in 1776; Andrew Jackson in 1815; William Henry Harrison, in 1818; Zachary Taylor, three times, in 1846, 1847, and 1848; and Ulysses S. Grant, in 1863.

President Harry S. Truman was honored posthumously in 1984.

Mrs. Ford will be the second First Lady to be so honored; the first was Lady Bird Johnson in 1984.

Gerald Ford is, of course, best known for his service as the 38th President of the United States who attempted to move the Nation past the scars left by the Watergate scandal.

He was the first person in history to have been appointed Vice President of the United States to fill a vacancy, pursuant to the 25th amendment to the Constitution.

He was confirmed in that office by vote of this House and of the Senate.

He was also the first person to have assumed the Presidency, in 1974, without having been elected to national office. As such, Gerald Ford served the Nation for two years and five months as President under very trying political circumstances.

But Gerald Ford is best known to this chamber as a ''Man of the House'', who served from 1949 to 1973 as a Representative from Michigan and from 1965 to 1973 as minority leader of the House.

While Representative Ford could be tough and partisan, he represented a tradition of bipartisanship and friendship across the aisle which served the House and the Nation well for many years. His accession to the Presidency was welcomed with joy by Members of Congress from both parties.

In his retirement, the former President has often spoken out against the divisiveness and harsh partisanship which have enveloped our political institutions in the decades after he left office, and which have so damaged the national interest.

Betty Ford, a model of an outspoken and courageous First Lady in the White House, is perhaps best known since her retirement for showing Americans who suffer from personal despair that recovery is possible.

She established the Betty Ford Center, to help those seeking to reestablish productive lives after suffering from drug dependency.

She has been active in many philanthropic causes.

Madam Speaker, the Fords were perhaps the first modern ''First Family'' to jointly lead both active public and private lives once out of office, and they established a pattern for other Presidents and spouses to follow in the future.

They set a worthy example of service to America, and I am pleased to support our action today in approving this ceremony to recognize their achievements.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 196, which will allow us to use the Rotunda to present a fitting tribute to President and Mrs. Gerald Ford—the Congressional Golf Medal. I would like to thank Mr. EHLERS, who now represents the Grand Rapids area, for his work on this measure.

We are all aware of President Ford's political accomplishments: a 25 year career in the House of Representatives, serving as vice-president and then president. Throughout his career he represented Michigan and this country with dignity and was a great example to those that have followed in his footsteps in this House. He will forever be associated with the University of Michigan, and he always carried this pedigree proudly. President Ford ascended to the highest office in the land during one of the most turbulent periods in our political history, and it is the grace that he and his wife Betty comported themselves that is perhaps their greatest legacy. President Ford restored a sense of stability to the office that was absolutely essential for both domestic and foreign relations. Among her many accomplishments, Mrs. Ford's dedication to helping others fight the terrible effects of breast cancer and substance abuse is well-known, and is illustrative of the caring decency this family came to represent.

Madam Speaker, Gerald Ford answered the call when his country needed it most. His example of professionalism in the worst of circumstances helped the United States through one of its worst constitutional crises. I look forward to seeing this wonderful couple receive this well-deserved award, and I join my colleagues and the citizens of this country in thanking them for their devoted service.

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

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I have no other requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 196.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 196.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) at 5 p.m.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COBURN moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2670 be instructed to agree, to the extent within the scope of the conference, to provisions that—

(1) reduce nonessential spending in programs within the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and other related agencies;

(2) reduce spending on international organizations, in particular, in order to honor the commitment of the Congress to protect Social Security; and

(3) do not increase overall spending to a level that exceeds the higher of the House bill or the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This motion to instruct is parliamentary procedure only to reemphasize the importance of the process that we presently find ourselves.

Today, unfortunately, President Clinton vetoed the Foreign Operations bill and with that veto he made the statement that we did not have enough money in the funding for the things that he wanted in terms of foreign operations. As we have struggled this year to limit the spending in this Congress so that we do not touch Social Security money, part of the way we have done that is to flat-line the amount of money that is spent on the Foreign Operations bill. In fact, it is the only bill that we sent to the President that is somewhat less than the spending from the year before. That bill, as I recall, was $200 million less than what we actually spent last year.

