

on weapons procurement, training, and personnel.

This administration has not given our troops the priority they deserve. For 7 straight years, the President has sent Congress a defense budget that falls short of its needs. If Congress had not added to this budget each year since 1995, we would be in even worse shape.

Kosovo illustrates the problem, but we in Congress have the power to correct it.

---

#### LET US COMMIT TO ENDING PAY INEQUITY ON "TAKE YOUR DAUGHTER TO WORK DAY"

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, today is "Take Your Daughter to Work Day," and on this day Democrats call for action to make sure that our daughters can earn the same wages as our sons.

As we go into the 21st century, pay inequity is persistent and real. Today women must work for 14 months to earn what their male counterparts earn in a year. We earn 74 cents to every dollar that a man earns. In Illinois, my State, it is actually worse. Women earn only 70 cents.

Pay inequity hurts women and their families. Women lose about \$420,000 in wages and benefits because of unfair pay practices. It is time to put an end to this very real and costly inequity in the workplace once and for all. Democrats, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ROSA DELAURO), and I am proud to have joined her, have introduced the Paycheck Fairness Act, H.R. 541, to help eliminate the wage gap that still exists between men and women.

When my granddaughter Isabel, who is just 1 year old, enters the work force, I certainly want to be part of the solution guaranteeing that she makes exactly what her male counterparts make.

---

#### WILL LEADERS ADMIT A FAILING POLICY IN YUGOSLAVIA?

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, Michael Kelly, the editor of the National Journal, said, "It is not too much to ask that the planners (of the war) do not lie, to themselves and to the public, about how their plans are faring. And what is going on with the plan in Yugoslavia is that it is failing, catastrophically."

He added that: "We started a war to protect a people, and we know that, far from being protected, the people are

being slaughtered and driven destitute from their homes to starve in the hills."

Columnist Doug Bandow, in yesterday's Washington Times, wrote: "... NATO's blundering assault on Yugoslavia has created every condition it was supposed to prevent."

Even Senator JOHN MCCAIN said yesterday, "The NATO bombing was intended to bring Milosevic to the bargaining table. Most evidence indicates this has had the opposite effect. Apparently, he has greater support than he had before."

We have made things many times worse by our bombings. I doubt, though, that our leaders are big enough to admit that they made a horrible mistake and that we should get out of this war as soon as we possibly can.

---

#### SCHOOL VIOLENCE

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

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, we are always shocked and stunned by the unexpected, unpredictable, the unimaginable. Perhaps that is why the incident in suburban Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, 2 days ago has left us dazed and numb. But should this incident have been unexpected?

In serene Springfield, Oregon, in friendly, congenial, Paducah, Kentucky, even in the home State of our president, Jonesboro, Arkansas, in fact over the past 38 months eight other major school shootings that have occurred and taken lives of far too many of our youth.

Very recently, in fact last week in my home county of North Carolina, a teenager 19 years old shot and killed a deputy sheriff. Earlier this month in my district, Vance County, North Carolina, two twins 11 years old shot their family, killed their father, injured their mother and sister.

Madam Speaker, I believe we must search for and find a prescription for peace, both in our lives and in the lives of our children. We should seek to engage our youth. Perhaps each day we should pause, put aside our problems, take stock in our blessings. Each day we should take time to make an extra effort to go out of our way to be kind to someone. We should avoid the differences that divide us, and concentrate on the many common interests that bring us together.

We should get involved. We should work together, confront the problems, and seek to find a prescription for peace within our families and with our youth.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1141, 1999 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Obey moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H.R. 1141) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes, be instructed to disagree with the across the board reduction of funds appropriated with an emergency designation in division B of Public Law 105-277 in the Senate amendment, having the effect of reducing by 44 percent funds made available for counter drug activities, antiterrorism programs including security enhancements at U.S. embassies, Y2K computer upgrades, Plutonium disposition and Uranium purchase, the Coast Guard, Domestic Disaster Assistance, Child Survival, and other emergencies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Madam Speaker, let me say that in the handling of this supplemental appropriation, the Republican majority in this House has given us a case study in how not to proceed. It seems that virtually every time we have an emergency which this Congress is asked to fund, we are being asked by the majority caucus to do one of two things: either to do nothing, or to blow up agreements which had just been reached in the previous year's budget bill by finding offsets to pay for emergency items designated by the administration.

