Part of this obligation is relieving our kids of the nearly $6 trillion Federal debt. This is what I call generational fairness. The Republican budget plan would maintain our commitment to generational fairness by continuing the start we made last year on paying down some of the debt.

How would this work? Under our plan, Social Security taxes would be collected and locked away until a reform plan was enacted that would actually preserve the Social Security system. Until a specific fix is worked out, those excess funds would be used to pay off bonds owned by the public. This means it would be easier to meet future obligations to Social Security. And, Alan Greenspan tells us, it means lower interest rates.

Fourth, our budget blueprint makes possible reductions in the tax burden on American families as additional revenues become available. Americans are overtaxed. The average American family pays more in taxes than they do for food, clothing, shelter and transportation combined. That is wrong. The Republican budget plan makes strengthening Social Security our first priority. Then, as more surplus dollars become available, we believe Americans should start getting some of their excess taxes back. They should be given back as an overpayment, because that is what they are. Our plan recognizes that extra taxes left in Washington will get spent on new government programs that most folks neither want nor need. When we allowed Washington to start taking taxes out of our paycheck, we never said to Washington, ''You can keep the change.''

In sum, our budget plan reflects the priorities of the American people. It safeguards 100 percent of the Social Security money, unlike the President's plan, and keeps faith with our Nation's seniors. Then, by preserving fiscal discipline, paying down debt and offering tax relief, this budget ensures lower interest rates and a stronger economy well into the 21st century. This keeps faith with our children. It is a budget I am proud to support.

ISSUES OF CONCERN REGARDING IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

TRIBUTE TO HOUSTONIANS ON OBSERVANCE OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is a month in which we honor women for the contributions that they have made to the United States and to our communities and our neighborhoods.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly acknowledge some of my neighbors in Texas, in Houston in particular, who I hope to be able to expand on their many contributions in weeks and months to come by tributes that I will submit to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But just for tonight briefly since I will also talk about another issue in the time allotted, let me pay tribute and acknowledge:

Christa Adair, the first secretary of the NAACP, who created opportunities for people to vote in Houston, Texas.

Luella Harrison, an outstanding teacher, pioneer and spokesperson in our community.

Mrs. Erma Leroy, another activist who has contributed along with her husband, Moses Leroy, to the labor movement in Houston.

Madgelean Bush who founded the Martin Luther King Community Center that today provides facilities for babies with HIV/AIDS.

Nellie Fraga who has championed Hispanic and Mexican rights but also cultural connections and exchange.

Mrs. Laurenzo, the owner of Ninfa's Restaurant, a businesswoman premier who has guided us to indicate and teach women that they too can be involved in business.

I pay tribute to those women among many others who have done such great things for our community with a special tribute as well to Mae Jemison who has pioneered into space and now has an office in the Houston area.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to respond and indicate some issues of concern that I have as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary. I was disappointed that the amendment today of my good friend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) was not able to be debated. The gentleman from Texas offered an amendment to ensure that criminal aliens that were already incarcerated would not be released until deportation. I wanted the gentleman from Texas to have the opportunity to discuss and debate a very important issue. The issue was raised because of the $80 million that was included in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill that was to provide increased border enforcement and funds for 2,945 additional beds for the detention of criminal aliens from certain parts of Central and South America.

I am concerned that when money is given to an agency and it is given to the agency still with the sense that the agency is not functioning, that we need to debate the issue and get clarification. I think it is important that we should acknowledge, as was acknowledged, that any presupposed or any memo that suggested that the INS was prepared to release criminal aliens is obviously incorrect or has been withdrawn. I am disappointed that preliminary discussions about that were ultimately released to the public. But INS should own up to it and explain what that memorandum was about. They say it was about the fact that they did not have enough beds. In fact, in our own community, they have contracted out the need for facilities for incarcerating or keeping criminal aliens. What I would like to see is the Federal Bureau of Prisons move more expeditiously, although I know they are working toward doing this, in providing beds for criminal aliens so that they are not located particularly in neighborhoods and communities around the Nation.

I also believe it is important not just to give $80 million for the increased border enforcement, but we need trained Border Patrol agents, experienced Border Patrol agents. And so it is important that INS responds how they are going to ensure that the border enforcement patrol is well trained so that everyone is protected, both the Border Patrol agents as well as those they encounter.

I think it is equally important that we address the question that so many have approached me with, and, that is, the INS personnel, in terms of improvements, both in terms of their conditions but also, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the workings of the office, the delay, the treatment of those who come into the INS office.

My commitment to all of those who are commenting about the INS is that we are going to fix it. It is an agency that has an enormous responsibility. Mr. Speaker, this is a country of immigration but it is a country of laws. My colleagues have my commitment as ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims that we are going to address these concerns to the INS and make the United States known for a fair and balanced immigration policy while responding to the concerns of our constituents and our colleagues.

□ 2015

THE NEW DEMOCRATS WANT FISCAL DISCIPLINE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow on the House floor we will begin the budget process. We will debate in the full House for the budget resolution, and the budget resolution is the parameters under which we will pass the spending bills later on in the session. So this is the first attempt to get a look at what our budget is going to look like for the fiscal year 2000.

I rise today to talk about fiscal discipline and to urge fiscal discipline in that process, and I do so from the perspective of a Democrat, but a New Democrat, and I would like to explain that a little bit at the outset because I am a member of the New Democratic Caucus back here in Washington, D.C., but that is not something folks may

necessarily be completely familiar with outside of Washington, D.C.

The basic premise behind the New Democrats is that the Democratic party needed to change to address some of the legitimate concerns that the American public had with our party. Essentially we in the New Democratic Caucus believe that the Democrats did have to make some changes in some of its policies in order to address the concerns the public had expressed with us and the reasons that we started losing elections, quite frankly. We had to understand some of the changes that were going on in society and some of the changes that were going on in government and address them in manners that had not been previously addressed, and one of the biggest ones is fiscal responsibility.

Now, as Democrats, we believe that government can, in fact, in certain areas be a positive force in peoples' lives. We can look to Medicare, Social Security, the interstate highway bill, the GI bill, laws that have protected our environment by cleaning up air and water; all of those areas have made a difference. So it is not that we do not believe, as some of our colleagues on the right, in the Republican party, sometimes believe, that government can ever do anything right; it is just that we believe that they need to do it in a fiscally responsible manner, and there is a variety of reasons for that.

First of all, all of the needs that we have as a society: education, defense, cleaning up and protecting the environment, medical research, taking care of our veterans, providing health care and pension security for our seniors are not one-time needs. Our generation is not going to be the only generation that is going to need to address those concerns. It is going to be ongoing in the future. And if we spend all of the money right now in this generation, we are going to be doing a grave disservice to future generations. In fact, that is more or less what happened in the 1980's.

Basically, as my colleagues know, there were a lot of compromises that were reached in this body in the 1980's, and I always characterize those compromises as being basically: Okay, we will take your tax cut if you take our spending increase, and we will just spend as much money as possible to make as many people as possible happy right now today. Put it on a credit card and forget about tomorrow.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I first got into politics in 1990 when I was elected to the Washington State Senate. Basically I got elected right about the time the bill came due, and I know how difficult it is to do what we need to do as a government when the previous members of a legislative body have spent all the money and then some. It is completely irresponsible, and it mortgages the future of our children. Future generations will need infrastructure, they will need money for transportation, they will need money for public education, for cleaning up the environment, and if we have spent it all, they will not have it.

So, being fiscally responsible should in no way be antithetical to the beliefs of the Democratic party. We need to emphasize it and make it a big priority.

One of the other problems with running up such a severe debt, other than spending all of the money that future generations could spend for needed and necessary programs, is that the more money we spend, the more debt we go into, the higher the interest payment. This is a concept that everybody in America understands whether it is a mortgage payment, a car payment, a credit card bill. We understand that not only do we have to pay back that money that we borrowed, but it keeps going up in the presence of interest that accumulates on our bill every month.

Mr. Speaker, I have a chart here that helps illustrate that problem in the Federal Government. Basically the third largest expenditure behind Social Security and national defense of our Federal Government is interest on the debt, $243 billion or 14 percent of the budget. That is money that does not go to educate our children, that does not go to provide health care for people in poverty, or seniors or people who need it. That does not go to help our environment, to help with medical research, to help with veterans, to do any of those things. It goes to pay for the irresponsible spending of those who went before us, and we should be keenly aware of that number because, as the deficit goes up, this number keeps going up as well.

And finally there is another benefit to being fiscally responsible that goes beyond this that the next chart, as I will demonstrate in a minute, reveals, and that is that basically, if we can pay down the Federal debt; because keep in mind this number here is a yearly number. We are running up a deficit on a yearly basis; we are getting close to balance, but we are not quite there, but more on that in a second. But we also at the same time are incurring overall debt. We are borrowing more and more money. So even if we get our budget balanced, one of the critical things we need to do is start paying down the debt. If we start paying down the debt, that helps interest rates go down, and if interest rates go down, there are benefits all across the economy, and I will demonstrate a few of them on the other chart.

One of the biggest ones that we can all relate to is a home mortgage, and basically if we can pay down the debt so that the public or the government sector is not gobbling up all the money, other people can have more access to it at a better rate. And my colleagues can see here, if you just reduce the mortgage interest rate on a 30-year fixed rate from 8 percent down to 6 percent, you can save yourself a great deal of money on the monthly payment, and over the course of a year you can save yourself a great, an even larger, sum of money.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is another problem with being fiscally irresponsible, all of which brings me to the budget that is going to be laid out here on the floor tomorrow by the majority party. It fails to be fiscally responsible. It is not just Democrats that have trouble being fiscally responsible in the past. It is Democrats and Republicans. One of the things I always try to say whenever people get into an argument over whose fault the debt is, as my colleagues know, is it the Reagan/Bush presidency or is it the Democratic Congress; as my colleagues know, I believe in saying it is both of their fault. They made the decisions to spend more money collectively than they can possibly cover. So it is not just one party or the other that is responsible for this, but now, as the budgets are being rolled out, if the Republican budget passes, it will be the Republicans who are responsible for further fiscal irresponsibility because their budget sounds themes that are eerily familiar: massive tax cuts totaling well over a trillion and a half dollars over the course of 15 years, at the same time accompanied by massive spending increases primarily in the areas of defense, and education and in some arguably laudable areas. Keep in mind, as I said earlier, this is not an argument against spending money. This is an argument of spending too much money and going into debt so that we create a fiscally irresponsible situation.

And lastly the last thing reflected in the current Republican plan is not only do they dramatically cut taxes and dramatically increase spending, but they also offer no plan at this point to do anything about entitlements, about Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid, all of which in their present framework are going to cost far more than the current budget structure could possibly accommodate. Medicare goes bankrupt in 2008, Social Security stops running a surplus in 2014 and goes bankrupt in 2032. All of those facts combine to make this Republican budget very fiscally irresponsible and to put us in a position of basically snatching defeat from the jaws of victory. We are just this close to balancing the budget.

Personally I do not think that we should count the surplus in the Social Security Trust Fund as income to reduce the overall deficit, so I do not think we have a balanced budget yet, but even if you do not count that money, we ran a $30 billion deficit this past fiscal year as opposed to the nearly $300 billion deficits that we were running in the early 1990's. So we are getting close.

I rise today basically as a New Democrat to urge fiscal discipline, urge us to get the rest of the way and to reject the Republican budget.

I have some of my colleagues here who are going to help me in this argument, and I will at this point yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Washington State (Mr. SMITH) for organizing this special order this evening on an issue that is really so important not only this year to this Congress, but to the future of this country and to our children who have not yet been born. And he talked a few moments ago about a new Democrat. As my colleagues know, that is a group, a caucus, as he has shared, has been formed here in Congress of Democrats who believe in growth, who believe in funding education, but also believe that we should balance our budget, and keep our House in order and that we should reduce our public debt. To make sure that we have a good sound economy I think is a sound philosophy, and it is most important and it makes sense for American families, as he just talked about.

Before I came to Congress, as many of my colleagues know, I was the elected State superintendent of my State of North Carolina for 8 years. What they may not know is that prior to that I spent 19 years as a small businessman meeting payrolls, paying taxes. I knew what it was to go to the bank and borrow money if I had to, not only to expand, but to meet payroll if I had to on Friday if I had not collected enough of my sales during the week. So it takes financial discipline. So I know firsthand how important it is to keep your books sound and your numbers straight.

That is why it is so important, as I come to the floor this evening to join my colleagues in this special order because it is an issue I think we have to take about. Tomorrow we will be debating it on the floor and talk about fiscal discipline at the federal level that we had in North Carolina when I was there because I served for 10 years in the General Assembly at the State level. Four of those years I chaired the Appropriations Committee and had responsibility to write four balanced budgets, and Congress is now headed in that direction of getting our House in order.

Mr. Speaker, that is why the Republican budget resolution is so troubling to me. If we look at it, they are talking about a $800 billion tax cut over 10 years. It is too risky, it is too radical, and, in my opinion, too irresponsible. The Republican budget is a tax cut spree financed with fantasy surpluses yet to materialize.

If the economy should dip and we hope it does not, but we know what history tells us, guess what happens? There is no money. The American people remember the 1980's when we had huge deficits. We do not want to return to that. That would certainly be a mistake.

When the people of North Carolina sent me to Congress, they gave me simple marching orders. That was to help the Federal Government live within its means. And one of the first bills I voted on, major bills, was to balance the federal budget, and, as I have said earlier, as a former businessman you have to balance your budget, and if you cannot balance your budget and live within your means when you have a good economy, when do you get to do it? We must act now to pay down the debt when we have money, and that is the one thing that could stifle our economic growth and the expansion that we are enjoying and bring tremendous hardship on hard-working people all across America who have paid the price, who are now working hard and looking for us to do the things we ought to do that are right. Pay the debt down so, if we have another tough time, we can get through it.

Mr. Speaker, future generations of Americans deserve the opportunity to strive and achieve without the questioned burden of debt that our current consumption is creating. We are consuming a great deal right now. We owe it to the next generations to pay this debt down and make sure that our children and our children's children are not saddled with it. If we use projected surpluses as an excuse to enact massive tax cuts, we will have no resources available to pay for debt relief for our children or our grandchildren.

□ 2030

We will not be able to lower interest rates on homes and expand the economy in the 21st century.

Two more pressing crises, and I could list a whole bunch, but I only want to touch two facing America, and that is facing social security and Medicare. We have to invest in that and do it now, and the budget we will see tomorrow will not do that. It is a shell game. They show us how to increase revenues and expenditures for programs that are important to people for 3 to 5 years. At the end of that period they cut them off, because that is when all the big tax cuts kick in. What a cruel hoax to play on the American people.

Secondly, investing in education, so that the next generation of American leaders will have the kind of education they need to continue to grow this economy in the 21st century. Not one penny in their budget proposal for school construction, at a time when there is crying across this country for modernization and new school buildings.

We have a greater growth in school population for children in public schools than we have had in the history of this Nation. There are more children in school today, and yet, not one penny.

The Republican budget proposal cripples our ability, in my opinion, to rise to these challenges, and we have an opportunity tomorrow to do something about it. We have a chance to say no, no to the excesses, but yes to a responsible budget that will provide opportunities for our children, that will provide targeted tax cuts, that will help grow this economy, and help us move into the 21st century in a position to continue to be the great Nation that we are, and provide strength and hope to people around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for this opportunity to be part of this special order.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I thank the gentleman very much for those fine comments.