As we think about the options, spending money and the $1.7 trillion budget that we have, I think it is important to look at what the President said in his own statement of administration policy which was issued August 4, 1999, in terms of his desires for the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill which this motion to instruct is directed at. On the second page of that,

he talks about international affairs programs which ties back into what he vetoed today in terms of the Foreign Operations bill. It is his message that the ''committee underfunds activities to support the ongoing conduct of effective diplomacy and does not fully fund payments to international organizations necessary to ensure U.S. leadership in international affairs.''

This weekend I happened to share my weekend on call that I do every 4 weeks in my medical practice in Oklahoma. Starting Friday night about 11:30 and finishing up about 4:30 this morning, 10 young Oklahomans came into this world. The debate we are going to be having with the President, whether we want to or not and whether we talk about it now or whether we talk about it in the future, is going to be focused on these 10 young lives. The fact is that the Congress and the President all too often make decisions in the short term and in the short run. What we find in the Commerce, Justice, State bill is many international organizations. I thought I would just kind of look at what the bill as coming out of the House funded in terms of international organizations and affairs programs that the President objected to. I just want to spend a minute talking about those.

There is $1,949,000 for funding the following programs: The International Copper Study Group, the International Cotton Advisory Committee, the International Lead and Zinc Study Group, the International Rubber Organization, the International Office of the Wine and Vine, the International Rubber Study Group, the International Seed Testing Association, the International Tropical Timber Organization, and the International Grains Council. The amount provided includes funding for travel and for arrears.

As we looked into some of these, I think it is very important that the American public knows what these organizations do and, remember, this money very likely, if the President has his way, will come from the future benefits of these 10 babies that I delivered this weekend. Their future is going to be compromised, because we are going to borrow money from their future to actually pay for this $1,949,000.

Let me give my colleagues a little outline of what the International Office of the Wine and Vine does. First of all, remember that the wine industry in America exports $537 million worth of wine each year and it is growing each year. In 1999 we sent $64,000 to this international organization. I want Members to know what we got for our money so we did a little research. It turns out that the International Office for the Wine and Vine wrote the rules for the chardonnay of the world competition. That is a healthy, very important thing for our taxpayers and these 10 new babies from Oklahoma to be saddled with in the future. A qualitative confrontation of the world's best chardonnay. That is where the American taxpayer's dollars are going. But that is not all. The International Office of the Wine and Vine also wrote a press release touting a Danish study that confirmed that the consumption of wine has health benefits. Well, our own Surgeon General said that 15 years ago. We know that. And actually that was all we could find that they actually did for 1999 for $64,000.

Now, let us talk about the rubber. The administration has proposed funding not one but two rubber organizations dedicated to supporting the rubber supply industry; not the rubber manufacturing industry but the rubber supply industry. We spent $300,000 on the International Rubber Organization last year, $111,000 on the International Rubber Study Group. The first organization we spent $300,000. What is their job? To keep the price of rubber high. To keep the price of raw rubber high. We are a total importer of rubber. Raw rubber, we produce no raw rubber in the United States, so we spent $300,000 asking that organization to help keep the price of our imports high.

The third organization, the International Copper Study Group established in 1992, we spent $77,000. What did we get for our money, you ask? According to the web site, you can order a number of products from the International Copper Study Group. We spent $77,000, but you cannot get any of that information unless you pay them big-time bucks. $350 for a report, a directory of the copper mines in this country is $350, and if you want to use their database, another $550. The American taxpayer has already paid for it. These dollar figures do not sound like much, but when we put it in perspective, it does.

I want to pull up a couple of charts for a minute and let the Members of the House see just in these international organizations, 475 American families, their tax rate if the average family is earning $55,000, they are paying $4,100 in Federal income taxes, that is what they are paying to fund this. Looking at it a different way, the average senior in this country earns $9,396, receives that in terms of Social Security payments. If we look at the amount of seniors, that is the equivalent of shipping 207 seniors' receipts overseas, for programs that the President wants us to spend more money on in terms of international organizations.