Madam Speaker, I would simply observe that if the provisions of the previous year's budget were so easy to reformat, it would not have taken the majority party 2 months into the new fiscal year before they got their work done last year. The decisions that were

arrived at in the budget last year were extremely hard to reach.

When the administration first provided its request to this Congress to respond to the emergency events in Central America with the greatest natural disaster we had in this century, and when they asked us to deal with what is an emerging emergency in farm country, at first the Committee on Appropriations, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Florida, produced a proposal which would have had the bipartisan support of this House. It was an honest, practical, sensible way to proceed. We thought we had a bipartisan agreement.

Then what happened is that contrary signals were sent from the House leadership to the committee leadership. They said no, throw out that approach and identify offsets, so these items will be funded on a nonemergency basis.

What the House did, in my view, was to come up with offsets which could not be more misguided if we had conducted a seminar on how to make mistakes. So we were asked by the majority party to eliminate funding which is necessary for us to have on the table in order to begin discussion with the Russians about how to secure plutonium now in the hands of the Russians so that it does not fall into the hands of terrorists or rogue Nation's, and I think that is a pretty important initiative.

Yet we are being asked to sandbag the ability of the administration to begin those discussions by taking that money out. We are also being asked to take out money which the Congress had previously appropriated for callable capital to the international financial institutions, an act which has caused our Secretary of the Treasury to become extremely concerned about the long-term instability which that could bring in dealing with many of our international economic problems.

In my judgment, those provisions were dumb enough, but then when this proposal went to the Senate, we saw a congressional version of the movie *Dumb and Dumber*. What they proceeded to do was to suggest that we ought to cut 43 percent from a number of other items in the budget last year, items which just a few months ago both parties thought were important enough to include in the budget.

They suggested that we cut, or the Senate amendment suggested we cut \$973 million in funding to correct the Y2K computer problem, which plagues many government agencies, as well as many private businesses.

□ 1030

They suggest that we cut more than \$200 million from various antiterrorism activities, including \$9.3 million in antiterrorism efforts of the FBI and \$43 million from the antiterrorism efforts of the Federal Aviation Administration

to prevent bombings and other acts of violence against commercial airlines and their passengers.

It cuts \$288 million from antidrug efforts, including reductions in enforcement activities of the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Coast Guard, and the Customs Service. It would have us cut more than \$600 million for the improvement of security at U.S. embassies overseas just 1 month after the administration was chastised in three hearings on this side of the Hill for not putting enough money in that item.

I have seen people fall off both sides of the same horse, but never at the same moment. Yet, that is what this Congress is doing by the actions that the Senate is trying to take on this conference report. It just seems to me that we ought to resist what they are doing.

We have an emergency in Kosovo, and we are hoping that that will be dealt with on a bipartisan basis. We have also had an emergency in our own backyard in the Caribbean with the worst natural disaster that has occurred in this century, and we are trying to do something about that.

We are being told that we are going to take 20,000 refugees from Kosovo to try to relieve that situation, and yet we face the prospect of having many times that number of refugees inundate our own country because of the economic collapse that is attendant to the natural disaster which occurred in Central America.

Yet that funding is not being called an emergency and it is being delayed by actions taken by this House and the actions taken by the other body. It just seems to me that we ought to recognize an emergency when we see it.

We cannot do much today about the fact that the House has already adopted what I consider to be incredibly ill-advised and misguided and certainly, in the case of the Russian plutonium item, a spectacularly destructive act. We cannot prevent the fact that the House has already done that in voting for the offsets that it has voted on. But we certainly should not compound the problem as the Senate amendment does.

So, very simply, what this motion does is ask the House to go on record asking the conferees to reject that Senate amendment so that we are not in the ludicrous position of blocking efforts to fix the Y2K computer problems, that we are not in a position of cutting off drug funding, funding about which many Members of this body just a couple months ago were posing for holy pictures, trying to show who is most for drug control efforts.