One quick comment before I recognize my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin. This is not easy. That is the reason it is called discipline. We all have people come back here and ask for a wide variety of programs and tax cuts.

I have always felt, I long for the day when somebody walks into my office and asks for $10 million or $20 million or $50 million for some program or tax cut, and I can look at them and say, that is a complete waste of money. That is not going to do any good for anybody, anywhere.

That is not true. Every dime we spend would do some good for some people. That is why we have to be disciplined to make sure we do not spend more money than we take in. The Federal budget is $1.7 trillion. We can do a lot and we should, but we should not give in to the pressure of taking it issue by issue and saying, we just have to spend the money. We have to think about the future, and think about the fact that it is their money that we are spending if we are not disciplined now.

Mr. Speaker I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) for giving some time this evening to talk about a very important issue in regard to the budget resolution which is coming up tomorrow, which will have an impact on the course of fiscal policy on this Nation for years to come.

I just came from my office, watching on television. I am sure many people throughout the country heard the President's explanation of our involvement in Kosovo.

Now that military air strikes are underway in the Balkans again, I am sure my friends from Washington State, North Carolina, my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, would extend our thoughts and prayers to the young men and women in American uniform who are once again being called upon to restore some peace and stability in Europe, along with the military personnel of the 18 NATO nations that have joined us unanimously in this policy.

It is never easy to order this type of action to place young lives in harm's way, but I believe that it is the right policy at the right time for the right reason.

As a student back in 1990, I had the opportunity of visiting Yugoslavia, and spent time in Kosovo, and I had a

chance to meet a lot of Kosovar students and people there. These are good, decent people. They do not deserve to be murdered and forced out of their homes by Milosevic's army.

If we are to learn any lessons from the Second World War, it is that the United States of America is not going to stand idly by and watch atrocities and genocidal practices being committed against defenseless civilians.

Yet, it is the young men and women who are called upon yet again to do their duty, and I am very confident they are going to be able to do it professionally, with a great deal of loyalty, and courageously. May they all return home soon to their families and safely.

On to the subject at hand in regard to the budget resolution, when I came to this body a couple of years ago, I was proud to join the New Democratic Coalition, which is new but expanding after every election. It is a group that stands principally for fiscal responsibility, along with making investments to promote growth in this country, highlighting issues such as the advancement of technology and education and the work force, a heavy emphasis on education issues, but underlying all this is the need for fiscal restraint, fiscal responsibility, and fiscal discipline.

I, too, am concerned, as my friends, the gentleman from Washington State and the gentleman from North Carolina, are tonight about the ramifications of what is going to hit the Floor tomorrow and what is going to be debated tomorrow; the lack of fiscal discipline, the fiscally irresponsible decisions that are being made in the course of this budget resolution, and the long-term implications that that holds throughout the country.

My friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, indicated earlier that what is being proposed is over an $800 billion tax cut, most of which is backloaded. In fact, it will not kick in until those crucial years when the aging baby boomers start reaching retirement, start entering the social security and Medicare program.

If there is an economic downturn, it could reap devastating consequences for that generation and that generation of leadership having to do with serious revenue shortfalls at precisely the time when these very important programs, like social security and Medicare, will be facing their greatest challenge.

The gentleman from North Carolina also pointed out a very fundamental fact. I remember not so long ago when there were great knockdown, drag-out fights over budget resolutions and proposals that would extend out 3 years. Now we have entered this era that we are not just talking about a 1-year fiscal cycle or 2-year or 3-year fiscal cycle, but a 10- or 15-year fiscal cycle, and fiscal decisions being made on projections way out into the next century.

We are hard-pressed with the economic experts that we have, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget, to even get the economic projections and numbers right over a 12-month period of time, let alone a 5- or 10-year period of time.

So these rosy scenarios, and they are certainly very optimistic, and hopefully they will come true, of projected budget surpluses of the tune of $4 to $4.5 trillion over the next 10 to 15 years, are I think a very dangerous and irresponsible calculation.

There are many warning signals, not only in our own domestic economy but in the international economic area, that could lead to a drastic downturn with the economic growth that we have fortunately been experiencing in recent years. If that downturn does happen, obviously it is going to affect revenue projections. It is going to affect other programs within the Federal budget.

If these budget surpluses do not in fact materialize and we lock into huge tax cuts that are now being proposed, we could find ourselves returning to the era of annual structural deficits that we are just now turning the corner and pulling out of from the 1980s and early 1990s.

I think the Democratic Party has a lot to be proud about and to talk about with regard to fiscal constraint and discipline that we have exhibited in the 1990s. Since the 1993 budget agreement, which was a very difficult vote for Democrats to take, many of them lost their seat because of it, there was not one Republican across the aisle who supported it.

In fact, many of their leadership were right here on the House Floor decrying that budget agreement, claiming that if it was enacted, that it would result in the next Great Depression in this country. But in fact, it has led to six consecutive years of budget deficits and now projected budget surpluses that are outside of the social security trust fund.

The truth is, and the American people and my constituents back home in western Wisconsin understand this fundamental fact, that all this talk about budget surpluses this year, next year, is really masking a social security surplus that the government is continuing to borrow from. We will not truly be running online budget surpluses until the fiscal year 2001, assuming, again, the economic projections do take place.

But I think the most fiscally responsible and prudent course of action to take now is a go slow and cautious approach, wait and see if in fact these budget surpluses do materialize before we start locking in on major fiscal policy changes.

One of the other things that disturbs me in regard to the budget resolution that we will be debating and voting on tomorrow is the fact that if we pass it and if it is implemented, we will be breaking a longstanding budget ruling of the 1990s called pay-as-you-go.

This is, I think, a very important reason why we have been able to practice fiscal discipline, why we have been able to reduce the Federal budget deficit over the last 6 years, and why we have the potential of going into the 21st century on a much firmer fiscal note.

Basically, pay-as-you-go means if you are going to offer any new spending or any new tax cuts, they have to be paid for by offsets in the already existing budget, meaning that you do not move forward on new spending or reduced taxes unless you can pay for it under the budget allocation as it exists.

That rule would have to be violated in passing the budget resolution that we face tomorrow. I think that would be disastrous. I think that would be the wrong step to be taking right now, when we are starting to make this turn into an era of potentially fiscally responsible and sound footing, so we can make a serious investment in saving social security and Medicare, but most of all, start making the attempt to reduce the national debt.

Right now it is at $5.5 or $6 trillion, going up, even today, and $3.7 trillion of that is publicly held, meaning that there is a government, Federal Government, obligation to pay back to individuals or corporations who are buying up Treasury notes and bonds. They have to come and they will come due. We have an obligation to pay it.

With the projected budget surpluses, we are in excellent shape now to start downloading that publicly held national debt of $3.7 trillion, which is, by the way, what Chairman Greenspan is consistently begging us to do every time he comes before congressional committees to testify.

We know how important the Federal Reserve has been in the economic activity we have experienced in this country. Why would paying down that national debt benefit us in regard to the Federal Reserve and monetary policy?

It is very simple. The Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan tells us that if we can reduce our national debt burden, that would mean the Federal Government would not have to go into the private sector and continue to borrow funds from the private sector in order to meet our Federal obligations and our deficit obligations.

What would that mean? It would free up capital then in the private sector, and make it cheaper for individuals and companies to borrow for their own investment needs. It would enable the Federal Reserve and Chairman Greenspan to keep rates low, and to lower them even further.

That really is the true economic story of the last few years, the fact that we have reduced interest rates, which has enabled individuals and corporations to borrow money cheaper, to make investments, to form capital, to create jobs, that leads to the economic growth we have had, the low unemployment and the low inflation.

If there is one thing we should attempt to do, it is pass fiscal policy

which will enable the Federal Reserve to keep rates low, and lower them even further. That is the big tax cut that all Americans can share in.

Virtually everyone at some time has to borrow some money for some reason. Whether it is credit card payments, whether it is home or car payments, student loans, whether it is farmers in the capital-intensive occupation that they are involved with, small and large businesses, they are all having to borrow money.

If we reduce the rate and the expense of borrowing it, that means more disposable money in their pockets. That is something that we should be striving for. That is where our priorities should really lie.

Unfortunately, that is not always politically sexy or politically juicy to take home to our constituents that we are representing. Tax cuts have always been popular and politically appealing, but unless we change that mindset in this body, unless we start becoming more concerned about the next generation, our children, and what type of fiscal inheritance they can expect, and less concerned about the next election, I am fearful that we are going to make bad decisions today that are going to affect my two little boys, who are just 2½ and 9 months old right now.

Most of what I do and the decisions that I make are done through their eyes; how is this going to affect them and their country in their century, the decisions that we make today. I think that is really what is at stake today. I think that is what the debate should be about tomorrow, how can we set the next generation up in the 21st century so that they do not have to face the burden of an exploding social security system or a Medicare system that is imploding because of the aging population in this country. That I think is the true challenge.

I appreciate the leadership and the effort that my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is making, that other Members of the New Democratic Coalition have been making, my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), who is at the forefront of this issue, fighting about it every day. Perhaps we can change the mindset in this body and do the right thing, starting with this budget.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), and I thank my friend, the gentleman from Washington State. It is good that this gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) came to Washington. We are glad he is here.

I very much agree with the sentiments of my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND). I have daughters who are 6 and 4, and I do look at these decisions the same way. When I was fortunate enough to come here in 1990, we were borrowing $400 billion a year to run the Federal Government. This year we will take in approximately $100 billion more than we spend. Tomorrow and in many days that follow tomorrow we will make a choice as to what to do about that.

As my colleagues have said very clearly and very well here tonight, there are many temptations in the short run. Virtually everyone who visits us in the Capitol wants more money from the Federal Treasury in the form of programs, or they want to send less money to the Federal Treasury in the form of taxes.

□ 2045

I believe that we have to do something this year that is totally contrary to the political impulse, and that is to avoid instant gratification in exchange for what makes sense in the long run.

For us to do what is right here, I believe we need to make a choice that says no to an awful lot of things that are worthy of saying yes to. I wish that we could double college scholarship Pell Grants. I wish that we could spend more on cleaning up Superfund sites. I wish that we could do more to expand child care opportunities right now for people. I wish we could get rid of the marriage penalty and further cut the capital gains tax. I frankly think we should get rid of the estate tax as well.

We get a lot of votes and a lot of constituencies that would support everything that I just said. But I think the choice we have to make is whether or not we help people a little bit right now with a modest, almost symbolic tax cut, or whether we invest in their children's schools, defend their country through a stronger military, protect their environment, and most especially, assure that they will have a secure retirement with a Social Security check and a full health benefit through Medicare.

The choice that will be on this floor tomorrow is rather clear. Both sides in fact want to place the lion's share of the surplus into Social Security. We have different ways to do it. I frankly think the way that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) is proposing is the right way to do it.

But the big difference is what to do with the rest of that surplus, and here is the difference: We choose Medicare in the Democratic Party. The majority party chooses a short-term reduction in taxes, which is alluring, which is popular, which is politically expedient, and which is wrong.

The most risky and difficult way, the most successful way, if you will, to let the deficit genie out of the bottle again is to start reducing taxes because it is a politically expedient and easy thing to do. It is a surefire recipe for higher interest rates, less confidence from the markets, and a return to the chaos that affected this country's economy when I arrived here nearly 10 years ago.

A lot of people deserve a lot of credit for bringing us to a point where we now have black rather than red ink. Our President deserves credit. Members of the majority party deserve credit. Members of our party deserve credit.

Most of the credit belongs to our constituents who get up every day, earn their living, send their tax dollars here, and sacrifice for their family and their community and their country. I would hate to see all of that sacrifice given away, eviscerated because of a need for short-term political expediency.

The right answer with that hundred billion dollars surplus is to fund the massive unfunded pension liability that was created for 30 years around here by putting it back into Social Security where it should never have been taken out. Then take the bulk of it, the remainder, and make Medicare sound for at least the next 10 years so that, when people retire, they understand that an illness is not a financial death sentence.

It is difficult to resist what is popular in the short run, but it is right, and it is necessary. The budgets that will come to this floor tomorrow compel us to make that choice: the next election or the next generation, a good headline tomorrow or a good retirement for the people that we represent today.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to put aside their partisanship, read these budgets, look through the eyes of young men and young women who are growing up in this country, and pass the resolution put forth by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) on behalf of the Democratic Party tomorrow.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, in terms of the budget, there are two key facts out there that are not getting a lot of headlines that need to be highlighted, because I think part of the problem and part of the rush towards spending all of this money or cutting taxes, one or the other, is the perception that we have these never-ending budget surpluses.

There are 2 key limitations to that fact that need to be pointed out. Number one, a significant portion of those budget surpluses is within the Social Security Trust Fund. That is not really surplus money. That is money, as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) just pointed out, that we have to pay back to the Social Security Trust Fund. So to count it as income and spend it now is like spending money twice. That puts us into a fiscal irresponsible situation.

Second is the coming expense of the entitlements of Medicare and Social Security and, to a lesser extent, Medicaid. We all know the statistics on those. They are very dire.

Basically, there are more people who are going to be in the retirement community who are going to be eligible for Medicare and Social Security. They are living longer, and health care costs are going up, all of which is combined to create a situation where the expenses for entitlements are going to explode in the next 10 to 15 years and beyond.

My colleagues need to factor those two things in before they go passing a

whole lot of money around thinking that we have surpluses that we do not in fact have and will not have in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, like a lot of Americans tonight and perhaps people all around the world, I have been spending my time channel surfacing through the various networks and following what is going on overseas in Kosovo. The President spoke, as my colleagues know, within the last hour from the Oval Office about what is going on.

From the standpoint of those of us who are dealing with these budgetary issues now and will be voting on them tomorrow, as we recognize our young men and women and the sacrifices they are making tonight, they are flying in the budget decisions that were made in years gone by.

I hope tomorrow that our thoughts will be with those young men and women as we cast our votes on what we think the best budget is for the future of this country.

The issues that have gotten a lot of attention over the last several months about the budget have been issues involving family security, Medicare, and Social Security. One of my specific concerns about the votes that we have to make tomorrow is another part of the security of our senior citizens, and that is the veterans budget. Frankly, I think that the budget proposal that apparently was just filed here in the last few minutes is not adequate for veterans. It is very disappointing and perhaps more disappointing in view of what is going on overseas this evening and today.

Fortunately we will have the opportunity tomorrow to vote on a better budget for veterans. It will be the alternative offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). It will not only add additional money to this next year's budget but will maintain that number through the next several years.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) did such a good job in discussing the problems of tax cuts down the line, unfortunately the budget document that we are going to be presented tomorrow takes money from, in my opinion, good programs in order to finance those tax cuts.

So we see that the budget tomorrow, with regard to veterans issues, it takes the President's budget, it adds $0.8 billion to it for the 2000 fiscal year, but then the number drops back down in 2001 and 2002 and 2003 and 2004.

So the veterans are being falsely, in my opinion, falsely fooled into thinking that somehow we have this great budget that is going to add money to their budget for their future, and it does not.

The number is inadequate for the fiscal year that we are considering, and then it is clearly even more inadequate in the years following because it drops back.

The budget of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) adds $1.8 billion to the veterans budget for the fiscal year we are considering and maintains that level over the future. The majority budget adds $0.8 billion to go to the budget for fiscal year 2000, and then that number drops back. I think that is not correct and not the proper way to treat our veterans.

