

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 SO- CIAL 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 considered 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 budget 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 under-

mine 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 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."

□ 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