So I would simply say, I do not know any reason why any Member of either party would oppose this motion. We are going to have strong debates in the conference about the ill-advised offsets which this House adopted. But I would

think that the House would at least agree that the Senate amendments which were adopted were at least as equally ill-advised and would agree that they ought to be rejected by the conference.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I agree on the need to move this bill quickly. We are dealing with a true emergency in Central America.

Immediately upon recognizing the result of Hurricane Mitch, American armed forces were sent to Central America, and they did a tremendous humanitarian job. They saved lives. They pulled people out of swollen rivers. They helped get people out of the mud. They helped people get water that they could drink, and they improved sanitary conditions. The United States military did an outstanding job in Hurricane Mitch, but there is more to be done.

As one of their good neighbors who spent billions of dollars in the late 1970's and early 1980's to stop communism from taking over that part of the world, which was a successful effort, by the way, I might say, we now have an obligation to help our friends and neighbors when they are in a real time of need.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I do not disagree too much on what we included in the bill for the obligations that needed to be met with the funding that we did include in this bill.

We did have some differences on whether or not the spending should be offset by reducing other accounts in our Federal budget. The decision was made to offset all but the military part of this bill, and we did that.

We had already seen the offsets provided by the other body when we developed our bill. As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said, we disagreed with the offsets suggested by the other body, and so we developed our own list of offsets. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I disagree somewhat on some of those.

But, Madam Speaker, the important thing is we need to get this bill moving. We need to get to conference. In conference, we will have great debates, especially about the offsets in this proposal. But we need to get it done, and we can't get it done until we appoint the conferees today.

I have no objection to the motion that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has offered because I agree with him. We do not agree with the offsets that the other body used. There will be, as I said, some vigorous debate on this issue. But, Madam Speaker, I do not object to this motion today, and

I would hope that the House could expedite our consideration of it, and move on to its next regular piece of business.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this motion to instruct conferees and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding me this time and for bringing this motion to instruct to the floor.

I am pleased to hear that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has no objection to the motion to instruct and would not agree to the Senate offsets. I wish he would not agree to the House offsets as well.

The reason we are here having this discussion, as the Speaker knows, is that, according to the budget rules, when there is an emergency funding bill, an emergency supplemental, we do not have to have offsets.

What is an emergency? Well, many of us think that the greatest natural disaster in this hemisphere in this century, Hurricane Mitch, was thousands and thousands of people losing their lives, millions of people losing their homes and their jobs. The economy is wiped out in Central America. We think that constitutes an emergency. By any measure, it is more of an emergency than most bills we have called emergencies, most of the situations we have called emergencies before.

It was our understanding, going into the bill, that the distinguished leadership of the Committee on Appropriations of the subcommittee and the full committee did not see the necessity for offsets. But instructions from the Republican leadership were to have offsets.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has very eloquently described the consequences of some of the offsets in the House bill relating to plutonium, relating to callable capital, thrusting uncertainty on the international financial institutions.

But this motion to instruct is about not making matters worse by having the House conferees not agree to the Senate offsets, which, as I say, would only make matters worse.

So here we are in a situation where ordinarily we would not need offsets,

but this time the Republican leadership has foisted them upon the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations.

We have a bill coming up soon for Kosovo where I hope we will not have offsets. It is hard to explain the inconsistencies in how we deal with these emergencies.

We agree that we must move this along, as the distinguished chairman said. But in order to do that, we have to have some very serious, mature conversations about these offsets.

I just want to convey to the House briefly some of the consequences of this delay that has been caused by this debate on the offset, this departure from the regular order in terms of funding an emergency supplemental bill.

Most of the world seems to have forgotten, because other events have begun to eclipse what has happened in Central America. It is the fate of the Central American countries who suffered the devastation of Hurricane Mitch.

It is now the end of April, 6 months after Hurricane Mitch struck, and none of the sorely needed reconstruction assistance has been approved by Congress. This is an emergency. AID and the Defense Department were able to respond to the immediate needs and restore basic health and sanitation to the devastated areas. However, in doing so, they are using existing resources that have been exhausted.

I associate myself with the comments of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), our distinguished chairman, when he talks and sings in praise of the work of the DOD and the U.S. military in Central America and their assistance there. They are to be praised; the situation would have been much worse without them. We are very proud of their effort.