What it demonstrates, though, is the importance of being fiscally responsible. We have some very real needs in this country, and I think Social Security and Medicare are appropriately at the top of the list. But veterans and our promises that we made to our veterans also should be at the top of that list, as should our national defense budget.

The more we take these dollars and, in my opinion, irresponsibly make promises to the American people that somehow we can do it all, we can fund everything, we can fund Medicare, we can fund Social Security, we can fund veterans, we can fund national defense, and, by the way, we can send all this money home to them, if we make those kinds of false promises, we do a disservice to our responsibilities down the line.

That is why I am pleased to be here tonight and support the efforts of this group in being fiscally responsible and voting for a budget that does not squander this opportunity to put away surpluses for the future of this country, for veterans, for national defense, and for our senior citizens.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues to carry a message that we do need to invest in our future and not squander our resources on ill-conceived tax cuts.

We have heard it before and we are going to continue hearing it, the recession of the early 1990s has been replaced with a record-breaking strong economy. Years of budget deficits have finally been replaced with a surplus.

Now we need to determine what is the most responsible thing to do in these good economic times. Should we do what any prudent family would do when times are good, namely, pay down our debt and invest in our future, or should we spend away our surplus on massive tax cuts that mostly benefit those that do not need it, the wealthy?

Before I think of what we go through, I do not think it is very hard. The answer is very clear. That is why I support my party's policy of paying down the national debt and investing in America's future.

Let us dedicate the 62 percent we have talked about of the surplus towards safeguarding Social Security and 15 percent towards Medicare. This would ensure that Americans have access to Social Security benefits until at least the year 2055 and access to Medicare benefits until at least the year 2020.

While we work to safeguard Social Security and Medicare, let us also start getting serious about paying down the national debt. Public debt is now the highest it has ever been at $3.7 trillion, that is with a ''t'', and it is soaking up billions of tax dollars that could otherwise be used towards further strengthening Social Security, Medicare, investing in our schools and infrastructure and expanding health care services.

In 1998, 14 percent of our government spending went into paying the interest on our national debt. That comes to $3,644 for every family in America, $3,644. That is more money than was spent on the entire Medicare program.

The money spent on the interest payments on the national debt did not reduce the debt itself by one cent. It certainly did nothing to improve our health care, our schools, our drinking water, or to help small businesses succeed.

Let us stop wasting money on the national debt's interest payments. Now that we have overcome a history of budget deficits, it is time to use that economic strength we have built towards finally paying off the national debt.

In addition, we have put an end to wasteful spending by looking at how we do the furtherance of cutting the national debt. It is good for Americans because it would lead to a reduction in interest rates.

Now get this, a 2 percent dip in interest rates would cut home mortgages, the rates in home mortgages significantly. A family currently making monthly payments on a $150,000 home with a 30-year fixed income mortgage at 8 percent is paying $844 a month. If their interest rate drop to 6 percent, that monthly payment would be cut to $689, a savings of $155 a month. That is better than any tax cut the other side is proposing.

Now for college students, a 2 percent reduction in the interest rate would cut typical 10-year student loans for a 4-year public college by $4,263. That is an 8.5 percent reduction. For small business, a 2 percent interest rate could reduce a 5-year start-up loan on $200,000 by $11,280 over the life of the loan.

□ 2100

These are very real and significant savings that demonstrate how paying off the national debt can help working families.

The President has proposed a budget that will cut the debt, reducing it to $1.3 trillion. That would be the lowest national debt in proportion to GDP since 1916. I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting our President's plan.

Common-sense fiscal discipline transformed the budget deficit into a surplus. Let us resist the temptation to spend our current surplus on tax cuts that will leave us ill-prepared to tackle the challenge of extending the life of

Social Security and Medicare and reducing the national debt.

Just because the days of deficits are behind us does not mean that fiscal responsibility is obsolete. We need to continue on the course of maintaining a strong and healthy economy that will benefit all Americans, especially our children and future generations.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. One quick point, Mr. Speaker, and then I want to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MALONEY).

When looking at fiscal discipline issues, I think tax cuts are fine. I do not think that there is necessarily a prejudice against cutting taxes. I think in certain areas we need to do it. Nor do I think that tax cuts are any greater threat to our fiscal discipline than spending. I think too much spending leads to the problems we have just as much as too much tax cuts.

What I would emphasize in any budget is to look at the overall budget and keep one primary goal in mind: balance it. If we think that we can find room for some tax cuts by cutting spending someplace else, great, let us put it on the table, let us talk about it, and let us weigh those options. Whatever the spending program may be, whether it is veterans spending that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) alluded to, or the capital gains tax cut and the marriage tax penalty that the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) alluded to, put it on the table and talk about it.

The problem is, and what we have yet again with the Republican budget, they sort of throw everything on the table and promise they can do it all, all the tax cuts, all the spending increases, and just kick it off down into the future and let the credit card grow. That is the problem.

Nothing against tax cuts, but we need to weigh them against spending increases or decreases and figure out what is best, with one fundamental goal in mind: balance the budget and pay down the debt. We cannot do that if we promise away all the money in both directions.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MALONEY).

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), and I think his final comments, and the motif of this special order, is fiscal responsibility and fiscal discipline. The day has finally arrived that we can stand here and say that we have a real opportunity to do the right thing in regard to fiscal responsibility.

If we look back over the past 30 years, we see what was the wrong thing to do, and it was done wrong on both sides of the aisle in this House and in this Congress at large. Thirty years we went without a balanced budget. We have accumulated a $5 trillion deficit. We raided the Social Security Trust Fund. We raided the Highway Trust Fund. The Congress raided the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Thirty years we have had a wrong direction. We have not made the right decisions; the decisions that are in the long-term interest of this country.

Today we are talking about doing the right thing. Tomorrow we will have the opportunity to vote on some budget resolutions, one of which, the one offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), I believe, does in fact do the right thing. It restores us to a path of fiscal responsibility.

Let me draw a straightforward analogy between a typical family and the budget decision that we have to make tomorrow. A typical family might, over the past years, have had some fiscal stress. They might have taken out a loan to help finance a young member of the family going to college; they might have taken out a loan to replace a car.

They now face the circumstance where they have a good time. They are in good economic times. They are at the end of a year and they are going to get perhaps a bonus. What do they do with that bonus? Do they pay down their car loan? Do they repay the student loan so that perhaps the next child in the family can go to college? Or perhaps they make a decision that they are going to take a fancy vacation, and they are going to spend their year-end bonus or the benefit of their fiscal good times on some other luxury.

That is the choice that this House faces tomorrow. Do we do the right thing? Do we pay down the deficit? Do we save our money for Social Security? Do we make sure that we have adequate provision for Medicare? Do we do the fiscally responsible thing, or do we kind of go on a holiday and find things that, sure, we would all love to do, but that frankly we cannot afford?

The answer, I think, is that we try to do the right thing. And when we look at what that right thing entails, it is very straightforward. We are proposing that 62 percent of the surplus be put aside to secure Social Security; that 15 percent of the surplus be put aside to secure Medicare for the future years. Those actions will extend the fiscal life of the Social Security program to the year 2050.

The proposal made by the majority party adds no additional years to the life of the Social Security program. The budget proposal of the gentleman from South Carolina will take us out to 2050.

Similarly for Medicare, the majority party will make a budget proposal tomorrow which will add no additional life to the Medicare trust fund. The proposal of the gentleman from South Carolina will bring us fiscal security in the Medicare program to the year 2020, and still leave us money to do targeted investments in things like education and make some responsible, affordable tax cuts: a tax cut for long-term care; the opportunity to make the research and development tax credit a permanent feature of the Tax Code, to encourage additional growth in economic progress in our country.

Tomorrow is a very important day in the history of this country. Tomorrow we have a choice, an irresponsible budget proposal containing an irresponsible tax, or a responsible budget proposal that looks to the long-term financial and social health of this country that includes targeted tax relief.

I sincerely hope that this House supports the proposal of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) and that we adopt a fiscally responsible budget resolution.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure at this point to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE). He is a Blue Dog as well as a new Democrat. He has a budget proposal himself that I think is very fiscally responsible and I will be happy to hear about.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I agree that tomorrow will be a historic day in the House of Representatives. It will be historic in part because for the first time in 2 years we face the prospect of adopting a budget and the possibility that we will have a concurrent resolution with the Senate that actually is the type of budget resolution that we have held to passing.

In 1998 it turned out that the leadership of the institution was not capable of bringing up and passing a budget resolution. I think that was a tragic flaw that existed in the leadership of Speaker Gingrich in 1998, and I am pleased to see that we are moving past that stage here in 1999, at least I hope we are.

The question really, then, is what type of a budget will we end up with here in 1999? The thing that I would like to emphasize in our discussions this evening is that there are a variety of views as to how we should handle the possible abundance; the opportunity to make prudent decisions in a time of a possible budget surplus.

Essentially, we have three different choices that we will face tomorrow. The majority will be proposing that we take the entire surplus that is generated from various Federal operations, from revenue collection to the operation of agencies, but excluding Social Security and the post office, that we take that surplus and we return it to the taxpayers.

Now, this sounds good. I think all of us would like to do that. But then some of us ask, what about this national debt that we have? What about priorities that we have as a country? For some, the priorities are education, for others it is veterans, for others it is the environment, for some it is the defense of our Nation, for others it is agriculture, for others it is health care, and the list goes on.

We are spending here in 1999 substantially more money, by some counts $35 billion more, than what people are promising we can live by in the year 2000. And yet, from what I can tell, the Republicans and the Democrats in this

body alike that are on the Committee on Appropriations feel this is an unrealistic position. So the question is, is it realistic to try to return all of this money or are we going to leave ourselves severely strapped? I daresay that there is not a person in this body that does not expect we would leave ourselves severely strapped.

Another approach is to invest the money in priority programs. And a third approach is to try to find a mix.

The Blue Dog Coalition, of which I am a member, it is a group of moderate to conservative Democrats, will propose a budget tomorrow that has a mix. In that sense it is similar to the budget proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT). We propose taking 50 percent of the money that is in surplus and using it to reduce the $5.6 trillion debt; 25 percent of the money to be used as a tax reduction measure, or for tax reductions; and 25 percent for program priorities.

We feel that this is a responsible division of how the budget surplus ought to be used. It recognizes the needs that we face here in America, health care, education, defense, veterans, agriculture, environment and others. At the same time, it recognizes the responsibility that we have in a time of prosperity and affluence to pay down our national debt to the maximum extent possible, while at the same time trying to give a dividend to the taxpayers and meet the needs of our great Nation.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, just in concluding the discussion this evening, as we are guided in our budget discussions, I think there should be some central principles. One of the most important principles in achieving fiscal discipline is to not play sort of the divide and conquer strategy; not get to the point where the sum of the parts adds up to more than we would like the whole to add up to.

We have heard about a variety of programs this evening. We have heard about a variety of tax cuts. There is merit to all of them. What we have to do in putting together a fiscally responsible budget is put them all on the table at the same time. I guess what I mean by divide and conquer, it is really more of a divide and pander strategy, which is to say we take each issue area which may be a priority for somebody, whether increased defense spending, increased education spending, increased spending for health care, an estate tax cut, a capital gains tax cut.

There are all groups out there, as well as individuals, who have their favorite. They come and talk to us about them and we want to make them happy. It is sort of the nature of being a Congressman that we want to make our constituents happy, so we want to promise all those things, and that is where we get into trouble.

What we have to say is if veterans are a big priority, then make it a priority and make it work in the budget. Make the sacrifices in other areas to make sure that we can do that. But we should not promise more than the budget can contain. That is what leads us to fiscal irresponsibility.

That is what, sadly, the Republican budget we are going to hear about tomorrow does. It promises all across the board and does not meet the test of fiscal discipline, getting us into the position of paying down our debt and be responsible to the future.

We are not the only ones who have needs. Future generations are going to have needs. Whether it is tax cuts or spending programs, if we take it all now, we will be mortgaging their future.

Mr. Speaker, I see the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has joined us, so I will yield to him to talk also about fiscal responsibility. But I urge more than anything that we balance the budget and start paying down the debt. It is the responsible thing to do for our future.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington very much for yielding to me, and I very much appreciate his taking the time tonight in order to discuss the subject that we will be debating in earnest tomorrow.

I guess the one thing that he said that I want to overly emphasize is that if by chance we have surpluses, and most of us, I think, and most of the American people understand that when we owe $5.6 trillion, we really do not have a surplus to talk about. And since most of the surplus, in fact all of the surplus this year is Social Security trust funds, we in the Blue Dog budget that will be offered as a substitute tomorrow, we emphasize that we should take that money and pay down the debt with it and really do it. I believe we will have bipartisan support for doing that because everybody is talking about that.

□ 2115

But the one thing that some are not talking about, and this is why we will offer our substitute amendment, some are saying that we ought to take future surpluses. And it was not too long ago in this body that we had a difficult time estimating next year, and then we started 5-year estimations and projections of what surpluses and what the budget would hold, and now we are starting 10 and 15 years.

My colleagues, I believe it is very dangerous for the future of this country to base 15-year projections and say we are going to have a tax cut that will explode in the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth year. That is not conservative politics, at least if they are a businessman or woman. We understand that they do not make those kind of decisions today based on what might happen tomorrow.

What we are going to be suggesting is, if in fact we do in the next 5 years achieve a surplus of the non-Social Security nature, let us put at least half of that down on the debt, let us pay an additional 50 percent down on the debt, and let us take 25 percent of that and let us meet the very real needs of which I know the gentleman from California is as concerned as I am about defense.

Let us put some real dollars in recognizing that, just as we have our young men and women in harm's way tonight, that it is extremely important that we give them the resources to do that which we ask them to do. And we cannot do that with the budget the majority is putting forward tomorrow, and everyone knows that.

It is time to get honest, and the Blue Dog budget will in fact get honest. And we will attempt, hopefully, to have a majority of this body agree with us.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 68, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. LINDER (during the special order of Mr. SMITH of Washington), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–77) on the resolution (H. Res. 131) providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2009, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

TRIBUTE TO ADMIRAL WILLIAM F. BRINGLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am going to do a tribute to an admiral that we lost in San Diego, a four-star.

But I would also say, and I would say excluding what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has said, in 8 years, this is the most laughable oxymoron discussion I have heard in 8 years on the budget about saving Social Security and Medicare. I would like my colleague sometime to explain how the President takes $9 billion out of Medicare and then puts in 15 percent.

So we will have that debate tomorrow. But I do not disagree with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) on a lot of the issues. But the other group, I am sorry, they are either naive or they just state their own opinion as fact and they are factually challenged.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about Admiral William F. Bringle. He was a very good friend of mine. And he is like Will Rogers, that he is the kind of guy that never met a man that he

did not like, for anyone that met Admiral ''Bush'' Bringle liked him.

Those of us that knew him would call him a leader's leader. Many of the aviators I have talked to and the admirals and the flag officers said that he was a pilot of all pilots. He was heroic in World War II, in Korea, in Vietnam. And one does not reach being a four-star admiral without some significance, Mr. Speaker.

Admiral Bringle passed away on Friday. We called him ''Bush'' Bringle. He had wavy, black bushy hair, and that is where he got his call sign that his wife Donnie gave to him. He won the Navy Cross, this Nation's second highest award. He won DFCs, with five different stars for five DFCs, Legion of Merit, and on and on and on.