Mr. President, we are not going to spend a penny of Social Security. This motion to instruct is to reaffirm what the House has already done and to say that we are going to stand by the appropriated amounts and not go any higher than the House level. The Senate version actually is somewhat lower. We would expect you to be a better steward of our international moneys. All we have to do is look at what has happened in Russia. We do not need more money for foreign aid because the money that we are sending in foreign aid, whether it be through the International Monetary Fund, whether it is through the World Bank, we are not a good steward of it. All we have to do is trace the $3 to $4 billion that has been absconded from the money that we sent to Russia.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is interesting to note that in anticipation of this debate, the House and Senate conferees took a break to be able to come here and speak about this issue. So from the onset, it should be noted that the work of the conferees is not being done at this moment because we have to be here to be dealing with what, in all due respect to the gentleman, I consider a waste of time.

The fact of life is that there is a process, a process where the House passes a bill and the Senate passes a bill and under our system we sit down to work it out. The gentleman does what he considers a good job at singling out some items that, if we look at any budget, could be for some people questionable items. But this is the Commerce, Justice, State, Federal Judiciary, Census Bureau, INS, FCC, FTC, NOAA, this is a bill that encompasses so much, that to single out some items that he may think are not proper and then try to in fact instruct the conferees to go out and destroy the bill is totally improper. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I rise in strong opposition to the motion to instruct conferees on the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary appropriations bill.

This is, as I said, a waste of time. Conferees are unable to meet because we have to be on the floor. On the motion, I would be interested in knowing what programs of, say, the Justice Department the gentleman from Oklahoma considers nonessential. For that matter, how would the gentleman from Oklahoma define ''nonessential''? I expect his definition would not agree with mine or with that of the administration. Does nonessential mean unauthorized? Much of the Justice Department is unauthorized. Does nonessential mean mostly salaries and expenses of Federal employees? The FBI is mostly salaries and expenses.

The second item in the motion suggests that the gentleman from Oklahoma thinks U.S. engagement with the world is of little importance. I wonder that after the Senate's failure to ratify the comprehensive test ban treaty last week, the gentleman also wishes to put the House on record as also favoring withdrawal from world leadership and refusal to meet our membership obligations to the various international organizations.

On the third point, it has been clear from the beginning that the allocations within which the House and Senate wrote their bills were too low and, therefore, unacceptable to many Democrats and certainly to the President. If Republicans are truly interested in getting the appropriations bills passed,

they will have to compromise with the Senate and the White House. That is a fact. Doing as the gentleman suggests moves us in the opposite direction.

I would remind the gentleman that while he has strong views on spending restraint, which I respect, and while this motion may actually pass because it is not binding so it is basically free, the votes are not there to pass bills that look the way he wants them to look.

I urge my colleagues not to support this motion and to have a fuller understanding of what this whole process is about. I would urge the gentleman to take a closer look at the various departments and agencies and the significance of this whole bill rather than to single out something which he feels is not proper and therefore should destroy a whole bill and a whole process.

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I find it very interesting that we did not specifically hear a denial of the claims that I made just in this one program. I was trying to be very, very general and not going into details on a lot of programs because that in fact is the priority of the appropriations process. I also was one that happened to vote to send this bill to conference.

But I would also note that the gentleman from New York did not agree that we should reduce nonessential spending, he did not agree that we should reduce spending on international organizations that are wasteful, that do not have a purpose for our children and our future, and he did not say that he was opposed to increasing the spending. Where does he think the money is going to come from? The money is going to come from these 10 children I delivered this weekend. They are going to pay for it.