But it is hard to understand why the money going to the DOD does not need to be offset, but all the other spending on Hurricane Mitch needs to be offset, again, another inconsistency.

To be more precise, several of the major NGOs operating in Honduras, such as CARE, the Catholic Relief Service, and Save the Church are running out of funding, really momentarily. The major Food for Work program under way in Honduras has run out of food to pay its workers.

One hundred thousand small-scale farms will not receive credit or inputs for the first crop of basic grains, corn, bean, and rice as the planting season gets under way.

Planting season is now upon us, and many farmers are without seeds to begin their first major crop since the hurricane. Low yields on the first crop will of course continue the food shortages and increase the emergency food requirements.

Over 2,940 miles of roads and 300 bridges destroyed by the hurricane re-

main unusable. No significant funding has been provided to begin this rebuilding. Without funds for infrastructure or agricultural recovery, the over 100,000 laborers displaced by the hurricane will remain unemployed or underemployed. This increases pressure on migration to the U.S.

Roughly 200,000 school kids have no schools or are managing in open-air facilities. Over 1,700 schools were destroyed by the hurricane, and little funding to rebuild them has been made available.

Over 700 health clinics, providing the most basic of health services to the impoverished area, were destroyed. The chances for the recurrence or the spread of epidemics for malaria, cholera and dengue fever increases as the recovery of health systems delayed.

Congress needs to act now to make this funding available. It is in fact long overdue. We want an economic recovery in Central America. We do need to provide some assistance to spur that along. We should be doing it without offsets. Certainly we should do it without the Senate offsets.

It is in that regard that I once again commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his leadership in bringing this very enlightened motion to instruct to the floor, and I am delighted that the distinguished gentleman (Mr. YOUNG) has no objection to it.

Let us move forward, keep our promises to our Latin American neighbors and relieve their plight as we move forward. We must move now.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for yielding me the time, and I rise in support, very strong support of this motion to instruct. I am not surprised that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is not objecting to this motion, and I congratulate the chairman on his leadership.

I want to associate myself with the remarks both that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) made earlier and that the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has just made.

With respect to offsets and with respect to the necessity to move the supplemental as quickly as possible both for our farmers and for those victims of Mitch, we have, as the gentlewoman indicated, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) may have referenced as well, some 800,000-plus people.

We see the pictures of refugees in Albania and in Macedonia being created by the violence and, from my perspective, war crimes being committed by

the Milosevic army. But having said that, we also know that there are other reasons to support this motion to instruct.

□ 1045

I want to specifically refer to the Y2K emergency fund that was put in, the supplemental that we proposed last year, or the omnibus bill we appropriated last year, some \$2.25 billion for nondefense agencies to make sure their critical computer systems are Year 2000 compliant. The motion that the Senate adopted would cut that by 44 percent. Quite obviously, that would have a devastating effect on all the other programs, but as well on the Y2K, which all of us, all of us, admit is an emergency.

There is not a day that goes by that we do not hear on our televisions or our radio or read in our newspapers about the issue of Y2K. Are we, on December 31 of 1999, going to have our computer systems, which are involved in almost everything we rely on on a daily basis, going to recognize the change and be able to ensure that the systems remain operative as they should? Obviously most critical, I suppose, with the FAA airplanes flying, but to so many other systems, large and small.

On the Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government of the Committee on Appropriations, we tried in a bipartisan manner to enact the critical appropriation as an emergency fiscal year 1998 supplemental. But we were continually told by the leadership to wait until the end of the year. Unfortunately, now the Senate has waited until well into the fiscal year and are proposing a 44 percent cut.

Madam Speaker, I am hopeful that not only will this motion to instruct prevail, which I presume it is going to, but also that the Senate, in conference, will see the wisdom of this motion to instruct and will not only reconsider this amendment to cut by 44 percent those supplemental funds but will, in addition, also see the necessity, the emergency of reconsidering their requirement for offsets. And that on those matters that are truly emergency, which we believe the supplemental is, we will move ahead without political rancor, without debate about offsets, to see that our farmers, those ravaged by an act of God such as Mitch, and those as well ravaged by war and by genocide will all be given the help of this Nation and of our people as quickly as possible.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Let me simply say in closing, Madam Speaker, that I think this Congress needs to recognize that we are facing a genuine emergency in the consideration of this bill. A bunch of people wearing suits on the floor of the House

of Representatives, or sport coats, might not think that there is an emergency in farm country, but real live dirt farmers see the fact that world farm prices are at near record low levels; they see that commercial lenders are refusing to extend the credit that is necessary in many instances for farmers to proceed with planting; and they understand why the President thought that this was an emergency and so designated it.