His career spanned 35 years, Mr. Speaker. Retired astronaut Wally Schirra, who lives in his district in Rancho Santa Fe, said, ''most become political and lose sight of the fact that the rest of the people have to look up to them.'' And that signifies Admiral Bush Bringle.

Vice Admiral Stockdale, best aviator he ever knew, I draw deference with Admiral Stockdale on that, but Admiral Stockdale was planning missions over Vietnam just before he was shot down with Bush Bringle. Admiral Stockdale said that ''he was born for the profession that he served in for over 35 years, and that is a country both at peace and at war, and he served us well.''

And he was commander of CV Division 7 in 1964, commander of 7th Fleet in 1967, commander of Pacific Fleet in 1970. He was in charge of nine aircraft carriers, 1,600 combat and support aircraft, and 85,000 military. Admiral Bernard Clarey: ''Bush Bringle's leadership and style is just the Bringle touch.''

Enlisted and officers alike respected and liked Admiral Bringle because of his leadership. Vice Admiral David Richardson called Admiral Bringle ''one of the most admired naval officers and aviators dating since prior to World War II.'' His leadership was derived by example. He was a native of Covington, Tennessee. He was an Annapolis grad.

To tell my colleagues the kind of guy that he was, he played football. I think he was a whopping 170 pounds. He played football for Annapolis. And when he was playing against William & Mary, during the first play, one of his opponents broke his hip. That gentleman is now Walter Zable, who lives in Bush Bringle's district, and they became the best of friends.

He went through Pensacola, Florida in flight training and became an aviator in 1940, before most of us were born. He was in the Allied invasion in southern France, the Leyte Gulf, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Korea. He was CO of the Hornet and the Kitty Hawk and commandant of midshipmen in Annapolis.

After his assignments with 7th fleet, Admiral Bringle was promoted with his fourth star. The last 3 years he served as U.S. Naval forces in Europe. Admiral Bush Bringle loved his country. But I want to tell my colleagues, he always spoke highly of his first love, not this country but his wife Donnie, his daughter Lynn, and his fighter pilot son Don Bringle.

Memorial services will be Monday at North Island Air Station in the chapel, and I wish those that are in San Diego can attend, Mr. Speaker.

Godspeed, Admiral Bringle, to you and your family.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following newspaper article:

ADM. WILLIAM BRINGLE DIES; CALLED AN AVIATOR'S AVIATOR—COLLEAGUES SAY HE KEPT COMMON TOUCH DURING HIS CAREER

(By Jack Williams)

Adm. William F. ''Bush'' Bringle, a heroic World War II aviator who kept the common touch in rising to commander of naval air forces in the Pacific Fleet and in Europe, died of pneumonia Friday. He was 85.

Adm. Bringle, who had lived in Rancho Santa Fe for the past 20 years, died at Scripps Memorial Hospital-La Jolla.

Known as ''Bush'' because of his thick curly hair, Adm. Bringle distinguished himself as an aviator's aviator, as one colleague called him, while rising through the officers' ranks.

In World War II, he took part in some pivotal engagements in the Pacific and European theaters, earning such medals as the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Flying Cross with Five gold stars and the French Croix de Guerre.

He also received the equivalent of three Legions of Merit in a naval career that spanned more than 35 years.

''Bush was the only four-star admiral I know who was loved by everybody in the Navy,'' said retired astronaut and Navy Capt. Wally Schirra. ''Most become political and lose sight of the fact that the rest of the people have to look up to them.''

''Bush was one we all liked, a dear friend of everyone in the U.S. Navy.''

Retired Vice Adm. James Stockdale remembered Adm. Bringle as ''an accomplished aviator, a natural, and he fell into the very profession he was built for—which was command at sea in time of war.''

Added Stockdale: ''He's one of my better all-time Navy all-stars.''

As a commander of Carrier Division 7 beginning in 1964, Adm. Bringle was involved in the early stages of the Vietnam War. He was promoted in 1967 to commander of 7th Fleet naval air forces and in 1970 to commander of Pacific Fleet naval air forces.

In the latter role, based at North Island Naval Air Station, Adm. Bringle was in charge of a force that included nine aircraft carriers, some 1,600 combat and support aircraft and about 85,000 military personnel and civil servants.

He established sophisticated training facilities for pilots and maintenance personnel at Miramar Naval Air Station, paving the way for introduction of the F–14 fighter plane.

Adm. Bringle's Vietnam-era command was characterized by what Adm. Bernard A. Clarey called at the time ''the legendary Bringle touch.'' Clarey also described Adm. Bringle as an aviator's aviator, stemming from his extraordinary rapport with fliers of all ranks and ages.

Stockdale recalled joining Adm. Bringle in planning an attack on a city near Hanoi in the Vietnam War. ''It was a piece of beauty the way he was able to coordinate it and build confidence in the joint effort.'' Stockdale said.

Another Navy contemporary, retired Vice Adm. David Richardson, called Adm. Bringle ''one of the most admired naval officers and aviators dating from World War II.''

Said Richardson: ''His leadership was derived from the examples he set and the way he handled people. And people responded beautifully to his leadership.''

In 1961, as commander of the fledgling Kitty Hawk, Adm. Bringle took the supercarrier on its maiden voyage from the East Coast to its home base of San Diego. At more than 1,047 feet in length, the Kitty Hawk became the largest ship to enter San Diego harbor up to that time.

Adm. Bringle was a native of Covington, Tenn. He graduated in 1937 from the U.S. Naval Academy, where he starred as a speedy, sure-handed 170-pound end in football.

Hip and knee injuries played havoc with his football career, and decades later he underwent knee and hip replacements.

In his junior year at Annapolis, on the first play of a game with William & Mary, Adm. Bringle suffered a broken hip on what he considered a ''cheap shot,'' a crack-back block.

Many decades later, while attending a cocktail party in San Diego, he met the man who claimed to be responsible for his pain: former William & Mary athlete Walter Zable, co-founder of Cubic Corp.

''They shook hands and became great friends,'' said Donald Bringle, Adm. Bringle's son.

Adm. Bringle underwent flight training at Pensacola, Fla., and was designated a naval aviator in December 1940.

Three years later, after flying observation and scouting patrols over the South Atlantic, he formed the Navy's first observation fighting squadron, VOF–1.

He received the Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism in action against enemy forces during the Allied invasion of southern France in August 1944.

His role in the invasion also earned him the French Croix de Guerre.

After the European action, Adm. Bringle led his squadron on close air support missions in the Pacific campaigns at Leyte, Iwo Jima and Okinawa.

His squadron also identified targets for naval gunfire, and its success brought Adm. Bringle a Distinguished Flying Cross with gold stars, signifying five additional awards of that medal.

When the Korean War broke out in June 1950, Adm. Bringle was serving in Annapolis as aide to the superintendent of the Naval Academy. He resumed sea duty in 1953 as executive officer of the carrier Hornet.

Adm. Bringle became commandant of midshipmen at the Naval Academy in 1958, his last assignment before taking command of the Kitty Hawk.

During his last tour in San Diego, Adm. Bringle was honored by the Greater San Diego Chamber of Commerce military affairs committee and the San Diego Council of the Navy League for his contributions to the community.

The Navy League award came with a leather golf bag of red, white and blue design.

After his assignments with the 7th Fleet and the Pacific Fleet, Adm. Bringle was promoted to four-star admiral. His last three years of active duty were as chief of U.S. naval forces in Europe, based in London.

As a Rancho Santa Fe resident. Adm. Bringle enjoyed golf until his late 70s, when he underwent his second knee replacement. ''He kept his competitive fires going by playing tennis into his late '50s,'' his son said.

Adm. Bringle was a member of the exclusive Early and Pioneer Naval Aviators Association, an honor society of some 200 members.

He is survived by his wife, Donnie Godwin Bringle; a daughter, Lynn Riegle of Thompson's Station, Tenn.; and a son, Donald of San Diego.

Memorial services are scheduled for 11 a.m. Monday at the North Island Naval Air Station chapel. Donations are suggested to the U.S. Naval Academy Alumni Association Fund, Alumni House, King George Street, Annapolis, MD 21402.

ADMIRAL WILLIAM F. BRINGLE, UNITED STATES NAVY, RETIRED

William Floyd Bringle was born in Covington, Tennessee, on April 23, 1913. He attended Byars-Hall High School in Covington, and Columbia Military Academy, Columbia, Tennessee, and entered the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland, on appointment from his native state on July 6, 1933. As a Midshipman he was a member of the Naval Academy Football Team (N* award). He was graduated and commissioned Ensign on June 3, 1937, and through subsequent advancement attained the rank of Rear Admiral, to date from January 1, 1964; Vice Admiral, to date from November 6, 1967 and Admiral, to date from July 1, 1971.

After graduation from the Naval Academy in June 1937, he was assigned to the USS SARATOGA until February 1940, with engineering, communications and gunnery duties on board that carrier, operating in the Pacific. In April 1940 he reported to the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Florida, for flight training, and was designated Naval Aviator in December of that year. Detached from Pensacola in January 1941, he joined the USS MILWAUKEE, and served as Senior Aviator on board that cruiser until December 1942. During the eight months to follow, he served as Commanding Officer of Cruiser Scouting Squadron TWO.

From September to November 1943 he had training at the Naval Air Station, Melbourne, Florida, and in December formed the first Observation Fighting Squadron (VOF–1) during World War II. He commanded that squadron throughout the period of hostilities. For outstanding service while in command of that squadron during the invasion of Southern France and Pacific operations in the vicinity of Sakishima, Nansei Shoto invasions of Luzon and Iwo Jima and operations in the Inkinawa and Philippine Islands areas, he was awarded the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Flying Cross with Gold Star in lieu of five additional awards and the Air Medal with Gold Stars in lieu of sixteen similar awards.

He is also entitled to the Ribbon with Star for, and facsimiles of, the Navy Unit Commendation awarded the USS MARCUS ISLAND and USS WAKE ISLAND and their Air Groups for heroic service in the Western Carolines, Leyte, Luzon, and Okinawa Gunto Areas. He was also awarded the Croix de Guerre with Silver Star by the Government of France for heroism while commanding Observation Fighting Squadron ONE during the Allied Invasion of Southern France in August 1944 before he moved his squadron to the Pacific.

After the Japanese surrender, from October 1945 until October 1946 he was Air Group Commander of Group SEVENTEEN, and when detached he returned to the Naval Academy for duty at Battalion Officer. He remained there until June 1948, then for two years was Air Group Commander of Carrier Air Group ONE, based on the USS TARAWA and USS PHILIPPINE SEA. Again at the Naval Academy, he served from June 1950 until July 1952 as a member of the Superintendent's Staff. The next year he spent as a student at the Naval War College, Newport, and from July 1953 to December 1954 served as Executive Officer of the USS HORNET (CVG–17).

In January 1955 he reported to the Navy Department, Washington, D.C., for duty as Head of the Operational Intelligence Branch in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, and on August 24, 1955, was transferred to duty as Naval Aide to the Secretary of the Navy. He commanded Heavy Attack Wing TWO from August 1957 until June 1958, after which he had duty until August 1960 as Commandant of Midshipmen at the Naval Academy.

Ordered to the USS KITTY HAWK, building at the New York Shipbuilding Corporation, Camden, New Jersey, he served as Prospective Commanding Officer until she was placed in commission, April 29, 1961, then as Commanding Officer. In June 1962 he was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, where he served as Assistant Director of the Aviation Plans Division until January 1963, then was designated Director of that division. On April 6, 1964, he assumed command of Carrier Division SEVEN. ''For exceptionally meritorious service as Commander Attack Carrier Striking Force SEVENTH Fleet and as Commander Task Group SEVENTY-SEVEN POINT SIX from March 29 to June 29, 1965, and as Commander Task Force SEVENTY-SEVEN from May 26 through June 27, 1965 . . .'' he was awarded the Legion of Merit with Combat ''V''.

On July 12, 1965 he became Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations to the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet and was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the Second Legion of Merit for exercising ''. . . forceful supervision and outstanding direction over each of the many diverse and complex operations conducted by the Pacific Fleet . . .'' In November 1967 he became Commander SEVENTH Fleet and for ''exceptionally meritorious service . . . was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal and Gold Star in lieu of a Second similar award for combat operations in Southeast Asia during the Vietnam conflict.

In March 1970 he became Commander Naval Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet, with headquarters at the Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California. For ''. . . his distinguished and dedicated service . . .'' in that capacity, from March 1970 to May 1971, he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the Third Legion of Merit. In July 1971 he reported as Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe and Naval Component Commander of the U.S. European Command with additional duty as United States Commander Eastern Atlantic. ''For exceptionally meritorious service . . . from July 1971 to August 1973 . . .'' he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the Third Distinguished Service Medal. The citation further states in part:

''. . . Admiral Bringle displayed inspirational leadership, outstanding executive ability and exceptional foresight in directing the complex and manifold operations of his command in the execution of United States national policy . . .''

Returning to the United States, Admiral Bringle had temporary duty at Headquarters Naval District, Washington, D.C. from September 1973 and on January 1, 1974 was transferred to the Retired List of the U.S. Navy.

In addition to the Navy Cross, Distinguished Service Medal with two Gold Stars, Legion of Merit with two Gold Stars and Combat ''V'', Distinguished Flying Cross with five Gold Stars, Air Medal with sixteen Gold Stars, the Navy Unit Commendation Ribbon with two stars, and the French Croix de Guerre with Silver Star, Admiral Bringle has the American Defense Service Medal; American Campaign Medal; European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal with one operation star; Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with four operation stars; World War II Victory Medal; Navy Occupation Service Medal, Europe Clasp; China Service Medal; National Defense Service Medal with bronze star; Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal with two stars, the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal; and the Philippine Liberation Ribbon.

Married to the former Donnie Godwin of Coronado, California, Admiral Bringle has two children, Rosalind Bringle Thorne and Donald Godwin Bringle. His official residence is 1639 Peabody Street, Memphis, Tennessee, the home of his mother.

TRADE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, our scientists have just discovered a new fault line that exists underneath downtown Los Angeles. This fault line, called Puente Hills, is 25 miles long and 10 miles wide and it was invisible until recently. The 1987 Whittier Narrows quake, which caused eight deaths and $358 million worth of damage, was the result of a rupture of just 10 percent of the Puente Hills fault line. Obviously, this fault line has the potential to do a great deal of harm to the good people in Los Angeles and we would be foolish to ignore it.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another fault line in America that is invisible to our eyes, the American economy. And the American workers are sitting on a fault line that is shifting below us; and, like many in Los Angeles, we are ignoring it, hoping it will go away. The fault line is our trade deficit. And as it grows, America is at greater risk of our very economic foundation being rocked.

We recently learned that the trade deficit grew to its highest level in the last decade, projected again this year at over $250 billion. According to the Commerce Department just this past month, $93.76 billion worth more of imports landed on our shores while our exports again fell. These are not just numbers. They are part of the shifting ground underneath America's economic feet. And for some, they could not escape the cracks in the ground.

I am talking about workers like the 6,000 at the Levi's plants, most of them women, that recently packed up and closed to ship manufacturing to undemocratic nations overseas. I am talking about the workers at Huffy Bicycle in Ohio who lost their jobs to Mexico's exploited workforce, or the thousands of workers at Anchor Glass or General Electric or Henry I. Siegel or VF Knitwear or Zenith Television or Dole Food, and the list goes on. They have seen the ground shift and they felt the earthquake. They have just seen some of the consequences of a growing trade deficit.