The fact is if we want to talk about authorizations, the reason the appropriations process is so hard is because the Congress does not do its job in terms of sending authorizations to the appropriators. And, in fact, if we followed the strict rules of the House and did not give a rule on every appropriation bill that would not make it a point of order to strike those bills which are appropriated that are unauthorized, we would in fact have a budget that is much easier to handle, we would be doing our jobs in terms of the authorization committees, and we would not be forced to play the line to where we have to walk up to the edge of stealing Social Security money.

□ 1715

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, I am in opposition to this motion. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) has just said, we had to interrupt a meeting of the conferees that Members of the Senate and the House who are downstairs in Room H–140 of this building in the Capitol; we had to interrupt the deliberations almost as we were concluding in order to rush up here to discuss this motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, we are already working to do as the gentleman in his motion hopes. We are working within the overall framework set by the leadership to meet all of the relevant goalposts including saving Social Security. We are working to reduce spending for nonessential programs. And if the gentleman would like to attend the conference, I will invite him as my guest to sit at the table and to observe the nonessential spending that we have already cut from this bill, particularly several hundred million dollars worth of items that were in the Senate bill that no longer exists because the House conferees insisted that that nonessential spending be cut.

We are working to preserve funding for critical law enforcement programs. The Senate bill was a billion dollars below the House for the Department of Justice; that is the FBI, that is the DEA, that is the INS; that is most of the law enforcement of the Federal Government in this country is in this bill. We have managed to get that money back in place in this conference.

Mr. Speaker, we are working to get a bill that is acceptable to both the House and the Senate, and that is a job in and of itself because the bodies passed radically different bills. And we are trying to mesh them into something that both bodies can now agree on those changes. We are working to give our best shot to produce a bill that has a shot at least of being signed into law by the President. So my colleagues have to take into account in this divided government the desires of the administration; there is no way around that.

We are working to do all that I have talked about and to spend as few dollars as possible, but the fundamental point is that we are working within the framework laid down by our leadership that will meet the targets for spending and protecting Social Security, as the gentleman wants.

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask of the body:

Let us do our job. Let us bring our work to a conclusion, I hope tonight, and then we will lay it on the floor here, hopefully tomorrow, and let our colleagues judge the bill and vote up or down on the product that we produce.

So the process is working. We are going to see the product tonight or tomorrow, and then our colleagues can make their judgment. But beforehand to try to prejudge what the conferees are doing in the middle of our work is a little bit like saying to Picasso while he is half finished with a painting, ''Let's throw it out, it's not worth looking at.'' I do not want to be compared to Picasso, but let us finish our work, and then my colleagues can judge it according to their desires at that time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the motion to instruct conferees so that we can go back to work and finish this bill tonight.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just be very brief; I have no speakers. I just wanted to tell the gentleman from Kentucky, if he wants to compare me to Picasso, I do not have a problem with that.

But to suggest that when we try to deal with the expenditures of government, and I might say just to be clear that the chairman and I are going through a process right now where we do not agree on how we are spending some dollars; that is the nature of our system. But that does not mean that I would try to impede his ability to do his job by having a motion like this one or that he would try to do the same with me. To suggest that somehow we are going to raid the Social Security system, I think we did that when we tried to tell the American people that the only thing they should get is a tax break and that nothing else mattered. That is the real danger. I do not think paying for the FBI, I do not think paying for the Immigration Department is necessarily creating that kind of a problem; and I have no further speakers.

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be the closing speaker, so would the gentleman like to yield back the balance of his time?

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The first point I want to address is the motion to instruct is an approved parliamentary procedure, and I hope the gentleman from New York would grant me the right to use the procedures within the House that are available to me to try to do a motion to instruct. We have the rules of the House, and this otherwise would not have been approved and would have been stricken down.

The next thing I would say is the American people need to know where we are on this. Last year we spent $34.9 billion on CJS, this appropriation bill, and what passed the House was 35.7 billion. The House passed that. What we are saying with this motion to instruct is: Do not go any higher.