I would simply note that it is now the latter part of April and we are just now talking about going to conference on this legislation. It is getting dangerously late for those American farmers. And I would say the situation in Central America is also pressing.

Now, many people will ask why should we provide emergency funding because of the Hurricane Mitch problems in Central America. I would simply make the following observation.

We spent almost \$9 billion in countering what we thought was a military threat in Central America through the funding of the Contras, through the funding of military aid and economic aid to El Salvador and a number of other Central American countries when they were having military problems. But we now run the danger of ignoring what is happening in that region at a time when something is going on which is just as destabilizing and in fact could be more so than the military confrontations that were taking place just a few short years ago.

Polls have shown that almost 10 percent of the population of Honduras, Nicaragua and El Salvador are thinking about leaving their countries and moving north because of the devastation caused by that hurricane. If that happens, we could see over a million people trying to work their way up, either legally or illegally, into this country. If people have a choice of simply standing in the rain or walking in the rain, they are going to start walking north. That could cost this country as much as \$7,000 a child for every child who comes into this country.

And so it seems to me even if we do not want to focus on the humanitarian obligations we have to our neighbors, it seems to me at least we have a self-interest reason for moving this legislation on and recognizing it for the emergency that it really is.

I would urge adoption of the amendment and a recognition that, in general, the offsets which are being proposed both by this body and the other body are ill-advised, counterproductive, and in some cases downright dangerous.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and want to thank him for his leadership on bringing this motion to the House.

I felt compelled to speak on this because of the condition of rural America and the fact that again we are encountering delay in the consideration of this legislation; more amendments being offered in the other body, slowing down a very important supplemental package that contains many items relating to assistance for Central America and Hurricane Mitch, but equally important for the farmers here in this country.

There is a literal depression that is affecting our country from coast to coast among people who are hard-working, taxpaying Americans, and this Congress is incapable of clearing a bill quickly to help the American people who so desperately need it.

I find it completely ironic that now we here in the House have to instruct the conferees to go back to the other body and say, no, we do not want this amendment either because they are dipping into cuts in other accounts that deal with Y2K and other programs, but tucked under all of that is this giant need in rural America where farmers are being put at the end of the line waiting as Congress dithers more, is unable to reach any kind of conclusion, and we have to have more delays.

So, to me, I will support the motion to instruct simply as an act of protest against the inability of this institution to protect the American people's interests. Frankly, I am very much interested in us being internationally involved and doing what is responsible elsewhere, but the point is that rural America is in depression and we are acting like nothing is happening.

I just wish every tractor would come back to Washington and surround this place and make the leadership of this institution and the other body responsible for what is happening. Farm income is going to drop another 20 percent this year. USDA has used up all of its emergency loan authority. Credit is not being extended this spring. Seed companies back home are holding debt from last year.

Now is planting season, my colleagues. Spring has been in existence for over a month now and we cannot bring a bill out of this Congress. Where is the leadership of this institution and the other body in trying to meet the real needs of the American people, which are urgent? For the life of me I do not understand. To me, it is a disgrace that we have to debate these kinds of amendments that are being loaded on over in the Senate and not clear that portion of the bill which is so desperately needed by our own people.

I want to thank the ranking member on our full committee, the gentleman

from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), whose State is as heavily affected as my own, as well as every other Member here who understands the pain of the rural countryside today, what has happened to prices, as we sit here on our haunches and are unable to clear a bill. I ask again, where is the leadership in this body and in the other one to recognize the pain of the rural countryside?