According to the Economic Policy Institute, between 1979 and 1994 nearly 2.5 million jobs in our country were lost to America's backward trade policy, which says to America's workers the solution for them is to work for shrinking wages and benefits and net worth in order to buy more imported products from places where workers have absolutely no rights.

The second consequence of the trade deficit is its crippling effect on wages here at home. Workers who lose their manufacturing jobs still have to find some way to feed, clothe, and educate their families; and usually that is in the form of a service job with a substantial pay and benefit cut.

The Economic Policy Institute points out that increasing imports from low-wage, undemocratic countries are contributing to decreasing wages of our workers. Our U.S. firms and workers are forced to cut their standards of living to compete. They cut wages or cut hours or cut benefits to reduce costs. And as a result, our workers are finding that their real buying power of their wages has been declining for almost 15 years. In fact, the growing gigantic trade deficit literally lops off a whopping 25 percent of the economic bang that would occur inside this economy if in fact our trade ledger was balanced.

Probably the biggest consequence of this deficit is what it does to our long-term competitiveness, as America writes off one industry after another: televisions, electronics, clothing, recently steel. We have seen how many parts of this economy have been savagely hit.

Mr. Speaker, this fault line in America cannot be ignored. We can see the consequences getting worse every year. But the people being hurt cannot afford high-powered lobbyists in this city. If we want American workers to be able to increase their net worth, save for their futures, invest in the stock market, start their own small businesses, we need to make sure our economic foundation is rock solid.

Mr. Speaker, we ignore this trade deficit, this fault line, at our own peril.

WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank my colleagues who have spoken so eloquently tonight about the importance of Women's History Month or who have submitted statements for the RECORD.

I want to especially thank my Republican colleague the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for being here this evening and also for submitting her statement on the RECORD for the contribution of African American women in America's history.

We are, in the month of March, proudly celebrating the achievements of all women in this Nation. I come this evening to take a few minutes to briefly talk about the history of Women's History Month and to celebrate the contributions of women, especially African American women, the contributions which they have made to this country and the world.

Back in 1978, the first Women's History Week celebration was initiated in Sonoma County, CA, which is now represented by a great woman, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), who serves here with us in this Congress. It began in Sonoma County as a means of introducing students and teachers to the many contributions that women of all cultures have made to the building of this Nation.

Three years later, the idea of celebrating Women's History Week began to spread across this Nation and the National Women's History Project was created to provide technical assistance to educators and community organizers and to produce and distribute women's history materials.

In 1981, then Representative, now Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, and Senator ORRIN HATCH cosponsored a joint congressional resolution proclaiming the week of March 8 National Women's History Week. The success of National Women's History Week and the availability of information on women's history necessitated expanding the celebration to a full month.

In 1987, the National Women's History Project petitioned Congress to expand the celebration to the entire month of March. The resolution was approved with bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate.

Today schools, communities, and workplaces celebrate the month with special curriculum and events. The popularity of women's history celebrations has sparked a new interest in uncovering women's forgotten heritage. It has allowed all Americans to learn more about women who have made a tremendous impact on our Nation's history.

□ 2130

Women's history is really a new way of looking at events and individuals that have made this country what it is today. History as it has been traditionally taught has virtually excluded women and people of color. One would think that someone would have noticed that half of the United States population is missing from our history. Textbooks, curricula and academic research has been silent about the impact that women and people of color have made. The silences have made women's accomplishments and contributions to American life invisible.

Mr. Speaker, the history of African-American women's participation in American politics must recognize our involvement in traditional political acts such as registering, voting and holding office, but also those nontraditional activities in which we engaged long before we had access to the ballot. Because African-American women are simultaneously members of the two groups that have suffered the Nation's most blatant exclusions from politics, African American and women, our political behavior has been largely really overlooked.

African-American women organized slave revolts, established underground networks and even sued for the right to vote. Public records reveal that many African-American women were involved in the abolition movement and were active participants in the early women's rights movement. African-American women's political activities have largely been directed towards altering our disadvantaged status as African Americans and women and making sure that this country lives up to its responsibilities for equality and justice for all people.

Today, we look at African-American women holding political office as a very recent experience. African-American women who have previously served in this Congress include my mentor, our first African-American woman who served here, Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, as well as Barbara Jordan, Yvonne Braithwaite Burke, Cardiss Collins, Katie Hall and Barbara Rose Collins. I stand here as the 171st woman, the 100th African American and the 19th African-American woman ever to have the privilege of serving in this body. I stand here because of those who came before us. I stand here as a result of the work of many of those individuals, and in the words of the Honorable Shirley Chisholm, ''We all came here to serve as a catalyst for change.''

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) for giving us the opportunity to have a moment.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

TRIBUTE TO DR. YVONNE BOND MILLER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge this month as Women's History Month and to honor the contributions of a distinguished African-American woman, Dr. Yvonne Bond Miller.

Dr. Miller is the first black woman to serve in the Virginia House of Delegates and the first black woman to serve in the Virginia Senate. She is the first woman of any race to serve as chair of a Senate committee in the State of Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, Women's History Month is a time to recognize and give thanks to those women who dared to brave uncharted waters so that we may all fully participate in our society.

As we pay tribute to women for their vast contributions to our nation, I'd like to formally salute Dr. Miller as an educator and as the first African American woman to serve in the Virginia House of Delegates and Virginia Senate. She has been widely recognized for her

work on behalf of children and under-represented persons. She understands the ''double bind'' and dual challenges facing women of color living in a society that marginalizes people by both gender and race. Despite those obstacles, she has risen above these circumstances and has made outstanding contributions to her community, always working to uplift persons with similarly disadvantaged status.

Yvonne Bond Miller was born in Edenton, North Carolina, the oldest of 13 children. She grew up in my home district of Norfolk and attended Booker T. Washington High School in Norfolk. Dr. Miller earned a Bachelor of Science degree from Virginia State College (now Virginia State University), a Master of Arts Degree from the Teacher's College at Columbia University, and then a Doctorate from the University of Pittsburgh. She is also a recipient of an Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree from Virginia State University.

She has had a distinguished career as an educator, teaching first in the Norfolk Public Schools and then at Norfolk State University from 1968 to present, where she is currently a Professor of Education. For seven years, she was the head of the Department of Early Childhood and Elementary Education at Norfolk State University. In addition to teaching, Dr. Miller has had an outstanding career in public service as a legislator. She was first elected to the Virginia House of Delegates in 1983, becoming the first African American woman in that body. Her accomplishments earned her a second term in 1985, and her career in the state legislature continued when she was elected to the Virginia Senate in 1987, becoming the first African American woman in the Virginia Senate as well. Since then, she has served with a meritorious record on several committees, including the Rehabilitation and Social Services Committee, where she is the first woman to chair a Virginia Senate committee. In addition, Dr. Miller has worked steadfastly on behalf of children and the otherwise underserved on Virginia's Youth Commission and Virginia Disability Commission.

Throughout her career as a legislator, Dr. Miller has demonstrated a consistent concern for the disadvantaged. She has worked hard in promoting education and early childhood issues, maintaining a living wage, and ensuring access to affordable health care. Dr. Miller's sense of justice, generosity, and dedication to the underprivileged carries over into her personal life as well. Most notably, she has established a scholarship fund at Norfolk State University for women returning to school. Her accolades are too numerous to describe in full, but it is no wonder that she has been honored with the Vivian C. Mason Meritorious Service Award from the Hampton Roads Urban League and the Social Action Award from the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity.

So, as we honor today the contributions of American women to our nation, we must pay a special tribute to Yvonne Bond Miller for prevailing in the face of adversity as an African American woman and for working tirelessly on behalf of children and other marginalized persons so that they too may be able to contribute to their fullest potential. Women's History Month is a time to recognize and give thanks to those women who dared to brave uncharted waters so that we may all fully participate in our own society. Thank You, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Yvonne Bond Miller.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, given the fact that this is indeed Women's History Month, I would just include the names of some of the outstanding women who have served with distinction in my community, the community where I live, people like Ms. Mamie Bone, Ms. Devira Beverly, Martha Marshall, Cora Moore, Mildred Dennis, Mary Alice (Ma) Henry, Ida Mae (Ma) Fletcher, Julia Fairfax, Earline Lindsey, Nancy Jefferson, Rosie Lee Betts, Nola Bright, Dr. Claudio O'Quinn, Ms. Rachel Ridley, Artensa Randolph, Dr. Lucy Chapelle.

I would mentioned one other woman, two others, who have had tremendous impacts on my life—a woman, Mrs. Beadie King, who was the teacher in the first school that I attended which was a one-room schoolhouse where Ms. Beadie King taught eight grades plus what we call the little primer and the big primer at the same time. Many of the things that I know and learned, many of the values, many of the attributes that I think that I have developed have actually come from the teachings of Mrs. Beadie King. And so I pay tribute to her as an outstanding educator.

The other woman, Mrs. Mazie L. Davis, my mother, who probably more than any other single person contributed to my development, because it was she and my father who basically suggested to me that life has the potential of being for each one of us whatever it is that we would determine to make life.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in salute of African American women.

African American women have a unique place in the history of our country. Fighting against racial and gender discrimination, we have had to fight two battles often at odds with each other. However, many African American women have not let race and gender prevent them from fighting for equality. These women's heroic efforts have forever changed American history. Women like Harriet Tubman who helped slaves escape via her underground railroad. Without Ms. Tubman many future African American doctors, politicians, lawyers, and teachers would not be alive.

Mr. Speaker so many African American women have been a part of our history: Sojourner truth, Coretta Scott King, Ida B. Wells to name a few. Today I would like to acknowledge one of those great African American female leaders—Juanita Shanks Croft.

Dallas native Juanita Craft fought for desegregation in Dallas and all over Texas. This onetime hotel worker, use the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) to fight legalized racism. She helped desegregate the University of Texas Law School, North Texas State University and the State Fair of Texas. She also helped desegregate many Dallas lunch counters, theaters and restaurants.

She worked with Christian Adair, who helped found the Houston chapter of the NAACP, to end segregation and promote African Americans. Because of their efforts, Hattie Mae White became the first black women elected to the Houston school boards in 1958. This also paved the way for the late Barbara Jordan to become the first African American woman and also the first African American since reconstruction elected to the Texas state Senate.

Ms. Craft served 25 years as the Dallas NAACP precinct chairperson. She helped found more than 100 chapters of the NAACP and helped Thurgood Marshall work on the U.S. Supreme Court case *Smith* vs. *Allwright*, which gave African Americans the right to vote in the Texas Democratic primaries in 1944. Ms. Craft was the first African-American woman to vote in Dallas and was elected to the Dallas City Council in 1975 at the age of 73.

Ms. Craft was a civil rights teacher to the young opening her home to anyone who wanted to learn about making change. Many of those young students today are teachers, lobbyists, community and civil rights activists and city officials.

Today her home in Dallas is a civil rights historic landmark where President Lyndon B. Johnson and Martin Luther King Jr. were once visitors.

I salute Juanita Craft's courage to fight for equality for African Americans. I salute her courage to teach others how to work for change. Through her legacy, we can see the battles which have been fought and can be proud of the progress our sisters have made so that we can attend any university, sit at any lunch counter, walk into any store and speak of this floor.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order this evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEMINT). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

SOCIAL SECURITY AND THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor tonight with several of my colleagues who I think will be joining me, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). I am in my fifth year as a Member of Congress from Oklahoma. I am also in my last term as a self-imposed term limit on myself.

One of the reasons I think that we only have 40 percent of the people voting in elections is that in fact there is a crisis of confidence in the Congress of the United States. I want to spend some time tonight outlining what we have heard many people say, whether it is the President in his State of the Union speech or others in terms about our budget, this so-called surplus that does not exist, explain to the American people why it does not exist and what it is really made of, and then talk about some of the facts of the last 3 or 4 years of what has gone on and what we can expect in the future if in fact we do not have honesty with the American public in terms of our budget, the budget process, and speaking honestly about where American tax dollars go.

I also might add that besides being a medical doctor who continues to practice and deliver babies on the weekends and the days that we are not in session, my original training is as an accountant. I can tell my colleagues, there is not an accountant in this country that would sign off on the books of the Federal Government. The reason is because it moves money around, it does not account for it, it uses the same money twice and then claims it as a surplus.

To start this discussion, I really want to try to explain to the American public the Social Security trust fund. Most people are paying 12.5 percent, half of it themselves, half of it by their employers, in to fund the Social Security system. At the present time, we have a significant excess number of dollars coming in above and beyond what is required to pay out benefits for our seniors under Social Security. What really happened is we are collecting more than we are spending in terms of Social Security dollars. What happens now is that the Federal Government uses the excess Social Security money to pay for more spending and to pay off publicly held debt. But as they pay off publicly held debt, they incur another debt and that is an IOU to the trust fund that says we will pay this back. That also incurs interest. The fancy way Washington talks about that is that that is a surplus. In fact it is only a surplus in that we have transferred the obligation to our children and grandchildren and they will pay that back through increased payroll taxes. So we put IOUs that are credited to the trust fund.

In 2013, we face a major problem, and that is the year in which the revenues that come into the Social Security trust fund will be less than the payments that we have to pay out. What is going to happen then? Social Security spends more than it collects. In order to pay all the Social Security benefits, Social Security is going to have to try to collect from the Federal Government on the IOUs, the money the Congress has borrowed. What happens? Having spent all the money, the Federal Government has to raise the income taxes or the payroll taxes on the people who are paying Social Security taxes just to meet the obligations.

That is borne out a little bit better when we actually see what the Social Security Administration says about what is going to happen to the fund. As you can see, all this in red is actually money coming in to Social Security in excess of what we are paying out. You will notice in 2013, we actually spend more money. But if you go out to the end of this graph, what you will see is we are getting close to $750 billion more a year in payments from general tax revenues, or increased raises in the tax paid on hourly wages in this country.

We have a terrible picture developing. I say all this because the politicians in Washington claim we have a surplus. There is no surplus. The money that they are using to pay down external debt is actually money they are going to be obligating our grandchildren for with a Treasury IOU that is interest-bearing. That money is a false surplus. All it is is the difference between what we paid out and what we have collected versus what we have spent more in other revenues that the Federal Government has taken in.

We are going to have only three options in 2013, and, better, we only have three options now to fix this problem: One, we can save 100 percent of the Social Security surplus and we can transition to a system that increases the earnings for all payments on Social Security between now and 2013 and thereafter. The annualized yield, the return on the investment on Social Security over the last 20 years, has been less than 1 percent. We would have been better to put it in a passbook savings account by 300 percent in terms of the power of compound interest. Had we done that, we would have displaced this day of reckoning where the imbalance in payments out versus revenue in would have been at least delayed another 10 to 12, maybe even 15 years, had they gotten some return.

I think the other point that needs to be made, why are we in trouble on Social Security? We are in trouble on Social Security because politicians easily spend your money without coming and saying, ''We're going to give you an increased benefit but we're not going to tell you that your children and grandchildren are going to have to pay that back.'' How do they pay that back? They pay that back by lowering their standard of living and sending more of their hard-earned dollars to Washington to pay for the benefits today that we did not have the courage to tell the American public that for this benefit, this increase in benefit, we have to pay for it.

What is easy to do in Washington, I have found in 5 years, is to pass on a benefit and not be responsible for paying for it. It is called spin. The real thing it is called is a half-truth. A half-truth, my daddy taught me, was a whole lie. We have seen a lie.