Now we understand my colleagues have been given the ability within the conference to go to $37.2 billion; we understand that. What we are saying is: If we are ever going to control the spending, if we are ever going to truly balance the budget, let alone not touch Social Security, because what the American people do not know is just because Social Security is not being

spent this year, that does not mean the Inland Waterway Trust money is not being spent and the retirement program for all Federal workers that are unfunded is not being spent that we are going to have to come back and get sometime. All these things are still not accounted for, and even though we do not spend one penny of Social Security, the national debt is still going to rise something like $40 billion this year.

So we can claim that we are not going to touch Social Security, but is that good enough for our children?

Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to see this one graph because it tells greatly what our problem is. If we do not become frugal with our taxpayers' money and with our children's money, look what happens in the year 2014. That is when the amount of money coming in for Social Security and the amount going out starts exceeding. So we would not have the ability to spend Social Security money in 2014 because the amount going to seniors would be less than what is coming in, and if we look on out to about the year 2030, what we see is a trillion dollars a year in general tax revenues. A trillion dollars above and beyond what is paid in Social Security is going to have to be available to take care of our seniors, and we have not begun to address the problems associated with Medicare.

So what we are trying to do is to slow the increase in the Commerce Justice State appropriation to about a 2 percent increase instead of a 6.6 percent, which is about to come out of conference.

Is it not interesting in our country when the Senate passes a bill at $33.7 billion, and the House passes a bill at $35.7 billion, and when they get together the tendency is, we are going to spend $2.5 billion more, and that is exactly what is getting ready to come out of that conference.

So again, I would ask the Members to think about the new children born across this country in the last 72 hours and what are we leaving them. We can do better, we have to do better, and this motion to instruct says do not spend one penny we do not have to, do not send money overseas for the International Wine and Vine or the International Rubber Council because it does not benefit Americans. It is a token we throw down in the international market that brings us no benefit.

I am not an isolationist, and I believe that America has to lead the world, but if we are bankrupt, how can we lead the world? And this is too important of an issue. We should not walk away from it. We should walk up to the line, and we should make sure that we secure the future for our children.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma, in offering this motion to instruct conferees, talked about some of the international programs that will be covered by the conference report.

However, reading the Coburn motion, I note that it also would instruct conferees to ''reduce nonessential spending in programs within the departments of Commerce'' as well as other Departments. Unfortunately, it does not indicate what programs might be meant.

In considering the motion, I must wonder whether it is aimed at making even further cuts in funding for NOAA's research programs, such as those carried out in its own labs or through cooperation with the University of Colorado and other universities. Because it's impossible to say whether NOAA is outside the scope of the motion, I cannot support the motion.

Similarly, I have to wonder whether the motion is intended to instruct the conferees to make further cuts in funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Is funding for NIST something that the gentleman from Oklahoma thinks is not essential? Again, it's impossible to tell, so once again I cannot support the motion.

And what about the Justice Department and the Judiciary? What funding for law enforcement and the courts does my colleague think is not essential? I think that having that kind of information would make it easier to decide about this motion to instruct the conferees—and, yet again, without that kind of information, I cannot support this motion to instruct the conferees.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote against this motion to instruct conferees.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until after the recorded votes on three suspension motions postponed earlier today.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3064. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3064) ''An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KYL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. INOUYE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 307(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5877(c)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which covers activities that occurred in fiscal year 1998.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1999.*

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-145)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2606, the ''Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000.''

The central lesson we have learned in this century is that we cannot protect American interests at home without active engagement abroad. Common sense tells us, and hard experience has confirmed, that we must lead in the world, working with other nations to defuse crises, repel dangers, promote more open economic and political systems, and strengthen the rule of law. These have been the guiding principles of American foreign policy for generations. They have served the American people well, and greatly helped to advance the cause of peace and freedom around the world.

This bill rejects all of those principles. It puts at risk America's 50-year tradition of leadership for a safer, more prosperous and democratic world. It is an abandonment of hope in our Nation's capacity to shape that kind of world. It implies that we are too small and insecure to meet our share of international responsibilities, too shortsighted to see that doing so is in our national interest. It is another sign of a new isolationism that would have America bury its head in the sand at the height of our power and prosperity.