Please support the motion to instruct and, more importantly, disgorge the farm portion of this bill and get it moving.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, having been led to believe there was not to be any debate on this motion, I yielded back my time. But at this time I ask unanimous consent that I may reclaim my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

I did believe that we were not to have any debate here so that we could expedite this motion and get on with the rest of the business of the House. But I would like to respond again, as I said earlier, we did not agree with the Senate offsets in the bill. That is why I am willing to support this motion that does not agree with the Senate offsets. There has been sufficient leadership in the House on this measure to move this to conference, and we will move it to conference quickly.

The gentleman is right, there has been a little bit of a delay on the part of the other body. I met with the majority leader of the Senate yesterday and discussed that issue and we are prepared to move expeditiously.

There will be differences, even among those of us who are conferees, on the House offsets. But what I have to tell my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, we made a determination that we were going to, except for true national defense emergencies, offset the spending bills.

Now, when we dealt with disasters in our own country just a few years back, we offset the money that we spent for those disasters. In fact, one of the sources for those offsets was one of the offsets that the other side objects to now.

So we will work this out, but I would hope that we would keep this from becoming a partisan political issue. I am attempting to move the appropriations bills in such a way that they relate to the needs of the country and to move them as expeditiously as possible under the House rules.

So we are prepared to do this, and we are prepared to accept this motion today. I would suggest that I am ready to vote if the gentleman from Wisconsin is ready to vote.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I am informed now that I have one additional request for time, and then that will be the last person I yield to on this side on this issue.

I just think the record is clear and we need to be reminded of it. This side has not made this supplemental a partisan issue. This side made clear to the gentleman that we were willing to support, on a bipartisan basis, his initial recommendations that he intended to make to the committee and to the House on how we ought to proceed on this supplemental, because the gentleman did correctly recognize that this was an emergency which should be funded on an emergency basis.

It was then the gentleman's caucus or his leadership, I am not sure which, who then instructed the majority side of the Committee on Appropriations to take a different route and, instead of seeking common ground with the President and us on this issue, they produced a proposal which they knew we would not buy.

I am sorry, but I believe it is downright stupid and dangerous for us to take off the table the money which we need in order to negotiate a settlement with the Russians that will remove the possibility that weapons-grade plutonium, which is now in their hands, will be diverted to other far more dangerous hands.

□ 1100

It is stupid and ridiculous for this House to take that position, and yet that is one of the offsets that this House decided to impose on the President. At the very time that we are talking about trying to get the Russians to help in solving the Yugoslav mess, they are yanking off the table the principal carrot that we have to reach agreement on the disposal of the most dangerous material in the universe.

Now, there is nothing partisan about that, but there is something very stupid about it. And that is why we are opposed to what the House did. We regret the fact that a proposal, which started out to be bipartisan because of the wise and correct judgments of the gentleman, have now been turned into something else by the determination of the Republican leadership of this House to have yet another unnecessary fight with the President.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Let me just say in the 1 minute that I have, this is in the national interest of the United States. Forget about being humanitarian and helping Central Americans, which we want to do.

Do we want to see a million people who have no home and no place to

work and have nothing to lose? They will come north; that is their mission if they have no opportunity, no hope. Do we want to see disease spread? It will spread north. Do we want to see the drug cartels take over regions that otherwise have no other hope? They will do that.

It is in the national interest of the United States to provide this funding, to have done so already. The rainy season starts. A million people who have nothing to lose. It is in the national interest of the United States to do this.

But our Republican friends have proposed those provisions that are impossible to accept as offsets to the supplemental. Imagine in the Senate having domestic drug programs cut at a time that the drug cartels are even moving more forcefully forward.

So I support the amendment of the gentleman, but our cause and our case is that this is an emergency. We have got a million people right to the south of us and they need help now and we are languishing with this. We need to move it and move it now.

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

I would like to suggest that if the worst thing the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) calls me during the balance of the appropriations process this year is stupid, I will be happy because there are other things that will be mentioned.

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam Speaker, I did not call him stupid, and I do not believe him to be stupid. I called the action taken by this House stupid, and I stand by that statement.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I must respond that offsetting spending when we are trying to balance the Federal budget is not stupid. When we have a national debt that has debt service that is equal to or exceeds what we invest in our only national security, it is not stupid to try to do something about that debt and to try to balance the budget.