The second option we have, we can repay the money from the trust fund by raising income taxes. We are at the highest rate of taxing the American public that we have ever been with the exception of World War II. Almost 22 percent of our gross domestic product is now consumed by taxes in this country. That is not a good option.

The third option is we can change the retirement system. We can delay the onset, we can decrease the benefits. That is just like we have done to the veterans. We promise one thing and then we deliver far less. It is not a principle of integrity to do something less than what you commit to do. So we only have three options when we are faced with Social Security. I want to just develop this for about another 5 minutes and then I will recognize the gentleman from Minnesota.

Now, we hear Washington say we have a surplus, but the fact is, is every day $275 million is added to the national debt. If we have a surplus, if we have more money coming in than we are paying out, how come the debt for our children and grandchildren is rising? It is because we are not honest in our bookkeeping. We are not honest about it. In 1997, each citizen's share of the national debt was $19,898. By the end of this year, every man, woman and child from baby to grandmom will owe $20,693. You cannot have a surplus and the debt rise. The question that the American people should ask when they hear the word surplus is, ''Did the debt go down?''

There is another tricky word that the politicians use. They say publicly held debt. Because that is the debt that is external to the internal IOUs that the government has paid or made with Social Security.

□ 2145

So it is true that the external-held debt of the United States went down, but only because we took money from the Social Security Trust Fund and wrote another IOU. So the total debt in terms of the Social Security increased revenues or excess revenues have not changed at all. We have just decided we are not going to pay ourselves and we will slow down the pain to those people on the outside.

So less debt is held by the public; that is true, but the total debt is rising, and, as my colleagues can see, it is rising $275 million per day, and where I come from, $275 million is one whole heck of a lot of money. It is about enough to run the State of Oklahoma for a month. So, we are talking about huge sums of money.

Again, I would make the point Washington says we have a surplus. If we have a surplus, why is the debt that our grandchildren and children are going to have to bear rising? Why is it going up? It is because we are not honest in our bookkeeping.

Another way of looking at that, and this chart shows exactly what we have seen and heard about 1998, is what I call the politicians' surplus. Here is what we claim was a surplus, the Washington establishment. But, as my colleagues will note, here is the debt in

1997. What has happened to the debt? The debt went from $5,325 trillion to close to $5,440 trillion, almost a $120 billion increase. So, if the surplus was 60 some billion dollars, how come the debt went up $120 billion?

Look what is projected in 1999. We are going to have this great big surplus that everybody wants to save or spend in a certain way. But look what the debt projection is. These are not my numbers; these are from the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan agency made up and influenced by both Democrats and Republicans, and they are saying the debt is going to continue to rise despite this surplus.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we can see that there is a lack of honesty about our budget policy and there is only one answer. It is called restrained spending. We have to be fiscally disciplined in the money that comes to the Federal Government.

The other thing I have learned is that if we leave money in Washington, do my colleagues know what happens to it? It gets spent. Somebody always has a good idea on a way to spend the money, except the money we are spending now we are stealing from the Social Security system and we are transferring a lowered standard of living to our children.

And what we can see under President Clinton's budget, and this is real numbers by the Congressional Budget Office under the budget that he proposes to see that there is no surplus; the red indicates real deficit in terms of moneys in versus moneys out, and even though all sides of the aisle, Democrat, Republican and the President, are claiming the surplus, we can see from here that one does not exist. Even with a conservative plan that restrains spending we are still going to see a deficit up until about 2000. It may be that the economy is good enough that we may see a real surplus this year. But look at the difference if we restrain spending in terms of real surplus; in other words, something that will actually slow down the growth and the debt, decrease the debt, decrease or, in an inverse, increase the standard of living for our children, that if in fact we will restrain spending, that in fact we will markedly help the children of tomorrow.

Mr. Gutknecht.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for having this special order.

I think we need to put this in some historical context though of where we were just a few years ago when the gentleman, and I and the gentleman from South Carolina who is going to be joining us in a minute, when we were first sent here to Washington after the 1994 elections. The Congressional Budget Office then told us that we were looking at $200 billion deficits growing to nearly $600 billion by the year 2009, and that was using the Social Security surplus to make those deficits look even smaller. So in reality, using honest accounting, honest bookkeeping, those deficits were probably between 350 and over a trillion dollars that we are looking at in annual deficits.

That is where we were just a few years ago, and I think it is important to note how far we have come just in the last several years in part because we have had the fiscal discipline. We have eliminated 400 programs, we have cut the rate in growth in Federal spending by more than half, and that coupled with lowered interest rates that helped bring about and the welfare reform, more people going back to work, a stronger economy; all of that has made it easier for us to get to what will be, I believe this year, the first real balanced budget; in other words, not using the Social Security surplus, the first real balanced budget I think this country has seen in many, many years.

Mr. COBURN. Let me add one thing.

I remember my first year in Congress. We rescinded and cut $70 billion worth of spending from this government that year, and I would tell my colleague that nobody in my district noticed that, and if we extrapolate $70 billion a year over the last 4 years, what we plainly see is the main reason that we are in surplus is what is 70 billion one year becomes 90 billion the next, becomes 120 billion the next, becomes 150, that that is worth about $160 billion in spending that is not happening today that would have happened had we not come in here and done a large rescission and also markedly cut the size of the government in 1995.

And so it is important to use that as a historical thing, that because we had fiscal discipline, that we, in fact, have an opportunity to truly lower the debt, not just the public debt, but all the debt, and that means creating a better future, creating opportunity, creating a standard of living that is going to be greater than what we have experienced for our grandchildren.

I yield back to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The gentleman is correct. I mean that in the end of this debate sometimes we get so caught up with numbers and statistics, we all have charts now, and we can use percentages, and we can talk about dollars and so forth.

But in the end the gentleman is absolutely right. What this debate is about is about generational fairness, and I think we have got to be fair to our parents, and I always talk about in my town hall meetings the fact that I was born in 1951.

Mr. COBURN. Youngster; are you not?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I do not feel quite so young any more, but I will tell my colleagues it is important because we are the peak of the baby boomers, and both my parents are still living, they are both on Social Security, they are both on Medicare, and the last thing I want to do is pull the rug out from under them.

But I also have three kids, and I worry about what kind of a country we are going to pass on to them, what kind of a standard of living are they going to enjoy.

And I want to get our colleague from South Carolina involved in this because something else the gentleman mentioned about using what Einstein called the most powerful force on earth, the magic of compound interest long term to allow individuals to save and invest for their own future. I have been told, and there are different numbers floating around, and it depends on which years you use, but, as my colleagues know, often we hear that Americans do not save enough for the future. But my colleague mentioned before that the average American between what they pay and what their employer pays into Social Security, they are saving about 12½ percent of their annual income.

Now the problem is not that Americans do not save enough. The problem is that we get such a lousy rate of return, and the number that I worked with usually and the average that I have seen provided by the Congressional Budget Office is for the last 30 or 40 years the average rate of return was 1.89 percent.

Now not many Americans would invest 12½ percent of their income into an IRA, or a 401(k), or even a savings account; can only earn 1.9 percent.

Mr. COBURN. It is interesting to note 1.9 percent is not in terms of real rate of return, that is not an inflation adjusted number, because when you do an inflation adjusted number, you go to .6 percent.

One last thing before the gentleman from South Carolina talks. I delivered 97 babies last year as a Member of Congress, and that is pure joy. But with that comes a heartache because I know that unless we change the environment in Washington that those children that I got to spank their back sides of and heard their first cry will never have the opportunity that my children had or I had as a youngster in this country.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. I thank the gentleman for doing so, and I thank him as well for convening this special order.

I want to follow up on what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) said, which was touching on the whole power of compound interest which cannot be underestimated. In fact, I saw an article yesterday in the Washington Post that I wish I had brought with me about an older man that put a little bit of money in stocks and lived a very simple life and yet ended up with a whole lot to show for it.

What I think is interesting on that point though is somebody on my staff was kind enough to do this, and this is a home-done chart, so I guess we are saving the taxpayer money by not having a professional chart done, but it

points out this power of compound interest because in 1937, and I did not realize this, Social Security actually ran a $766 million surplus. It is a pay-as-you-go system, so what is not spent ends up going into the general coffers the way it is now configured.

Now, if we grew that at about 10 percent, maybe that is too high a rate, maybe the appropriate number that the staffer should have picked would be 5 percent or 6 percent, but he picked 10 percent. Anyway, that would result today, that pot of money back in 1937, that $766 million pot of money, if it grew and compounded at about 10 percent, would end up today having about $1.17 trillion in your bank account.

And so when older folks at town hall meetings say to me, ''Mark, you know we wouldn't even be having this problem on Social Security if you all had kept your hands off the money.'' Well, it turns out they are right because just that one year alone you would end up with $1 trillion.

Now 1938 the surplus was $365 million. If again you compounded and grew that over this long time period between now and then, you would end up with about $485 billion in the bank. Well, you add those 2 together, and you get 1.66 trillion.

In 1939, our surplus in Social Security was 590 million bucks. Again, if you grew and compounded that over time, you would end up with $680 billion.

And you do that in 1940; surplus then was $305 million. You grow that and compound that over time, you end up with $310 billion in the bank.

In 1941, our surplus was $760 million in payroll taxes. You grew that and compounded that over time, that would be $670 billion.

In 1942, and I will not over do this point, but the surplus then was $926 million. You grow and compound that over time, you would end up with basically about $700 billion in the bank.

You add all that up just over the 1,2,3,4,5,6 years, that is about $4 trillion.

Now the contention liability with Social Security is about $8 trillion. In other words, very quickly you could get to the point wherein the people in my town hall meetings are exactly right. If Washington had truly kept their hands off the money, if the money had been in an account and had grown and compounded over time, we would not be having this conversation tonight, which goes straight back to what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is getting at, which is this power of compound interest.

The other thought I wanted to pick up on for just 2 seconds is what the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) was talking about, and that is just plain honest accounting, and that is, if you look at the numbers, and again just to pick a couple of numbers, this is fiscal year 1994.

Now everybody thought we ran a deficit of about $200 billion. That would have been the number that was talked about. But what is interesting here is, as the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) very correctly pointed out, if you actually look at how much the debt went up, the debt went up by $293 billion. Same thing happened in 1995. It looked like it was 164, but if you look at how much the debt actually went up, it was 277. Same thing a year later.

□ 2200

The same thing a year later. Apparently it appeared as if our deficit was $100 billion, but if we look at how much the debt went up, it went up $261 billion. Even just this last year it appeared, now that we are in the black, that we ran a surplus of about $70 billion. Again, if we look at how much the debt actually went up, it actually went up by basically $100 billion.

That is not the kind of basic accounting that people use back home in their businesses. It is not the kind of basic accounting somebody uses in balancing the family checkbook. It clearly states we have a real problem with this stuff here in Washington.

I have some other weird charts here in my home-done log of charts, but I do not want to belabor that point. I want to talk about these because it is what we are talking about.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, we will come back to that in just a minute.

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) to comment on this situation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I have enjoyed listening. It just reinforces the things we do every day.

One of my colleagues once said that when we talk about all these numbers, people's eyes glaze over. It is, how does it affect them personally, and can the men and women at the Red Pig understand it. That is what I am going to try and do.

Once it was said that if we do not remember history, then we are likely to repeat it. I would like to take just a brief run, based on my colleague's 1 hour, and I will do it briefly. It is laughable, that Congress spends money, not the White House. We authorize, we appropriate; we authorize to spend it.

For 40 years, except for a small period of 1 term in the Senate, the Democrats have controlled the House and Senate, which controls all spending. When they say that they are fiscally responsible, that is an oxymoron. The debt was acquired, the deficit was acquired, and it put us on a negative road.

They have to spend. I feel sorry for my colleagues on the other side because they have to spend. By their party, they want big government because they believe government can do it better. That requires spending, and that increases taxes to pay for it. It is automatic. They have to spend that.

What I would like to do is take us on a walk through memory lane. When I came in in 1990, we said that enough was enough. We had the Gang of Seven. I don't know if Members remember that, for those who were not here. We shut down the House bank. We shut down the post office, because we knew that an individual here was dealing stamps. We set about to do the balanced budget. As a matter of fact, a lot of us wanted the Speaker to be changed at that point, so we could move ahead.

But my colleagues said in 1993 that it took courage for them to vote for that budget. It went by for me, because they said in 1993 their highest tax increase in the history of the United States is responsible for the economy today.

Let us take a look. In 1993, they promised a tax cut for what they call the middle class. First of all, there are no middle class citizens in this country, they are middle-income. I think we do a disservice to people by calling them middle class.

They said they would give tax relief for that group. They increased the tax in that budget. They increased taxes themselves by $270 billion. They cut defense $127 billion. They increased the tax on social security. They cut the COLA for veterans, they cut the COLAs for military. They had no welfare reform, they had no education reform.

When they had the White House, the House and Senate, did they have a minimum wage increase? Absolutely not. They said that was not the way to stimulate growth or jobs.

When we took the majority in 1994, we did away with the 1993 tax increase. We dissolved it. What did we do? The first thing, we gave back middle-income tax breaks. There are a whole host of ways we did that. People are enjoying that today.

We were not able to increase defense. It went down under that watch. That is one of the low points, I think, of our particular budget. But we took away the increase on social security tax. We reinstated our veterans' COLA. We reinstated our active duty military COLA, and while the Democrats put $100 million against us, while we were trying to save Medicare, and blasted us from the unions and all sides, at the end, the President signed our Medicare bill, after he vetoed it.

Because of welfare reform, the welfare reform we did in 1995, we have billions of dollars coming into the Treasury instead of going out. The average was 16 years. We changed that. So for them to say that they were responsible for the economy today is laughable.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman is so right. Again, with my homemade charts here, I have another chart showing that exact point the gentleman is making, which is that Washington has been getting bigger raises than working families have gotten.

I do not want to bore people to death with a lot of numbers, but whether we start in 1993, we go to 1994, this is the rate at which money coming into

Washington has gone up. This is the rate at which people's pocketbooks, if you will, their earnings, have gone up. In every case, it is that red line, which is the money coming into Washington, that has been going up faster than money back home.

To say it another way, if we look at these two little lines, this is the rate at which Washington has been getting raises versus the rate at which the rest of America has been getting raises. So the gentleman is exactly right, the thing that is ''balancing the books'' up here has been hard-earned taxpayer dollars coming into Washington, as opposed to fiscal restraint.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman. The overall point I am trying to make is that Alan Greenspan, because of our tax relief, of us ''balancing the budget,'' do Members remember when the President said, I can do it in 7 years, in 2 years, in 3 years? It is an arbitrary number. When we finally pinned the President down, three of his budgets increased the deficits by over $260 billion, with a forecast to $200 billion forever.

What we did is say no, a balanced budget is important. For them to say that they are fiscally responsible, I would ask Members, look at every bill on the Floor. The other side of the aisle will always want to increase the spending. They will say, we are cutting, we are cutting, except for one area, in defense. That is their cash cow. They also want to raise taxes to pay for it.

My last statement I would like to make, I would like Members to look up www.dsausa.org, on the Web page. That stands for the Democrat Socialists of America. This is on the Web page, this is not the gentleman from California (Mr. DUKE CUNNINGHAM). In there is the Progressive Caucus.