And if we are going to spend on one hand without taking the budget into a deficit situation, we have got to take it away somewhere else. And we cannot go visiting around the world dropping off commitments for money for one thing or another without even consulting with the Congress and expect the Congress to just pay the bill when it gets here.

Now, that is not partisan either. What it is is trying to be responsible and keep the commitment that all of us have made.

I do not know of anyone, there may be one or two, that have said we should not balance the budget. But everyone

that I know in this House has committed themselves to a balanced budget. And you cannot balance the budget by continuing to spend. So we take some of the items that are not quite as important as responding to the disaster and we offset them.

Now let me mention what the offset was that the gentleman is so upset about. We used as an offset callable capital to the World Bank, callable capital which has not been called in over 20 years and that is not even important, but callable capital which was the same source that was used in this House to offset a disaster appropriations bill. For a disaster in the United States in the western part of our country, we used callable capital as the offset.

I know the gentlewoman is shaking her head, but the fact is, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has it on record and indicates who voted for that amendment by our friend and previous colleague from California (Mr. Fazio) to reduce the callable capital for the World Bank by the amount needed to offset that bill.

Now, if that consistency was mentioned before, if we are going to be consistent, if callable capital as an offset was okay now, why is it not okay now?

So I think, Madam Speaker, that we have what I think Harry Truman called a red herring, but we are going to debate these issues in conference and we will come to a resolution and this bill will be provided.

We are not withholding the immediate emergency support that was needed in Central America. We did that already. We sent troops and they took care of the immediate emergency requirements.

So, anyway, despite all of this debate and despite this argument, I still support the motion made by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and I say we get on about our business and get into conference and settle this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. OBEY. Madam 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. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 414, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—414

Abercrombie	Davis (VA)	Hoyer
Ackerman	Deal	Hulshof
Aderholt	DeFazio	Hunter
Allen	DeGette	Hutchinson
Andrews	Delahunt	Hyde
Archer	DeLauro	Inslee
Armey	DeLay	Isakson
Bachus	DeMint	Istook
Baird	Deutsch	Jackson (IL)
Baker	Diaz-Balart	Jackson-Lee
Baldacci	Dickey	(TX)
Baldwin	Dicks	Jefferson
Ballenger	Dingell	Jenkins
Barcia	Dixon	John
Barr	Doggett	Johnson (CT)
Barrett (NE)	Dooley	Johnson, E. B.
Barrett (WI)	Doolittle	Johnson, Sam
Bartlett	Doyle	Jones (NC)
Barton	Dreier	Jones (OH)
Bass	Duncan	Kanjorski
Bateman	Dunn	Kaptur
Becerra	Edwards	Kelly
Bentsen	Ehlers	Kennedy
Bereuter	Ehrlich	Kildee
Berkley	Emerson	Kilpatrick
Berman	English	Kind (WI)
Berry	Eshoo	King (NY)
Biggert	Etheridge	Kingston
Bilbray	Evans	Kleczka
Bilirakis	Everett	Klink
Bishop	Ewing	Knollenberg
Blagojevich	Farr	Kolbe
Bliley	Fattah	Kucinich
Blumenauer	Filner	Kuykendall
Blunt	Fletcher	LaFalce
Boehlert	Foley	LaHood
Boehner	Forbes	Lampson
Bonior	Fossella	Lantos
Bono	Fowler	Largent
Borski	Frank (MA)	Larson
Boswell	Franks (NJ)	Latham
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	LaTourette
Boyd	Frost	Lazio
Brady (PA)	Gallegly	Leach
Brady (TX)	Ganske	Lee
Brown (OH)	Gejdenson	Levin
Bryant	Gekas	Lewis (CA)
Burr	Gephardt	Lewis (KY)
Burton	Gibbons	Lipinski
Buyer	Gilchrest	LoBiondo
Callahan	Gillmor	Lofgren
Calvert	Gilman	Lowey
Camp	Gonzalez	Lucas (KY)
Campbell	Goode	Lucas (OK)
Canady	Goodlatte	Luther
Cannon	Goodling	Maloney (CT)
Capps	Gordon	Maloney (NY)
Capuano	Goss	Manzullo
Cardin	Graham	Markey
Carson	Granger	Martinez
Castle	Green (TX)	Mascara
Chabot	Green (WI)	Matsui
Chambliss	Greenwood	McCarthy (MO)
Chenoweth	Gutierrez	McCarthy (NY)
Clay	Gutknecht	McCollum
Clayton	Hall (OH)	McCrary
Clement	Hall (TX)	McDermott
Clyburn	Hansen	McGovern
Coble	Hastings (WA)	McHugh
Coburn	Hayes	McInnis
Collins	Hayworth	McIntosh
Combest	Hefley	McIntyre
Condit	Herger	McKinney
Conyers	Hill (IN)	McNulty
Cook	Hill (MT)	Meehan
Cooksey	Hilleary	Meek (FL)
Costello	Hilliard	Meeks (NY)
Cox	Hinchey	Menendez
Coyne	Hinojosa	Metcalfe
Cramer	Hobson	Mica
Crane	Hoeffel	Millender-
Crowley	Hoekstra	McDonald
Cubin	Holden	Miller (FL)
Cummings	Holt	Miller, Gary
Cunningham	Hooley	Miller, George
Danner	Horn	Minge
Davis (FL)	Hostettler	Mink
Davis (IL)	Houghton	Moakley