In the socialist contract, they want government health care. What did they do when they had the leadership of the White House, the House and Senate? They want to cut defense in this Web page by 50 percent. What does the President do? He has cut it in half. They want to cut it 50 percent more. They want government control of education, private property; they want union control over small business; they want to increase socialized spending the highest ever. They want to raise taxes to the highest progressive tax ever, in this 12-point agenda. How do they pay for it? By increased taxes and cutting the military.

That is not what other forefathers meant when they talked about fiscal responsibility. We cannot do it by having government do it. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend just a minute here going over the present budgets, if we can.

Mr. SANFORD. Before the gentleman does so, if the gentleman will yield for one more second, again, I want to follow up on the point of the gentleman from California.

Consistently, the way the rhetoric works around Washington, we would think that Republicans are trying to slash and burn and basically eliminate the city and eliminate all Federal functions. That is what I think is very interesting about this chart.

If we look at this line, would the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) tell me whether the line goes up or down? It is a one-way line, and that is going up. All Federal spending in Washington, D.C. has not been cut in real dollars or in nominal dollars. On the whole it has been going up. In 1994 it was $1.4 trillion. In fiscal year 1999, it is $1.7 trillion. The Republicans have not been cutting, eliminating. In fact, things have been going up in Washington.

Mr. COBURN. Actually, the gentleman makes my point. We have not done as good a job as we should have. We should have restrained spending more.

Let me spend a few minutes talking about the budget proposal of President Clinton and what has happened in 1999, and what has been projected. Then I want the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) to kind of talk on these budget items.

The other thing we hear, and I hope we get some time to spend on it, is Medicare. I know a lot about Medicare because I interact with Medicare every day as a physician. I know the ins and outs of it. I know what is good about it and what is bad about it.

The one thing I want the American public to know is the Congress, regardless of its politics, regardless of the rhetoric, nobody in Washington wants to do anything except enhance the viability of Medicare.

What I want to do is go through the budget for 1999, which we are operating under right now. By the end of this year, the fiscal surplus on social security, the amount of money taken in versus the amount of money taken out, is expected to be $127 billion.

If the government would have exercised fiscal discipline, we would have saved $126 billion. That is where this red line is. But we did not. Last year in the omnibus appropriations bill this Congress, over the threat of a government shutdown, spent $15 billion above what the budget caps had said we would spend in 1997, an agreement that the President agreed to and the Congress agreed to. They did not keep it.

What happens? Instead of a $127 billion surplus, it became $111. Now the President wants to spend another $1 billion on foreign aid. That takes us down to $110 billion in terms of social security.

We have a chance to have a real surplus this year because the revenues coming to the Federal Government, as the gentleman from South Carolina said, are rising. Why are they rising? It is called bracket creep. As people make more money, they move into a higher tax bracket, so therefore, the government takes more of our money. They reward us for working harder and earning more by taking a lot of that money away. What happens is the revenues to the Federal Government grow.

If we take the President's budget, the Congressional Budget Office estimates there will be $138 billion more in social security coming in than is paid out. Our idea is to not spend any of that on anything but social security, to solve the problems associated with Medicare and social security; to not spend any of it, to save 100 percent of it.

If we reject what the Republican budget plan is, the Congressional Budget Office anticipates right now that we will spend at least $5 billion of that $138 billion, bringing us down to only taking $5 billion out of the social security trust fund. We will only have $133 billion.

If we take what the President has proposed under his budget proposal, we will take another $20 billion of that and spend it. Remember, we all agreed in 1997 that we are not going to spend above the caps. We already have $35 billion proposed spending above the caps.

Finally, if we take the President's plan of saving 62 percent of the social security fund and spending 38 percent on new spending, what we get down to is actually, by all his plans, down to somewhere around 57 or 58 percent he wants to save.

If something is wrong, it is wrong all the time. If it is wrong to take the social security trust fund, and what that means is lowering the standard of living for our children and grandchildren, and placing a tremendous increased burden on them from a tax standpoint, it is wrong now, it was wrong before, as we have seen from the gentleman from South Carolina's chart, and it is wrong for the future.

There is no way we will ever solve this problem until we start being honest about what the word ''surplus'' means, until we start being honest about the social security trust fund, and we start being honest about the problems coming up with Medicare.

Nobody is proposing that we spend this money on anything except social security. It is true that we will reduce external debt with that, but the total debt will not go up if we do not spend this money, so it is important that we have the restraint on spending.

I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to read a couple of quotes.

In his 1998 State of the Union Address, President Clinton said, ''Tonight I propose that we reserve 100 percent of the surplus, every penny of any surplus, until we have taken all the necessary measures to strengthen social security for the 21st century.''

This year the President lowered the bar. This year he said, ''I propose that we commit 62 percent of the budget surplus for the next 15 years to social security.''

We took the President at his word. In the budget that we will debate tomorrow, the House Republican-passed

budget will take 100 percent. That means that every single penny, for the first time I think perhaps in my lifetime, every penny of social security taxes will only go for social security.

What we will do with money that is not needed to pay those benefits is we will actually pay off some of the debt that is owed to the public.

□ 2215

The debt will still probably go up slightly.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, let me ask a question because the assumption in the partisan nature of this place is, if we say that money in there is a real surplus, then automatically money is going to go out of Washington to give a tax cut to the rich.

Does the gentleman know anybody in Washington in any area that is proposing to do that?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, in fact what we will do is make a determination of where we need to use that money. If it is shoring up Medicare, we will use it for shoring up Medicare.

But I will remind the gentleman and the American people that we had a commission that gave great recommendations on Medicare and how to save it, and the President rejected his own commission on what to do.

I think the gentleman has some things that are very important for us in discussing that in his charts.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. But first, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to establish that our priorities are very clear in our budget. First and foremost, we need to solve that problem. If the gentleman will put that chart up with the blue and the red bars which demonstrates where we are headed with the Social Security Trust Fund, it demonstrates why it is so important that we begin as soon as we can to say that every penny of Social Security taxes will go only for Social Security. We are going to do that this year. That is the most important thing.

Now if we find out come later in the year that there is more revenue available, then we should allow some of the families to keep some of what they earn. I happen to believe that if we do start talking about tax relief as this process goes forward, I believe that the first and foremost tax we ought to solve is this marriage penalty tax.

Every year about 21 million American families pay a penalty for being married. They pay extra taxes to the tune of an average of about $1,200 per family just because they are married. That is my own personal opinion. That has nothing to do with the rich versus the poor. That has nothing to do, in my opinion, with right versus wrong.

But the gentleman asked about Social Security and Medicare. I might just point out we were talking earlier, and the gentleman from South Carolina I think will appreciate this particular chart and this quote. One of the things we believe long-term, I believe, is allowing individuals to take at least a portion of their FICA taxes and be able to invest for themselves in personalized retirement accounts and take advantage of what Einstein described as the most powerful force on earth, the magic of compound interest.

But I want to make it clear, the President has a slightly different scheme. What he wants to do is take taxpayer money and invest it directly in the stock market.

One of the people who has probably had more influence on fiscal policy, at least as it relates to the Federal Reserve and interest rates and all the things that have helped keep this economy strong, is a gentleman by the name of Alan Greenspan. I want to just read this quote and what he said about the President's scheme of investing taxpayer money without the permission of retirees directly in the stock market.

He said, and I quote, ''Investing a portion of the Social Security Trust Fund assets in equities, as the administration and others have proposed, would arguably put at risk the efficiency of our capital markets and thus our economy. Even with Herculean efforts, I doubt if it would be feasible to insulate the trust funds from the political pressures.'' That is what Alan Greenspan said.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, everybody up here knows that that would happen, that political pressure would decide what and how that money was invested.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make it clear, we look at this as a possibility in the future of allowing people to invest for themselves, where on the other side the administration is saying, ''Well, we will invest it for you.'' With that we see all the political pressures and really the tremendous number of potential conflicts of interest.

I mean what would the government do if they were one of the largest investors in Microsoft, for example? Could they pursue the antitrust suit that they are doing right now, or any antitrust suit?

In fact, it is estimated that if we went ahead with the scheme that the President was talking about, that within 10 years the Federal Government could own as much as 25 percent of all the stocks on the New York Stock Exchange, and we become more than the 800-pound gorilla. It is more like the 5,000-pound gorilla on Wall Street.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will yield, I would just pick up where the gentleman from Minnesota leaves off now.

I think Alan Greenspan very correctly pointed out the dangers in collective investment. It sounds good, it sounds alluring, and that is, let us send all the money to Washington, let the experts take care of it.

But there are real dangers that come with that idea. This other idea, again we are talking about a gradual shift in that direction. It would take time. It is going to take a lot of debate in this place. But the idea of allowing people to invest a portion of their payroll tax in their own personal account does take advantage of this powerful compound interest and takes advantage of it in, I think, a special way that was highlighted in the Washington Post today.

In the Metro section of today's Washington Post, there is an article entitled, the ''Munificence of an Unusual Millionaire''. If I may, I would like to read just the first couple of paragraphs of this article.

> Karl H. Hagen lived modestly and alone for much of his life, in his family's decaying farmhouse in Suitland. For 36 years, he worked for the Potomac Electric Power Co., painting signs and fences and doing other maintenance jobs.
>
> He did indulge in a few passions, however, including travel, watercolor painting, reading, ballroom dancing, and investing in stocks and bonds.
>
> The latter paid off in a big way.
>
> Hagen, whose clothes came from thrift shops and who looked to acquaintances as though he might be homeless, managed to amass a fortune of about $3 million. When he died of a stroke last Thursday at the age of 89, he left his estate to three institutions that had earned his admiration: . . . Johns Hopkins University, the National Air and Space Museum and National Geographic Society.

I think that that says a lot about this simple thing of compound interest so well highlighted in today's Washington Post on the front page of the Metro section.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, what we are going to hear tomorrow, too, I think that is important in terms of Medicare, is that they want to take 15 percent of Social Security money and shift it over to Medicare. That may or may not be a good idea, but if we are going to preserve Social Security, the one way to do it is not to spend Social Security money on Medicare, because all we are going to do is undermine Social Security even further.

President Clinton's own chairman, Senator BREAUX, had this quote from the Wall Street Journal on March 12. ''I think what we have on the table is a classic Clinton New Democrat reform, but there are entrenched people within the White House who do not want any change.''

The fact is, if we are going to save Medicare, it is going to have to have some change. Politicians generally worry about changing something as important as Medicare. It takes real courage to solve the Medicare problem. But we have to change it if we are going to solve it. We can not solve it, and we can do the same thing to our children on Medicare as we have done on Social Security, and that is steal the money from somewhere else and then raise their taxes in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I just yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) on that point. I think he has a

chart that talks about the amount of money that can be saved if we fiscally restrain spending.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I would just point out a couple of charts, because there is going to be, I suspect, a rather heated debate tomorrow and for the next several weeks about who is doing a better job of saving Medicare and Social Security.

I think the numbers do speak for themselves. This is a chart, and again, these are not our numbers. These numbers actually are generated by the Congressional Budget Office. But it shows that over the next 10 years we are going to save $1.8 trillion for Medicare. The Clinton plan, which is rather complicated and difficult to explain, will save about $1.65 trillion over that period. There is a big difference.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, the difference is $150 billion.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Exactly. Mr. Speaker, that is a lot of money even around here.

Mr. COBURN. Right.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, let me point out, though, what some of the Congressional Budget Office people and what the Office of Management and Budget also said. They did not actually use the term ''irresponsible''. I want to show this article which appeared in the Washington Post last week, and they were both very, very critical of the Clinton plan. Basically, they described it as sort of a smoke and mirrors type plan.

Frankly, even the chairman and many of the Democrats who either served on or were very involved in the Medicare Commission essentially came to the same conclusion, that what the President was really proposing was nothing. He was proposing taking more general fund revenues to try and supplement Medicare, when really what we need with Medicare is not necessarily just more money. We need real reforms. We need to get under the hood, as Ross Perot used to say, and really fix this thing.

By doing what the President was doing, it was called irresponsible because it really, in some respects, only makes the problem worse over the long-term.

So I think we are going to have a good and healthy and heated debate about Medicare, but it is important to see what some experts have said. It is not just us. As I say, it is the Congressional Budget Office. It is OMB. It is columnist David Broder.

He wrote a column last week. It appeared in Sunday's Washington Post. The headline was ''Medicare: Another Clinton failure?''

As we look through his plan, and it is described in detail here, and if people would like a copy, we can certainly make certain they can get a copy of it, but there have been many people who have studied the Clinton plan and they say this is a joke, and unfortunately it is kind of a sad joke for American seniors.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I do with my seniors who are on Medicare, I have actually asked them this at home when the President started talking about a drug benefit, we are talking about here we go again, politicians adding a benefit to a program that we cannot afford now. When we ask the seniors, ''Do you want to increase the benefits associated with Medicare, and the way we are going to pay it is we are taking it away from your grandchildren,'' they uniformly say no.

But they also will say, ''If you will spend wiser in Washington, maybe you can do more for me, because I am struggling.'' But they do not want their children and their grandchildren to have to pay for it.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for being here tonight. My purpose is not partisanship. My purpose is to make sure the American public knows that there are some of us here that are going to honestly talk about what the numbers are, honestly talk about being critical of both Republicans and Democrats in the past in terms of the mistakes that have been made that have been politically expedient.

I want to close this tonight with a statement that Martin Luther King said in his last speech in the Washington Cathedral not long before he was assassinated. What he said was is that ''Vanity asked the question, is it popular? And cowardice asked the question, is it expedient? But conscience asked the question, is it right?''

The gentleman related to something, right versus wrong. For too long Washington has been asking the wrong question. What they have been saying is, is it popular, and is it expedient for my political career, versus is it right for our country, right for the future generation and the following?

I hope the Congress will have the courage to do what is right rather than what is expedient and what is popular. That is what we are sent up here to do.

RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF WOMEN OF COLOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for organizing the special order that was supposed to be on women's history, although it had been altered.

I would just like to offer my remarks for this evening. Let me also add that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has certainly put her stamp on history through her outstanding work here in the House of Representatives and being the first African American woman to be elected to her district.

It is fitting indeed that we honor the achievements of women of color, who for too long were neglected in our Nation's history. In recent years, it has been exciting to watch school children learn about African American women of strength, courage, and dignity who shaped the course of history.

We can point with pride to women like Harriet Tubman who secretly guided over 300 slaves to freedom on the ''Underground Railroad.'' She spent time working in my home State of New Jersey at Cape May between 1849 and 1852.

We honor the legacy of Sojourner Truth, who was freed from slavery by the New York State Emancipation Act of 1827, became famous in her lifetime as a preacher and abolitionist and lecturer. When war broke out, she raised money to buy gifts for the soldiers and went into Army camps and distributed them by herself.

We recall the contributions of Mary McLeod Bethune, who built Bethune-Cookman College in Florida and founded the National Council of Negro Women. She was the first black woman to receive a major appointment in the Federal Government.

□ 2230

She served as an adviser to President Franklin Roosevelt and to President Truman.

There have been so many remarkable women of color that it is impossible to pay tribute to all of them tonight. We have all had the opportunity to meet women who were personal heroines in our own lives, and I would like to pay tribute to three women who have had the greatest impact on my early life, African American women who have made a direct contribution to my growth and development. And these three women, other than my late mother and grandmother, have had a tremendous impact on my development.

The first one I would like to mention is Mrs. Madeline Williams, who was an adviser of the NAACP Youth Councils and College Chapter of the Oranges and Maplewood in New Jersey. When I was invited to join the NAACP as a college student she provided the opportunity for young people to become involved in civic activities and public service. She helped me develop an interest in civil rights at a time in history when we were all moved to become involved. I remain grateful to her for giving me the opportunity to become involved in civil rights and government affairs.

Another great woman who exerted an enormous positive influence on my life was Mrs. Mary Burch, founder of a group called The Leaguers, which helped young people from the inner city to become more involved in their activities in their cities.

Belonging to the Leaguers opened up a whole new world for young people like myself, a world from which we otherwise would have been excluded. Never before had we been able to have

the opportunity to wear formal attire when I was a young boy; to learn the waltz and to attend cotillion dances in a ballroom. It was an uplifting experience which taught us about social graces and made us feel special.

The Leaguers sponsored many innovative programs. I recall as a teenager my excitement over my first real trip as a high school student away from home, to visit Philadelphia, through a Leaguer exchange program. Later, the student I visited, Joe Wade, stayed at my home in Newark. Forging friendships and relationships with young people from different cities was exciting, it was novel, and it was a great experience. This year we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Leaguers.

Finally, let me just mention another exceptional woman from New Jersey whom I was pleased to join at a celebration recently at her hundredth birthday at the YWCA in Montclair last week, and that is Mrs. Hortense Tate. Her career spanned seven decades of service through education as a teacher and guidance counselor, the enrichment and development of young women through the Montclair YWCA and the AKA sorority, and over 70 years of service to her church.

When I was a young teacher at Robert Treat School in 1957, Mrs. Tate guided me and inspired me. She comes from on outstanding family; her father worked his way up from a blue collar job to become a principal of an African American school in Topeka, Kansas. As we all know, the 1954 Supreme Court case was based on the Topeka Board of Education that said separate but equal is unconstitutional. He was acquainted with Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver.

Mrs. Tate entertained Mary McLeod Bethune and Dorothy Height. Her son, Herb Tate, was a distinguished foreign diplomat, and her grandson, Herbert H. Tate, Junior, is President of the State of New Jersey Board of Public Utilities.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in honoring these women of achievement who have, as the theme of this Women's History Month goes, ''put their stamp on America.'' I am so pleased to have the chance to express my personal gratitude and admiration for women who have meant so much to me throughout my life. I would not be here if it were not for the faith, confidence and direction that these persons have had on my life.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. SLAUGHTER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for Wednesday, March 24th, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OLVER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JEFFERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes each day, today and on March 25.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENGLISH, for 5 minutes, on March 25.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, on March 25.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, on March 25.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 437. An act to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 333 Las Vegas Boulevard South in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the ''Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse'' to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 460. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 401 South Michigan Street in South Bend, Indiana, as the ''Robert K. Rodibaugh United States Bankruptcy Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 25, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1246. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Recourse Loan Regulations for Mohair (RIN: 0560–AF63) received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1247. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting Final regulations—Graduate Assistance in the Areas of National Need, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1248. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Final Regulations—Assistance to States for the Education of children with Disabilities and the Early Intervention Program for Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1249. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Demonstration Projects to Ensure Students with Disabilities Receive a Quality Higher Education. Notice of final priorities and invitation for applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 1999—received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1250. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1998 annual report on the Loan Repayment Program for Research Generally, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2541—1(i); to the Committee on Commerce.

1251. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Criteria and Procedures for DOE Contractor Employee Protection Program; Department of Energy Acquisition Regulations (RIN: 1901–AA78) received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1252. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Acquisition Regulation; Department of Energy Management and Operating Contracts and Other Designated Contracts; Final Rule—received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1253. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Augusta, Wisconsin) [MM Docket No. 98–234, RM–9324] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1254. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Knox City, Texas) [MM Docket No. 98–236, RM–9344] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1255. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amdendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Healdton, Oklahoma and Krum, Texas) [MM Docket No. 98–50; RM–9247] Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Pauls Valley and Healdton, Oklahoma) [MM Docket No. 98–75; RM–9264] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1256. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Manhattan, Montana) [MM Docket No. 98–233 RM–9316] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1257. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—List of Drug Products That Have Been Withdrawn or Removed From the Market for Reasons of Safety or Effectiveness [Docket No. 98N–0655] received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1258. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Standard Review Plan on Foreign Ownership, Control, or Domination—received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1259. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting reports in accordance with Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1260. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1261. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

1262. A letter from the Director, Selective Service, transmitting Activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1263. A letter from the Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on the activities of the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization for 1998; to the Committee on Resources.

1264. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 961204340–7087–02; I.D. 031299A] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1265. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation (Sikorsky) Model S–76C Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–22–AD; Amendment 39–11083; AD 99–07–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1266. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; CFM International CFM56–5 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–56–AD; Amendment 39–11079; AD 99–06–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1267. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace HP137 MK1, Jetstream Series 200, and Jetstream Models 3101 and 3201 Airplanes [Docket No. 98–CE–92–AD; Amendment 39–11075; AD 99–06–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1268. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. (Agusta) Model A109E Helicopeters [Docket No. 99–SW–10–AD; Amendment 39–11080; AD 99–03–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1269. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–400, -400D, and -400F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96–NM–171–AD; Amendment 39–11082; AD 99–06–18] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1270. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change of Using Agency for Prohibited Area P–56, District of Columbia [Airspace Docket No. 98–AWA–4] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received March 22,1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1271. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class D Airspace and Modification of Class E Airspace; Bozeman, MT [Airspace Docket No. 98–ANM–19] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1272. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification to the Gulf of Mexico High Offshore Airspace Area [Airspace Docket No. 97–ASW–24] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1273. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328–100 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–198–AD; Amendment 39–11078; AD 99–06–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) receivedMarch 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1274. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace HP137 Mk1, Jetstream Series 200, and Jetstream Models 3101 and 3201 Airplanes [Docket No. 98–CE–102–AD; Amendment 39–11076; AD 99–06–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1275. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revocation of Class E Airspace, Revision of Class D Airspace; Torrance, CA [Airspace Docket No. 98–AWP–34] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1276. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Alliance, NE [Airspace Docket No. 98–ACE–54] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1277. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Alliance, NE [Airspace Docket No. 98–ACE–54] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1278. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29487; Amdt. No. 1919] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1279. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29488; Amdt. No. 1920] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1280. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Taxation of fringe benefits [Rev. Rul. 99–12] received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1281. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property [Revenue Ruling 99–17] received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 131. Resolution providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2009 (Rept. 106–77). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 1243. A bill to reauthorize the National Marine Sanctuaries Act; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SHAW, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OXLEY,

Mr. MINGE, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. EWING, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOEHNER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. JOHN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas):

H.R. 1244. A bill to provide a framework for consideration by the legislative and executive branches of unilateral economic sanctions; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 1245. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to regulate the transfer of firearms over the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DUNN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 1246. A bill to create a National Museum of Women's History Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 1247. A bill to expand the fund raising authorities of the American Battle Monuments Commission to expedite the establishment of the World War II memorial in the District of Columbia and to ensure adequate funds for the repair and long-term maintenance of the memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. KELLY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CARSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. WILSON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. DANNER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WAXMAN, and Ms. GRANGER):

H.R. 1248. A bill to prevent violence against women; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARR of Georgia (for himself, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. COLLINS, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. ISAKSON):

H.R. 1249. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a national cemetery for veterans in the Atlanta, Georgia, metropolitan area; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LAFALCE (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. LEE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii):

H.R. 1250. A bill to amend the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 to clarify and improve the requirements for the development of an automated entry-exit control system, to enhance land border control and enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 1251. A bill to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 8850 South 700 East, Sandy, Utah, as the ''Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1252. A bill to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to repeal the Interstate System Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Pilot Program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. CRANE, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 1253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restrict the use of tax-exempt financing by governmentally owned electric utilities and to subject certain activities of such utilities to income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. MCINNIS):

H.R. 1254. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a refund of up to 5 percent of the income tax otherwise payable for taxable year 1999; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD (for himself, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 1255. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to add Hickman, Lawrence, Lewis, Perry, and Wayne Counties, Tennessee, to the Appalachian region; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FOSSELLA (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

H.R. 1256. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide for an annual limit on the amount of certain fees which may be collected by the Securities and Exchange Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FROST:

H.R. 1257. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to continuation of operating assistance for small transit operators in large urbanized areas; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SALMON, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. ROHRABACHER):

H.R. 1258. A bill to accelerate the Wilderness designation process by establishing a timetable for the completion of wilderness studies on Federal Lands; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HERGER (for himself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. CRANE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. DUNN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. BILBRAY):

H.R. 1259. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BORSKI (for himself and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H.R. 1260. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the harbor maintenance tax and to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1986 to authorize appropriations for activities formerly funded with revenues from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOBSON (for himself, Mr. KASICH, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. SAWYER):

H.R. 1261. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and title XIX of the Social Security Act to promote the purchase of private long-term care insurance by providing tax deductibility, State Medicaid flexibility, and information dissemination; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 1262. A bill to provide that existing facilities located on the Pentwater River in Michigan, are not required to be licensed by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission under part 1 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. COBURN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Mr. SANFORD):

H.R. 1263. A bill to require the Federal Government to disclose to Federal employees on each paycheck the Government's share of taxes for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and for hospital insurance of the employee, and the Government's total payroll allocation for the employee; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr.

COBURN, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. SCHAFFER, and Mr. SANFORD):

H.R. 1264. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that each employer show on the W–2 form of each employee the employer's share of taxes for old-age, survivors, and disability insurance and for hospital insurance for the employee as well as the total amount of such taxes for such employee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. FORD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LARSON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. FROST, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WEINER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FATTAH, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 1265. A bill to develop a demonstration project through the National Science Foundation to encourage interest in the fields of mathematics, science, and information technology; to the Committee on Science, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 1266. A bill to authorize appropriations for the payment of United States arrearages to the United Nations; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 1267. A bill to provide grants to local educational agencies that agree to begin school for secondary students after 9:00 in the morning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARY MILLER of California:

H.R. 1268. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to ensure the integrity of the Social Security trust funds by requiring the Managing Trustee to invest such trust funds in marketable obligations of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 1269. A bill to amend the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 to strengthen sanctions for violations of that Act relating to oil or gas royalties; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MINGE:

H.R. 1270. A bill to authorize States and political subdivisions of States to control the management of municipal solid waste generated within their jurisdictions, and to exempt States and political subdivisions of States from civil liability with respect to the good faith passage, implementation, and enforcement of flow control ordinances; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 1271. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit discrimination in the payment of wages on account of sex, race, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NUSSLE:

H.R. 1272. A bill to amend the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to allow State educational agencies and local educational agencies to establish and implement uniform policies with respect to discipline and order applicable to all children within their jurisdiction to ensure safety and an appropriate educational atmosphere in their schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OXLEY (for himself and Mr. HALL of Texas):

H.R. 1273. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to repeal unconstitutional reporting and recordkeeping requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1274. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for medical research related to developing vaccines against widespread diseases; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 1275. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to prohibit the interstate movement of live birds for the purpose of having the birds participate in animal fighting; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. STARK, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DIXON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1276. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to protect consumers from certain unreasonable practices of creditors which result in higher fees or rates of interest for credit cardholders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SANDERS:

H.R. 1277. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to establish the National Public Employment Relations Commission, and to amend title I of the Employment Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to provide for joint trusteeship of single-employer pension plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 1278. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the limitation on the estate tax deduction for family-owned business interests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 1279. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States post office located at 223 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, Mississippi, as the ''Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and United States Post Office''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 1280. A bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to ban toys which in size, shape, or overall appearance resemble real handguns; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

H.J. Res. 41. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

H.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution to amend the War Powers Resolution; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana):

H.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution disapproving the certification of the President under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 regarding foreign assistance for Mexico during fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BONILLA (for himself and Mr. NETHERCUTT):

H. Con. Res. 69. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Government of Costa Rica should take steps to protect the lives of property owners in Costa Rica, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BONILLA (for himself, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. KOLBE, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ):

H. Con. Res. 70. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be parity among the countries that are parties to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) with respect to the personal allowance for duty-free merchandise purchased abroad by returning residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CALLAHAN:

H. Con. Res. 71. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that State and local governments and local educational agencies are encouraged to dedicate a day of learning to the study and understanding of the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution, and the Federalist Papers; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 72. A concurrent resolution providing support to the United States Armed Forces in their efforts to halt the brutal ethnic cleansing of Kosovar Albanians; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H. Con. Res. 73. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that secondary schools should consider starting school after 9:00 in the morning; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr.

PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. TIERNEY, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H. Con. Res. 74. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding maintenance of the nuclear weapons stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WYNN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KING, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FROST, and Mr. CANADY of Florida):

H. Con. Res. 75. A concurrent resolution condemning the National Islamic Front (NIF) government for its genocidal war in southern Sudan, support for terrorism, and continued human rights violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SALMON:

H. Con. Res. 76. A concurrent resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SHOWS (for himself, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MOORE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. DANNER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FROST, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BUYER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. QUINN, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H. Con. Res. 77. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued by the United States Postal Service honoring the members of the Armed Forces who have been awarded the Purple Heart; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. COX (for himself and Mr. DICKS):

H. Res. 129. A resolution extending the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns With the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. Res. 130. A resolution expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the members of the United States Armed Forces who are engaged in military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GEJDENSON:

H. Res. 132. A resolution expressing the support of the House of Representatives for the members of the United States Armed Forces who are engaged in military operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 51: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 52: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CRANE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FROST, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. STARK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. KING, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. BASS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 66: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 82: Mr. FORBES and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 86: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 110: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BOYD, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 133: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 150: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 170: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 218: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 325: Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 347: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 355: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FORBES, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 371: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. OBEY.

H.R. 407: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HILLEARY, and Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 423: Mr. HILL of Montana.

H.R. 443: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 461: Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 488: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 491: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 500: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 501: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 523: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 528: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 534: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 573: Mr. LARSON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WU, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 574: Mr. METCALF

H.R. 580: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 584: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H.R. 590: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 610: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 612: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 614: Mr. GANSKE.

H.R. 625: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 670: Mr. HULSHOF and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 691: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 692: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 693: Mr. HULSHOF.

H.R. 697: Mr. LINDER, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 719: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 732: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 741: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 746: Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 750: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 765: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 766: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 772: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DIXON, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ.

H.R. 789: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 797: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 798: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 815: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 832: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 833: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. NEY, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 846: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 847: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FROST, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 851: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. MOORE, Mr. PETRI, Mr. NEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MINGE, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 860: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 870: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 894: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 922: Mr. LARGENT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 925: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 937: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 958: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 961: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 964: Mr. GILMAN and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 976: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. COOK, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. REYES, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 987: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCINNIS, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1008: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1036: Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 1042: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. NUSSLE, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1044: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 1048: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1053: Mr. TIERNEY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1063: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1071: Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1080: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1082: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 1116: Mr. FROST and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 1139: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1145: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 1146: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1160: Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 1195: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 1214: Mr. FROST and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1217: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. CROWLEY.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. KLINK.

H. Con. Res. 6: Mr. LANTOS.

H. Con. Res. 14: Mr. SISISKY, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. GOODLING.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. HILLEARY.

H. Res. 15: Mr. CONYERS.

H. Res. 41: Mr. KLINK, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H. Res. 82: Mr. SANDERS.

H. Res. 97: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Res. 106: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. PICKERING.

H. Res. 128: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1150: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.J. Res. 37: Mr. PORTER.