Mollohan	Rogan	Stump
Moran (KS)	Rogers	Stupak
Moran (VA)	Rohrabacher	Sununu
Morella	Ros-Lehtinen	Sweeney
Murtha	Rothman	Talent
Myrick	Roukema	Tauscher
Nadler	Roybal-Allard	Tauzin
Napolitano	Royce	Taylor (MS)
Neal	Rush	Taylor (NC)
Nethercutt	Ryan (WI)	Terry
Ney	Ryun (KS)	Thomas
Northup	Sabo	Thompson (CA)
Norwood	Salmon	Thompson (MS)
Oberstar	Sanchez	Thornberry
Obey	Sanders	Thune
Olver	Sandlin	Thurman
Ortiz	Sanford	Tiahrt
Ose	Sawyer	Tierney
Owens	Scarborough	Toomey
Oxley	Schaffer	Traficant
Packard	Schakowsky	Turner
Pallone	Scott	Udall (CO)
Pascrell	Sensenbrenner	Udall (NM)
Pastor	Serrano	Upton
Paul	Sessions	Velázquez
Payne	Shadegg	Vento
Pease	Shaw	Visclosky
Pelosi	Shays	Walden
Peterson (MN)	Sherman	Walsh
Peterson (PA)	Sherwood	Wamp
Petri	Shimkus	Waters
Phelps	Shows	Watkins
Pickering	Shuster	Watt (NC)
Pickett	Simpson	Watts (OK)
Pitts	Sisisky	Waxman
Pombo	Skeen	Weldon (FL)
Pomeroy	Skelton	Weldon (PA)
Porter	Slaughter	Weller
Portman	Smith (MI)	Wexler
Price (NC)	Smith (NJ)	Weygand
Pryce (OH)	Smith (TX)	Whitfield
Quinn	Smith (WA)	Wicker
Ramstad	Snyder	Wilson
Rangel	Souder	Wise
Regula	Spence	Wolf
Reyes	Spratt	Woolsey
Reynolds	Stabenow	Wu
Riley	Stark	Wynn
Rivers	Stearns	Young (AK)
Rodriguez	Stenholm	Young (FL)
Roemer	Strickland	

NOT VOTING—19

Bonilla	Lewis (GA)	Saxton
Brown (CA)	Linder	Tancredó
Brown (FL)	McKeon	Tanner
Engel	Moore	Towns
Ford	Nussle	Weiner
Hastings (FL)	Radanovich	
Kasich	Rahall	

□ 1126

So the motion to instruct 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. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 22, 1999, I was unable to record a vote by electronic device on roll No. 96. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on roll No. 96.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOEHNER). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. YOUNG of Florida, REGULA, LEWIS of California, PORTER, ROGERS, SKEEN, WOLF, KOLBE, PACKARD, CALLAHAN, WALSH, TAYLOR of North Carolina, HOBSON, OBEY, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, HOYER, MOLLOHAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SERRANO and Mr. PAS- TOR.

There was no objection.